



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 2023

No. 93

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Sovereign God, watch over us this day. Remind us of Your abiding presence in the valley of decision. Walk alongside each of us that we would receive Your assurance that we are not alone in our efforts to serve this country. The concerns we harbor both personally and professionally are safely in Your keeping.

Guard our hearts and minds and fill them with the grace of Your spirit that, in the discourse of this day, we would take each thought captive in our obedience to You.

Replenish our energy and purpose with the good treasure of hope found only in You, that we would trust that in Your loving mercy and preventient grace, what is good will be brought forth from the work this week.

Protect us from everything that would draw us away from You. In the multitude of decisions, actions, and all their consequences, remind us that our eyes should remain fixed on Your guidance and our faith stand firm in discerning Your will this day and in the days ahead.

In the certainty of Your name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 3(z) of House Resolution 5, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON) come

forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. HINSON 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.

COMBATING SPOTTED LANTERNFLIES

(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 draw attention to an invasive species attacking Pennsylvania agriculture.

The spotted lanternfly was first discovered in the Commonwealth in 2014 and has since traveled to 51 out of our 67 counties. This spotted lanternfly can impact the grape, fruit tree, plant nursery, and timber industries, which contribute billions of dollars each year to Pennsylvania's economy.

In efforts to prevent the spread of the spotted lanternfly, Pennsylvania has established quarantine zones, but it takes collective and intentional efforts to slow the spread of this insect.

Across the Commonwealth, the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture along with Penn State Extension provide education-based programs to the public. These programs are key resources for community members looking for information on how to combat and slow the spread of the spotted lanternfly.

Mr. Speaker, with warmer weather comes spotted lanternfly hatching season, and residents are encouraged to squash the bug and their egg masses.

It will take us all doing our part to prevent any further spread of this invasive insect, and I encourage all to utilize their local resources when combating invasive species.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CONEN MORGAN

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor an exceptional North Carolinian taken from us too soon, Conen Morgan.

Conen grew up in Wake County, where he developed a love for science in middle school. He graduated from Garner High School and went on to earn his bachelor of science degree in computer science from North Carolina State.

He was a Kappa brother and embodied their motto: Achievement in every field of human endeavor.

Like a Rube Goldberg machine, he was always doing so many different creative things. Conen was an activist, scientist, teacher, graphic artist, and entrepreneur. Occasionally, he did some politics, too.

He served as the 67th president of the Young Democrats of North Carolina and worked on countless campaigns, including my own.

However, after his wife, Reyna, and his family and friends, his greatest love was Science Olympiad. With over 30 years of service to Science Olympiad, he gave back to the entire North Carolina community by empowering young minds to explore science and find wonder in the world.

His friends, his family, his political colleagues, and the tens of thousands of students he reached will all miss Conen's smile, his laugh, his compassion, and, most of all, his faith that if a kid like him could succeed, every kid in our State should have the education

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.

H2667

and opportunities they need so they could succeed, as well.

Rest in peace, Conen.

CONGRATULATING CHAMBERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL TRACK AND FIELD

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chambersburg High School on winning the PIAA boys' track and field championship this past week at Shippensburg University.

Under the leadership of Coach Bob Walker, Chambersburg outdistanced their competition on the way to scoring 48 points and claiming the team's first-ever State championship.

Coach Walker has consistently worked with student athletes to demonstrate that there are no shortcuts to success. Practice, hard work, and determination are the hallmarks of what has made this an incredible team.

Chambersburg's commitment to academic excellence is an example of how student athletes can be supported both on and off the track.

On behalf of the people of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, I congratulate the Chambersburg High School Trojans and wish them every continued success.

HIGHLIGHTING SOCIAL MOBILITY AND CSUSM

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to highlight California State University San Marcos, located in my district in San Diego County.

Recently, the university was ranked number one in the Nation in the 2022 Social Mobility Index out of 14,000 colleges and universities.

This annual index measures the opportunities universities provide economically disadvantaged and first-generation students to graduate into well-paying jobs.

With approximately 80 percent of their students remaining in our region after graduation, the university's success is a major benefit to the San Diego region.

California State University San Marcos has opened its doors wide and welcomed students of all backgrounds: 54 percent of students are the first in their family to attend college; 40 percent have high financial need; 12 percent are military-affiliated; and the campus has the highest enrollment of former foster youth per capita in the Nation.

Through teaching hard skills and providing a world-class STEM education, California State University San Marcos drives upward social and economic mobility. We should encourage

universities across the Nation to look to this institution as an example of how to put student success first.

I congratulate California State University San Marcos and President Neufeldt. I am proud they are serving the citizens of my district, and I look forward to seeing the ongoing success of their graduates in our region and beyond.

ARE YOU SMARTER THAN A FIFTH GRADER?

(Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize fifth grade students from Mid-Prairie Middle School in Kalona, Iowa, for serving as an excellent example of how young Americans can have a positive impact on their communities. They spent the last few months learning about financial literacy and entrepreneurship by starting their own endeavor selling candy to other students in the district, with the goal of donating their profits to a local animal shelter.

What the students and teachers didn't know when they started the business was how successful it would become. With an initial goal of raising \$100, they blew everyone away when they presented their grand total of \$750 to the local shelter this past Tuesday. The money will go toward saving the lives of countless animals in need of a home.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have such bright young entrepreneurs in my district. When they ask if you are smarter than a fifth grader, I would say to look to Kalona Mid-Prairie Middle School.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CONEN MORGAN

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

Mrs. FOUSHEE. Mr. Speaker, with a heavy heart, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring the memory of Mr. Conen Morgan, an extraordinary North Carolinian who was taken from us far too soon.

Conen was a steadfast advocate for equity and played a pivotal role in shaping North Carolina politics as a renowned political consultant and a founding member of Advance North Carolina.

He was a remarkable human being and had the unique ability to inspire and touch the lives of everyone he encountered through his kindness, compassion, and genuine care for others.

Conen's leadership, passion, and tireless efforts will have a lasting impact and will leave a profound void in many folks across North Carolina that will be felt for years to come.

I am immensely honored to have known Conen, both personally and professionally. Indeed, he was my friend. I

extend my deepest condolences to his wife, Reyna Walters-Morgan, and his family, friends, and loved ones.

RECOGNIZING FIRST-EVER JMU VALLEY SCHOLARS GRADUATING CLASS

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the first-ever graduating class from the Valley Scholars program at James Madison University in Harrisonburg, Virginia.

Between eighth grade and high school graduation, potential first-generation college students are recruited as scholars from surrounding public school districts, and they engage in educational and cultural enrichment activities.

During the Valley Scholars program, students are encouraged and motivated to become leaders in the classroom and the community while building skills that will increase awareness and access to institutions of higher education.

With the goal of receiving scholarship support to attend JMU, the students have the opportunity to be the first in their families to earn college degrees.

Virginia's Sixth District is incredibly proud of these talented students for their hard work to achieve their American Dream.

I congratulate the first graduating class of Valley Scholars and their families back home. America can't wait to see what the future has in store for them.

□ 1415

FIGHTING FOR VETERANS

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

Mr. Speaker, extreme Republicans have been dead set on demanding harmful cuts that would be disastrous for the American people. If they didn't get their way, they threatened to default on our economy.

In fact, Republicans demanded: a 22 percent cut to veterans' healthcare; to make essential toxic exposure and burn pits funding discretionary so that veterans would have to come hat in hand to the Federal Government every year; and to zero out funding for the PACT Act's toxic exposure fund or use it for other purposes.

Republicans were willing to cause an economic default that would have raised costs for families, cut one million jobs for workers, and cost seniors their retirement, if they didn't get their way.

Now, under these horrendous circumstances, the House today will vote on a bipartisan budget agreement. Under President Biden's leadership, this bill saved veterans' healthcare

from Republicans' harmful cuts and prevented an economic disaster for the American people.

This bill will fully fund the PACT Act's toxic exposure fund for veterans exposed to burn pits with an increase of \$15 billion, and it makes this funding mandatory. That is why I will vote "yes" today.

REMEMBERING DR. ALLAN BERNSTEIN

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

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Dr. Allan Bernstein, a former Tustin mayor known as "Doc". He passed away on May 24, 2023.

Dr. Bernstein devoted many years to serving the city of Tustin, serving on the city council from 2012 to 2020 and as mayor in 2017 and also in 2020. He also served on several State and county boards and committees.

He was committed to seeing Tustin thrive and always looked after the best interests of his residents, businesses, and staff.

Doc was a dear friend of mine, and I know he truly cared about the Tustin community. I join our Tustin community in mourning his passing and send my deepest condolences to his wife, Randi; son and daughter-in-law, Adam and Karlee; and his mother, Ruth.

OHIO ENERGY RATE HIKES

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an immense burden being shifted onto Ohio electric ratepayers beginning this week while Congress works to prevent a national default.

Ohio customers who buy electricity directly from disgraced FirstEnergy Corporation may see rates increase by as much as 47 percent starting in June.

If your energy bill is \$50, you will now pay \$73.50 a month. If your bill is \$100 a month on average, you will pay \$147 per month. These new rates will last through May of 2024.

The State of Ohio seems to have no problem with a system where FirstEnergy, a criminal nuclear enterprise, can shift \$1.3 billion in their losses to ratepayers. When it comes time to pay its taxes, the company has an effective tax rate of negative 1.3 percent. Then FirstEnergy bilks millions more from the Federal Government instead of paying its fair share.

As Ohio families struggle to keep up with inflation, put food on the table, and pay for childcare, FirstEnergy is squeezing consumers to pay for its criminal behavior. For shame. This corruption cannot stand.

RECOGNIZING GENERAL RANDY GEORGE

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

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize General Randy George, a native of Alden, Iowa, who was recently nominated to be the next Army Chief of Staff. This is a tremendous and well-deserved honor for General George.

General George served our Nation both in Iraq and Afghanistan. He is a decorated military hero, having earned a Purple Heart and Defense Distinguished Service Medal, among many other accolades.

General George exemplifies distinguished and selfless service. It is only because of brave Americans like General George that we can wave our American flag, we can speak freely, and we can practice the religion that we choose.

I am hopeful that his service inspires the next generation of Iowans and Americans to answer our Nation's call.

General George has made his hometown of Alden, Iowa, and the entire Hawkeye State proud.

CLEAN DEBT BILL

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in awe of Republicans' ability to hijack our economy and put lives at risk.

We should be voting on a clean debt limit bill, not a quasi-budget bill that began with their phony default on America act.

They usurped a legitimate policy process to get gains they knew would never make it across the finish line. This has been about a vengeful GOP party chomping at the bit for retribution and willing to push our country to the brink of economic catastrophe.

Let's not forget where we started. Republicans wanted to cut food benefits, eliminate healthcare, and take away benefits from veterans.

I want to know how they can say they stand for this Republic and the American people, when their actions say the opposite. They have proven what they were willing to do to our families and the global economy.

They think they are drawing blood from Democrats, but really, they are exacting their pound of flesh from the American people. If that is what they stand for, then like the Speaker votes, later today should be easy for them.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FAUSTO G. DIAZ

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

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my constituent and friend, Fausto G. Diaz.

A fellow member of the Christopher Columbus High School family, Fausto was a successful Cuban-American entrepreneur and job creator who, along with parents Remedios and Fausto and sister Rosie, took their business to new heights.

Fausto was deeply patriotic, loved this country and never forgot about his parents' native homeland of Cuba. He was a tireless advocate for Cuba's freedom and the importance of keeping sanctions on the brutal regime that strangles the island.

Above all, Fausto was a loving son, brother, father, grandfather, and uncle who was so proud of his growing family.

Fausto passed away unexpectedly on the morning of Tuesday, May 30, but his legacy lives on in his children, Jacqueline and Fausto; and grandchildren, Victor and Katherine.

Rest easy, my friend.

REMEMBERING CONEN MORGAN

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

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and stand in solidarity with my fellow North Carolina delegation members to honor and remember the life and legacy of Conen Morgan.

Conen was a friend and a giant in the world of North Carolina political advocacy and public policy. He had an uncanny ability to connect with people from all walks of life, bridging divides and fostering a sense of unity.

He wanted everyone to have access to the American Dream. His passion in life was to work for fairness and equity.

Conen left this world a brighter place for current and future generations of North Carolinians. May we find strength in each other as we remember the profound impact Conen Morgan made in our lives, and may we strive to carry forward his legacy of compassion, dedication, and tireless advocacy.

RESTORING FISCAL SANITY

(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, today on behalf of all Americans, the House will be voting on the Fiscal Responsibility Act to restore fiscal sanity and hold Washington accountable.

Yesterday, a New York Post editorial acknowledged that the debt limit deal from Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY is a win for the Nation.

It advances the GOP's control-spending agenda significantly, on multiple fronts. Most crucially, it starts reducing Federal outlays immediately and it

cuts some spending. That by itself is the first such major spending reduction ever.

It also claws back tens of billions of dollars in unspent COVID relief. It adds work requirements for food stamps. It also adds some budgeting/appropriations rules that should prevent another omnibus monster to avoid a government shutdown. It is the first reform in decades of environmental rules that slow major energy and infrastructure projects.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America with Biden's open borders.

HONORING CONEN MORGAN

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I too rise to honor a true North Carolinian, Conen Morgan. Conen was taken from us at the age of 42 in a recent boating accident.

Mr. Speaker, he dearly loved North Carolina. Conen used his God-given talents to make our State and Nation better.

He led the Longleaf Agency. Conen was wise beyond his years and known for his knack and insights into our State and Nation.

Conen's hard work, determination, and dedication did not go unnoticed. He made a positive impact on the lives of people across North Carolina.

We will miss his warmth whenever he walked into a room and his infectious smile.

Mr. Speaker, I join those in eastern North Carolina and across our State in sending our deepest sympathy to his wife, Reyna; his family; and friends.

HONORING CLEVELAND JOSEPH FOUNTAIN

(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 honor the life of Cleve Fountain who was involved in his community with a deep commitment to public service.

Early on in his life, he was a member of the YMCA and the Boy Scouts of America. He joined the U.S. Army at age 15 and served in the Pacific theater during World War II and finished his service with the rank of second lieutenant.

He moved to Port Wentworth, Georgia, my hometown. He owned Fountain Funeral Home and Westview Nursing and Rehabilitation Center. He was our mayor. He was our county commissioner.

In 1988, I set out to achieve a goal of mine and that was to own my own busi-

ness. I went to two banks. Both of them turned me down. I went to the third bank. They gave me the loan.

They gave me the loan because Cleve Fountain called and told them that I was a fine young man and that I came from a good family.

Mr. Speaker, in our lives there are people and places we remember. I will always remember Cleve Fountain for what he did for me and what he did for my family.

ADVANCING ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, everyone, no matter their ZIP Code, should be able to enjoy natural resources. This week, Congresswoman MELANIE STANSBURY and I introduced the Environmental Justice in Recreation Permitting Act to require the Biden administration to complete an inner-agency report on the effects of special recreation permits on environmental justice communities.

Our communities of color, Mr. Speaker, low-income communities, Tribal and indigenous communities are on the front lines of the climate crisis.

Enabling greater connections between environmental justice communities and recreation opportunities on our public lands and waters is just the beginning of advancing true environmental justice for our residents in Michigan's 12th District and beyond.

Every single American, Mr. Speaker, deserves the right to breathe clean air, and every American deserves to experience all that our public lands and waters have to offer. This body must do more to protect them instead of gutting our bedrock environmental laws.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, did pass the House in the Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act, and I urge my colleagues to pass this commonsense bill again this session.

USE OF AERIAL FIRE RETARDANT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, there was a crazy lawsuit brought by an environmental group here recently in the West to stop the usage of fire retardant that is used to fight forest fires, that red stuff that comes out of the aircraft that they drop on fires to keep them from getting worse.

Thankfully, that lawsuit was overruled. A district judge ruled that the U.S. Forest Service can keep using the aerial fire retardant for at least another couple of years, so we have that going for us.

Now, they do have to keep checking back every 6 months to make sure that they are working on a permit process to keep the ability to use that fire retardant to put out forest fires.

As you know, every year millions of acres of forest go up, sending even the smoke plume all the way back here to the East Coast sometimes and causing health days to not be able to go outside.

Here in Congress, we have legislation ready. I have introduced H.R. 1586, the Forest Protection and Wildland Firefighter Safety Act of 2023, so we will be ready in case there is a court ruling that comes in and says they can't use that stuff anymore. Congress needs to act.

□ 1430

I AM HERE FOR STRUGGLING FAMILIES

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

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on a bill that reflects how little Republicans care about everyday people, even their own constituents.

We should be voting on a straightforward extension of the debt ceiling, but instead Republicans are more than willing to force our Nation and economy into default just to score political wins.

They want to increase work requirements on SNAP, a cruel resumption of student loan payments, and more restrictions on TANF. They are clearly not here for families who are struggling. Well, I am.

I am here for the 1.3 million student loan borrowers in Illinois who are being forced a resumption of payments when people are struggling to keep up with their bills.

I am here for the 76,836 people across Illinois who are counting on TANF cash assistance. I am also here for the 1.9 million residents of Illinois who all count on SNAP to put food on their table.

Representing them is my responsibility, and it is why I know that we could have worked on a clean debt ceiling, but this hostage situation is not something I can vote for.

SETTING OUR AIM HIGH ENOUGH

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

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my grave concern with the fiscal state of our Nation, as someone who spent over a decade in the finance and accounting profession.

We are going to be voting on the Fiscal Responsibility Act today. One side will say how great it is, and the other side will say how awful it is, but really it is meaningless, considering the immense gravity of our fiscal problems.

As Michelangelo once said: "The greater danger for most of us lies not in setting our aim too high and falling short; but in setting our aim too low, and achieving our mark."

Unfortunately, this Congress is not setting its aim high enough for all of the people who died for our Republic and for future generations. I hope we will have a backbone to do it someday.

SAVING EDUARDO'S LIFE

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise today, and I rise today to express my gratitude and appreciation for Eduardo. Eduardo, Mr. Speaker, is a person who was in an auto accident and hurt severely, and it was discovered that he was at the end stage of severe renal disease. Upon finding this out, he had to be dialyzed three times a week.

Mr. Speaker, this picture shows a press event which Eduardo attended because he was removed from the country. I am here to thank the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, as well as the Congressional Black Caucus for getting him back into the country and saving his life.

Mr. Speaker, once he was returned, the question was asked: What would you like to be when you grow up?

He said: I want to go into the military, the United States military, so that I can protect the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, this is an immigrant who wants to protect our country, and I am grateful to those who saved his life.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, I join with my colleague, JIM MCGOVERN, on our constant fight for ending hunger. I thank my colleague, the Honorable Mickey Leland, along with the late Congressman Emerson for beginning the Congressional Hunger Center and starting the Select Committee on Hunger in this Congress.

As I transition to why I stand here today, one would wonder why this is so relevant. In about 24 hours, the State of Texas will take over a majority-minority school district that has been fighting to overcome the pandemic effect, but there are children who do not eat unless they have the programs that our public school system has been able to provide for them. They are hungry.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. If the title I funding and other funding is gone, they are hungry.

The Houston Independent School District should not be taken over because I wonder about the children who will go hungry under the new administration.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3746, FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2023

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 456 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 456

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3746) to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my very good friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 456.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule, House Resolution 456, providing for consideration of H.R. 3746, the Fiscal Responsibility Act, under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and it provides for one motion to recommit.

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today's legislation has been a long time coming. An agreement like the one we are considering today could and should have been in place much earlier. Instead, President Biden dithered and refused to negotiate with House Republicans, pushing us

right up to the very brink of a catastrophic default.

From day one, Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans tried to get President Biden and congressional Democrats to come to the negotiating table, but for months they refused. Over and over again, President Biden refused to meet with Speaker MCCARTHY to discuss the debt limit and the budget. He insisted, over and over again, that it was his way or the highway, and he told us over and over again that the only thing he would accept was a clean debt ceiling increase. It was that or nothing.

Of course, it is easy to understand why President Biden wouldn't want to talk about cutting spending. Just look at the spending record he has amassed. Since he took office, President Biden and congressional Democrats have increased the 10-year spending trajectory by \$10 trillion. They did this by passing a partisan reconciliation bill that spent \$1.9 trillion, and then by passing another partisan reconciliation bill that added up to another \$600 billion in new spending. President Biden himself issued executive orders that added \$1.5 trillion in spending, including his reckless and unconstitutional \$400 billion plan to cancel student loan debt.

When you lay it out like that, it is easy to see how we have reached the statutory debt ceiling so quickly, and it is easy to see why President Biden and congressional Democrats wouldn't want any barriers to spending more and more money. They want the gravy train to keep flowing and the spending to keep increasing, which will ultimately lead the Nation further and further into debt.

However, House Republicans disagreed, and last month we acted. We passed the Limit, Save, Grow Act, a bill that responsibly lifts the debt ceiling and changes the trajectory of future spending downward. We agreed that the United States cannot, should not, and will not default on our national debt, but we also put forward clear, commonsense, and responsible savings that will bring reckless spending under control.

What did Democrats do? Nothing; not a thing. Not a single Democrat in the House voted to lift the debt ceiling. Not a single House Democrat voted to save trillions of dollars over the next 10 years. Our friends in the Senate, which is controlled by the Democrats, refused to take up the Limit, Save, Grow Act; and to this day, the Senate has refused to pass any bill lifting the debt limit. Not one.

However, House Republicans have. For all the posturing on the other side of the aisle, I would remind everyone that House Republicans are the only ones who have taken concrete action to avoid default. President Biden's refusal to negotiate for so long was what brought us so close to the brink of a catastrophic default in the first place.

Having said all that, today we are bringing a bill to the floor that will resolve this crisis. This bill is the result

of negotiations between President Biden and House Republicans. It is not a perfect bill, but it does represent a compromise between the administration and Congress that is necessary in a divided government. Nobody got everything they wanted, but the end result is a truly historic bill.

Consider what the bill does, Mr. Speaker. It responsibly lifts the debt ceiling through January 1, 2025. In exchange, it also puts in place a series of fiscal reforms that will save taxpayers money. For the first time in history, we are pairing a debt ceiling increase with a year-over-year decrease in spending. We will be spending less in fiscal year 2024 than we are in fiscal year 2023, something that has never happened before in conjunction with a debt ceiling increase. We accomplish that goal while preserving funding for our national defense and ensuring our veterans get the care they need and deserve.

We have also clawed back \$28 billion in unspent COVID pandemic relief dollars that are no longer needed, the largest rescission in history. We have cut \$1.4 billion that President Biden and congressional Democrats want to give to the IRS for new agents. We will cap future spending at just 1 percent growth per year for the next 6 years. We accomplish all of this without including any new taxes or new government programs, rejecting President Biden's demands to charge hard-working Americans another \$5 trillion in taxes.

However, that is not all this bill does. It includes real policy victories, Mr. Speaker, that will improve the lives of everyday Americans. The bill includes the first major reforms to work requirements for SNAP and TANF, ensuring that we can help lift people on these programs out of poverty and into the workforce. The bill also includes major permitting reform provisions, reducing approval time for essential infrastructure and energy projects.

None of this would have happened but for President Biden's decision to come to the table and negotiate. Additionally, none of this would have happened but for House Republicans doing the responsible thing and insisting on fiscal reforms. Together, we are doing something good for the Nation. We are avoiding a devastating default on the national debt, and we are enacting needed fiscal reform to put us on a more sustainable spending path.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished chairman, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, with less than a week from default, we have been rushed back to Washington because Republicans decided they wanted to waste months playing games with the debt limit.

They said if Democrats and President Biden didn't give House Republicans everything they wanted, they were prepared to push the entire economy off a cliff, causing catastrophic, lasting, irreparable damage to America.

Even though the GOP voted three times to prevent default when Donald Trump was President, even though 97 percent of the debt was accumulated before President Biden took office and over a quarter of the debt was accumulated under Donald Trump, even though Republicans had no problem adding trillions to the debt with their giveaways to Big Oil and to Wall Street CEOs and lavish tax cuts for the very rich, now they choose to play Russian roulette with our economy.

□ 1445

Frankly, we should not be here. We should have taken care of this months ago, but once again, Republicans are demonstrating that they cannot govern.

Let's rewind to the end of 2017. The last time Republicans held the majority, they left our government with the longest shutdown in American history.

Here we are today, dealing with a totally manufactured crisis that jeopardizes the full faith and credit of the United States.

Both then and now, Democrats have had to be the adults in the room to come in and clean up Republicans' self-made mess. Every time Republicans are in charge, Mr. Speaker, they screw things up.

Mr. Speaker, I thank President Biden, Shalanda Young, Steve Ricchetti, Louisa Terrell, Ashley Jones, Alicia Molt-West, and the White House team, as well as Leader JEFFRIES and his staff, for their leadership throughout these negotiations. I am sure it wasn't easy working with our Republican colleagues. I saw reports that White House staff was holed up in a stuffy room late at night and early in the morning, arguing for hours on end with Republicans.

All I can say as a longstanding member of the Rules Committee: Welcome to the club.

Mr. Speaker, because of their efforts, this bill is a lot less awful than it could have been.

That said, I have some very real, very serious reservations about this bill. There are better ways to deal with our deficit than to further burden our Nation's most vulnerable.

We can make sure the wealthy and well connected pay their fair share.

Let's close the tax loopholes that millionaires and billionaires and corporations exploit. This bill does the opposite. It cuts IRS funding that would have kept big corporations and the top 1 percent in check. We have some of the wealthiest corporations on the entire planet, and they pay little to no taxes. They should at least pay the rate their lowest paying workers pay.

What about the military budget? "60 Minutes" covered a story a couple of

weekends ago where a former Pentagon official talked about the insane price gouging taking place at the Pentagon. He told us that the Pentagon overpays for almost everything—in one example, the Pentagon paid \$10,000 for a \$300 oil switch—but we are hearing from the Republicans that we can't find any savings in the bloated Pentagon budget.

Really? Instead, they say, let's continue to take from the most vulnerable in our country. Give me a break.

I know my Republican friends claim that investing less in military expenditures would somehow undercut our national security. Yes, we want a defense budget that ensures we are second to none, but to put everything in perspective here, we spend more on our national defense than the next 10 countries combined, including China and Russia. Defense spending accounts for nearly half of discretionary spending.

Our national security is so much more than bullets and bombs. It is healthcare. It is education and food. It is a clean environment. It is good jobs and safe neighborhoods. It includes adequate support for our veterans, our seniors, and for our children—all the things that strengthen our communities.

Honestly, Mr. Speaker, thank God for Joe Biden. He secured expanded food benefits for some of the most vulnerable individuals, like veterans, kids emerging from the foster care system, and the unhoused.

It is clear the President entered these negotiations trying to protect as many people as possible from the GOP's war on the poor, but at the end of the day, we should not be making tradeoffs between which vulnerable population gets to eat.

I have a hard time understanding why we are kicking up to 700,000 older adults off of SNAP. It is just cruel. Food and hunger should not be a partisan issue. It is a human issue, but Republicans don't care who they hurt.

We have over 30 million people in this country who do not know where their next meal will come from. The current SNAP benefit, on average, is \$6 per person per day. That is \$2 per meal. The majority of people on SNAP who can work do work, and we also know that work requirements do not work.

In a February 2021 report titled: "The Effects of Changing SNAP Work Requirement on the Health and Employment Outcomes of Able-Bodied Adults without Dependents," exactly what we are talking about here today, it was reported that losing SNAP made people less healthy and had no significant change in employment status. Again, work requirements do not work.

By the way, if my Republican colleagues don't believe me, they could have held a hearing. They could have held a hearing in the Agriculture Committee or in the Nutrition, Foreign Agriculture, and Horticulture Subcommittee.

They didn't hold a single hearing on this issue, not one. They have no clue

who this will adversely impact, and I don't even think they care. You would think that we want to go into this knowing exactly how this legislation would affect our constituents, but they didn't even have time for a hearing.

Here is the kicker, Mr. Speaker. You are going to love this. Many of the people in this Chamber who are trying to take food away from struggling Americans are the same people who had their PPP loans forgiven. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle received hundreds of thousands of dollars—some, millions—in taxpayer dollars that were used to forgive some of their loans.

They had no problem with that. They just shrugged that off, but they say we cannot afford to help make sure that families can put food on their tables. It is ridiculous.

I also have issues with the antienvironmental language in the deal. The bill slashes key NEPA protections, approves the Mountain Valley Pipeline, and doesn't include transmission reform.

Look, we all knew there would have to be compromise. No side was going to get everything they wanted out of this deal, but Republicans have used this manufactured crisis to force policy changes that are so unpopular that they could not possibly get them through regular order.

For some on the far, far right—and there are a lot of them over there—this bill isn't mean enough. Let that sink in, everybody.

By weaponizing the debt ceiling, Republicans are establishing a precedent that will haunt us forever, that one party can use the full faith and credit of the United States as a hostage to pass their widely unpopular ideas that they could not get done through the normal legislative process. It is a lousy, lousy way to govern.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that in this Republican-led Congress, it has become unfashionable to worry about the poor and the vulnerable, to believe in the principle that we should bring everyone along, that we must meet the needs of the many, not just of the few.

Mr. Speaker, our goal should be to elevate people, not demean them. The policies being advocated and forced upon us by my Republican friends do not reflect my values. It is sad that, for them, solving problems and uplifting all people apparently is not their mission.

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

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

I would quickly respond to my friend's statement about the origins of the national debt.

Let me remind him that much of this debt was accumulated in just the last 2 years as a consequence of President Biden and congressional Democrats' reckless spending spree.

Consider this: In the spring of 2021, congressional Democrats, without a

single Republican vote, pushed through a \$1.9 trillion partisan spending bill.

Last year, they enacted another partisan spending bill, without a single Republican vote, with \$600 billion in new spending, partly offset by budget gimmicks and higher taxes.

President Biden himself put forward the unconstitutional and illegal student debt cancellation, which, if allowed to stand, would add another \$400 billion to the national debt. This is on top of all regular Federal spending and emergency spending for the COVID-19 pandemic.

As for the military budget, my friends call it bloated. Frankly, I think we should be spending more, but I will remind him we are giving the President what he asked for. If this budget is bloated for the Pentagon, they can ask the White House about it because it is the budget that they proposed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my very good friend and a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the chairman, for giving me time, despite the fact that I voted against the rule in the Rules Committee.

I respect that. I respect it immensely so that we can have a full and open debate here on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman from Massachusetts wax on, talking about governing. I would say to the gentleman that we don't govern; we represent. That is what we are supposed to do, anyway, represent the people of this country fed up with a government that is now 40 percent bigger since the beginning of COVID, a government barreling toward \$36 trillion of debt, and an absolute devastating burden on the future of this country, on our children and our grandchildren, who are not going to be able to afford homes, not be able to go to school, not be able to afford food, groceries.

Talk about food programs, I don't hear a whole hell of a lot about what we are doing to devastate American families with rampant inflation because we keep spending money we don't have.

To my colleagues on this side of the aisle, my beef isn't that I don't understand the struggle with the negotiators against that kind of reasoning. My beef is that you cut a deal that shouldn't have been cut.

The fact is, at best, we have a 2-year spending freeze that is full of loopholes and gimmicks that would allow for increased funding for the Federal bureaucracy in order to receive a \$4 trillion increase in the debt by January 1, 2025.

Mr. Speaker, we have permitting reform, which might have some good elements in it. The problem is, you have the Biden administration saying it will "accelerate implementation of the historic clean energy and environmental justice investments in the Inflation Reduction Act," the very policies de-

stroying the American way of life and making them unable to afford energy and afford their food.

We have watered-down work requirements that the CBO just said will actually increase the cost of SNAP by \$2 billion, a supposed 1 percent automatic top-line reduction in spending at the end of the year that will actually make a Christmas omnibus more likely, and a 2 percent cut to Biden's \$80 billion IRS expansion.

Administrative paygo, I am told, we are not going to do the REINS Act. We are not going to restrain the regulatory state. We are going to do a waivable administrative paygo.

Great. We will pass a bill next week. Yay us. It will die in the Senate.

Why aren't we using this leverage—a complete punt to SCOTUS on the Biden administration's unfair, half-trillion-dollar student loan bailout; billions in COVID dollars left untouched to fund things like vaccines and COVID-19 testing; and the loss of one of our biggest leverage points to force Biden to actually secure the southern border.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and to oppose this legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a report by The Balance titled: "President Trump's Impact on the National Debt."

[From the balance, Jan. 26, 2022]

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S IMPACT ON THE NATIONAL DEBT

(By Kimberly Amadeo)

The national debt increased by almost 36% during Trump's tenure.

Republican candidate Donald Trump promised during the 2016 presidential campaign that he would eliminate the nation's debt in eight years.

Instead, his budget estimates showed that he would actually add at least \$8.3 trillion, increasing the U.S. debt to \$28.5 trillion by 2025. But the national debt reached that figure much sooner. The national debt stood at \$19.9 trillion when President Trump took office in January 2017, and it reached a high of \$27 trillion in October 2020.

The national debt reached another high of \$28 trillion less than two months after President Trump left office. In December 2021, Congress then increased the debt limit by \$2.5 trillion, to almost \$31.4 trillion, as debt rose again under President Joe Biden.

HOW DID THE NATIONAL DEBT INCREASE?

At first it seemed that Trump was lowering the debt. It fell \$102 billion in the first six months after he took office. The debt was \$19.9 trillion on Jan. 20, the day Trump was inaugurated. It was \$19.8 trillion on July 30, thanks to the federal debt ceiling.

Trump signed a bill increasing the debt ceiling on Sept. 8, 2017. The debt exceeded \$20 trillion for the first time in U.S. history later that day. Trump signed a bill on Feb. 9, 2018, suspending the debt ceiling until March 1, 2019. The total national debt was at \$22 trillion by February 2019. Trump again suspended the debt ceiling in July 2019 until after the 2020 presidential election.

The debt hit a record \$27 trillion on Oct. 1, 2020 before reaching further peaks in 2021 that caused Congress to act again to raise the debt limit in December.

Trump oversaw the fastest increase in the debt of any president, almost 36% from 2017 to 2020.

DID PRESIDENT TRUMP REDUCE THE NATIONAL DEBT?

Trump promised two strategies to reduce U.S. debt before taking office: He would increase growth by 4% to 6%, and he would eliminate wasteful federal spending

INCREASING GROWTH

Trump promised while on the campaign trail to grow the economy by 4% to 6% annually to increase tax revenues. Once in office, he lowered his growth estimates to between 2% and 3%. These more realistic projections are within the 2% to 3% healthy growth rate.

President Trump also promised to achieve between 2% and 4% growth with tax cuts. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act cut the corporate tax rate from 35% to 21% beginning in 2018. The top individual income tax rate dropped to 37%. The TCJA doubled the standard deduction and eliminated personal exemptions. The corporate cuts are permanent, but the individual changes expire at the end of 2025.

According to the Laffer curve, tax cuts only stimulate the economy enough to make up for lost revenue when the rates are above 50%. It worked during the Reagan administration because the highest tax rate was 70% at that time.

ELIMINATING WASTEFUL FEDERAL SPENDING

Trump's second strategy was to eliminate waste and redundancy in federal spending. He demonstrated this cost-consciousness during his campaign when he used his Twitter account and rallies instead of expensive television ads.

Trump was right that there is waste in federal spending. The problem isn't finding it. The problem is in cutting it. Each program has a constituency that lobbies Congress. Eliminating these benefits may lose voters and contributors. Congressional representatives may agree to cut spending in someone else's district, but they resist doing so on their own.

More than two-thirds of government spending goes to mandatory obligations made by previous acts of Congress. Social Security benefits cost \$1.2 trillion in Fiscal Year 2021. Medicare cost \$722 billion, and Medicaid cost \$448 billion. The interest on the debt was \$378 billion.

Military spending must also be cut to lower the debt because it's such a large portion of the budget. But Trump increased military spending in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 to \$933 billion. That includes three components: \$636 billion base budget for the Department of Defense

\$69 billion in overseas contingency operations for DoD to fight the Islamic State group

\$229 billion to fund the other agencies that protect our nation, including the Department of Veterans Affairs (\$105 billion), Homeland Security (\$50 billion), the State Department (\$44 billion), the National Nuclear Security Administration in the Department of Energy (\$20 billion), and the FBI and Cybersecurity for the eDepartment of Justice (\$10 billion)

Only \$595 billion was left to pay for everything else budgeted for FY 2021 after mandatory and military spending. That includes agencies that process Social Security and other benefits. It also includes the necessary functions performed by the Department of Justice and the Internal Revenue Service. We'd have to eliminate it all to make a dent in the \$966 billion deficit.

You can't reduce the deficit or debt without major cuts to defense and mandated benefits programs. Cutting waste isn't enough.

DID TRUMP'S BUSINESS DEBT AFFECT HIS APPROACH TO U.S. DEBT?

Trump said in an interview with CNBC during his 2016 campaign that he would "bor-

row, knowing that if the economy crashed, you could make a deal." But sovereign debt is different from personal debt. It can't be handled the same way.

A 2016 Fortune magazine analysis revealed Trump's business was \$1.11 billion in debt. That includes \$846 million owed on five properties. These include Trump Tower, 40 Wall Street, and 1290 Avenue of the Americas in New York. It also includes the Trump Hotel in Washington, D.C., and 555 California Street in San Francisco. But the income generated by these properties easily pays their annual interest payment. Trump's debt is reasonable in the business world.

The U.S. debt-to-GDP ratio was 129% at the end of 2020. That's the \$27.8 trillion U.S. debt as of December 2020, divided by the \$21.5 trillion nominal GDP at the end of the second quarter this year.

The World Bank compares countries based on their total debt-to-gross domestic product ratio. It considers a country to be in trouble if that ratio is greater than 77%.

The high U.S. debt-to-GDP ratio didn't discourage investors. America is one of the safest economies in the world and its currency is the world's reserve currency. Investors purchase U.S. Treasuries in a flight to safety even during a U.S. economic crisis. That's one reason why interest rates plunged to historical lows in March 2020 after the coronavirus outbreak. Those falling interest rates meant that America's debt could increase, but interest payments remain stable.

The U.S. also has a massive fixed pension expense and health insurance costs. A business can renege on these benefits, ask for bankruptcy, and weather the resulting lawsuits, but a president and Congress can't cut back those costs without losing their jobs at the next election. As such, Trump's experience in handling business debt did not transfer to managing the U.S. debt.

HOW THE NATIONAL DEBT AFFECTS YOU

The national debt doesn't affect you directly until it reaches the tipping point. It slows economic growth once the debt-to-GDP ratio exceeds 77% for an extended period of time. Every percentage point of debt above this level costs the country 0.017 percentage points in economic growth, according to a World Bank analysis.

The first sign of trouble is when interest rates start to rise significantly. Investors need a higher return to offset the greater perceived risk. They start to doubt that the debt can be paid off.

The second sign is that the U.S. dollar loses value. You will notice that as inflation rises, imported goods cost more. Gas and grocery prices rise. Travel to other countries also becomes much more expensive.

The cost of providing benefits and paying the interest on the debt will skyrocket as interest rates and inflation rise. That leaves less money for other services. The government will be forced to cut services or raise taxes at that point. This will further slow economic growth. Continued deficit spending will no longer work at that point.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, talk about spending. The national debt increased by almost 36 percent from 2017 to 2020 during Trump's tenure.

I wish the gentleman from Texas was on the floor screaming then as he is now. He has no problem with spending trillions of dollars on tax cuts for rich people and taxpayer subsidies for Big Oil companies, but when it comes to providing people the basics to be able to put food on the table, he has a problem. We just don't share the same values.

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. This bill is not about fiscal responsibility. It is about the extreme GOP pushing their extreme agenda.

Extreme Republicans demanded to cut veterans' healthcare; to zero out the toxic exposures fund for sick, burn-pit-exposed veterans; to end protections for our environment and allow polluters to expose workers and communities to toxic chemicals for corporate profits; to cut Medicare, childcare, and education; and to repeal efforts to make our air and water cleaner, especially in vulnerable communities.

If they didn't get their way, they held hostage the American economy and threatened to send America into default, raising costs for families, cutting 1 million jobs for workers, and devastating seniors' retirements.

Mr. Speaker, today, under this Republican-manufactured extreme crisis, we will take up the bipartisan budget agreement to prevent a Republican catastrophic default.

President Biden, in this bill, made sure veterans got the care that they needed by funding the toxic exposures fund for burn pit veterans and keeping in place the key provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act's environmental and clean energy protections to stop polluters from harming people. He was able to protect Medicaid, with no changes to Medicaid, and maintain healthcare access for millions of families across the country. He preserved funding for clean energy programs to clean up our air.

□ 1500

Look, if extreme Republicans were serious about fiscal responsibility, they would have accepted President Biden's budget that would have reduced the deficit by \$3 trillion. Instead, this bill only reduces it by \$1.5 trillion. Nevertheless, today I will vote for the bipartisan agreement.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of a response.

I remind my friend from California that we actually filed a veterans' bill that increased veteran spending, so that canard is just simply not the case. We, from the very beginning, were going to take care of veterans, and we filed legislation to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my very good friend, my classmate, and the distinguished vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. Included within the rule measure is H.R. 3746, the Fiscal Responsibility Act. Fortunately, the Fiscal Responsibility Act makes worthwhile reforms that will safeguard America's fiscal solvency.

Mr. Speaker, 100 days, that is how long President Biden flirted with economic calamity because he was too

stubborn to come to terms with the new political reality. The American people did not send a Republican majority to continue business as usual.

Mr. Speaker, the typical business as usual is where elected lawmakers come together in a lameduck session and knock the bottom out of the country's finances.

Well, no more, Mr. Speaker.

With the passage of this legislation, Republicans are putting America back on a sound fiscal footing by reducing nondiscretionary funding, reforming entitlement programs, and adding requirements that Congress pass its 12 appropriations bills on time. That is a massive change from the status quo.

Credit our fellow Rules Committee member, THOMAS MASSIE, for the concept of including this in the debt limit bill, because if the appropriators cannot pass all 12 of their appropriations bills by September 30, it automatically goes to a continuing resolution with a 1 percent reduction. That is the first time that that has ever happened. So we have budget enforcement, in fact, without blowing up the filibuster over in the Senate, and we all know what that could lead to.

While no one can say that they got everything they wanted in this bill, and candidly, I don't think the permitting reforms are nearly enough. The NEPA reform included in this bill is an important first step, but there is no question that we will need to do much more.

The full faith and credit of the United States is preserved with this legislative product. Bear this in mind: If the United States were to default on its debt, there actually is another country, the People's Republic of China, who would like to be the reserve currency of the world. We will not give them that chance when we pass this bill.

I commend PATRICK MCHENRY and GARRET GRAVES for their hard work in bringing us this vital piece of legislation. I commend the Speaker for bringing it to a vote on the floor today after 72 hours for Members to read and understand the bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we are where we are at today, at the precipice of ruin, because extreme Republicans chose to hold Americans hostage by refusing to pay America's bills. Their chaos created fear and stress as Americans worried about a catastrophic recession.

Extreme Republicans' ransom demand was the default on America act, a proposal which targeted rural communities, Head Start, veterans' healthcare, and more, with 22 percent tax cuts—all to pay for the Trump tax

cuts for the wealthiest CEOs that added \$2 trillion to the deficit.

Rather than making the wealthiest pay their fair share, extreme Republicans wanted to balance the budget on America's growling, hungry stomachs.

Democrats proposed amendments to the default on America act to protect programs like rural development and veterans' healthcare programs. Republicans rejected every amendment.

So we went to our communities. We told them the truth about what the Republicans' default on America act would do. Americans listened, and they spoke out against the Republicans' plan.

When Democrats and President Biden's team went into the room to negotiate with Republicans, the voices of veterans, seniors, and working Americans went in, too.

Now, we have H.R. 3746. The bill does save us from economic catastrophe. It rejects the most extreme and cruel proposals contained in the Republicans' default on America act. It allows advanced appropriations for the Indian Health Service, and protects clean energy tax credits and healthcare for veterans.

Is it perfect? Absolutely not.

I do not support many of the changes to our environmental laws and our social safety net programs.

Let's talk fiscal responsibility for a moment. President Trump increased the debt by \$8 trillion. In contrast, President Biden reduced the deficit in his first 2 years alone by \$1.7 trillion, while creating 12 million jobs, bringing manufacturing back, and making the largest investments to address the climate crisis ever.

The bill today reduces the deficit by only \$1.5 trillion. If we had merely passed the President's budget, we would have decreased the deficit by \$3 trillion, without creating the fear and economic insecurity that extreme MAGA Republicans have forced Americans to endure.

Let me repeat this point: This crisis didn't have to happen. Everything in this bill could have been negotiated through the normal process without a debt crisis. Indeed, that is how it has almost always been done, except for in 2011 when the Republicans did this before. The American people need to tell the Republicans: No more hostage taking.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCENTIALER), my very good friend, a distinguished member of both the Appropriations and the Rules Committee.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for being generous in yielding me this time.

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

Today, the House is taking historic steps to address our Nation's out-of-

control debt. This House Republican win rescinds \$28 billion in unobligated COVID funds. It cuts over \$2 trillion in government spending. It reins in the executive branch, and it rejects the President's extreme \$5 trillion in proposed tax increases.

Further, this legislation will help lift Americans out of poverty and grow our economy by cutting red tape and streamlining energy and infrastructure projects.

H.R. 3746 also includes an important provision championed by House Republicans, and that is to complete the Mountain Valley Pipeline. MVP is near completion, but the last 14 miles—there are just 14 miles left—are being held up by extreme radical, far-left judges.

When completed, this pipeline will help reduce costs for hardworking Americans in South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. It will simultaneously help the economies of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia with thousands of construction jobs and millions of dollars in royalty payments, just in Pennsylvania alone. It will be \$150 million a year in royalty payments just to Pennsylvania alone, and it will lead to direct investment in rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and the underlying legislation. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of argument about who is responsible for why we are here.

Mr. ROY, the gentleman from Texas, as I was coming in, spoke about keeping leverage.

Now, what do you keep leverage for? You keep it so you can make something that you want to happen happen.

The Speaker of this House has said default is not an option. The leader of the Democratic Party in this House has said default is not an option. But that wasn't good enough that we agreed.

It was, as the gentleman from Texas said, our Republican friends that wanted to keep leverage. They wanted to accomplish, essentially, in the appropriation bill, what they couldn't either accomplish or pass in the Appropriations Committee here because of their extraordinarily devastating bill that they offered and passed, which some of them are going to have to answer for in the next election.

What today is about is whether we are going to hurt 330 million Americans; whether we are going to hurt the global economy. That is what this is about.

From my perspective, there is only one answer: to pass a bill that, in fact, does not have America welf on its debts or, alternatively, to defeat a bill which will devastate our economy and be catastrophic globally. That is why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to think of those 330 million Americans, all of whom will be hurt if we fail to do our duty.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO), my very good friend.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I have only been here for 5 months, but I already have been blamed for things I have and have not done, for actions we did or didn't take.

We are here now. We are here now at a moment where Americans, by design or default, have given us a bipartisan government, and the House Republicans delivered on a promise to hold up the Federal Government for accountability and we have an agreement. That agreement will move this Nation forward.

I will speak very specifically about one component. I, Mr. Speaker, grew up on food stamps. My mother, diagnosed with depression, would not have survived without that assistance. She was encouraged and worked hard and got on her feet and ultimately achieved independence.

For the last 12 years, I have administered a social service agency in the State of New York.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act takes important action, not to punish our most vulnerable at all. In fact, takes real steps to ensure those most vulnerable among us are protected and served and have access to the support that they deserve and, by the way, find their way to work.

This bill holds States like New York and others accountable. It holds them accountable for waiving restrictions, expanding access, not to help the most vulnerable, but to bloat and to grow and to increase State government.

Because of action States have taken, the most vulnerable are left to fend for themselves, demoralized, dehumanized, and feeling worthless, while States like New York increase their infrastructure, their government, and leverage Federal taxpayer dollars, not to benefit those who need the help the most, but to benefit State government.

This bill starts a very important step of holding States accountable and assisting those who are most vulnerable among us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not only to support the rule, but to support the underlying bill. We have an opportunity here to make a measurable difference in the lives of those who struggle the most, and this is an effort to ensure that happens.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the gentleman that under the new standards in this bill, 700,000 older Americans, vulnerable Americans, will lose their food benefits. If that is his idea of protecting the vulnerable, we don't want your help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

□ 1515

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, before us today, we have a difficult vote. Like many of my Democratic colleagues, I would have preferred to vote on a clean debt ceiling bill. I signed a discharge petition, along with all of my Democratic colleagues to bring a debt ceiling bill to the House floor, but we couldn't get just five Republicans to join us to force that vote.

That is why we are here today because not just five Republicans could do that. I don't like the language in the bill to bypass environmental reviews and approve the Mountain Valley Pipeline. There are pipelines that have leaked and there are pipelines that have leaked.

I joined Representatives McClellan, Beyer, and others in the Virginia delegation in support of an amendment offered to remove that language, but it wasn't allowed to be voted upon. I don't like the permitting reform that strips NEPA of its authorities.

Instead of rolling back regulations, we should be adequately funding the agency so that staff can help projects be built in a timely and responsible manner. I don't like that tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans are protected. The Trump tax scam, which was not funded, raised the debt by \$2 trillion, and not an effort was made to put more duty and responsibility on those individuals.

I sponsored a bill to make billionaires pay their fair share. They should. Despite all the things we don't like about this bill, including the addition of work requirements for SNAP recipients in their 50s, as Members of Congress, we have tough decisions to make and ultimately do what is best for our constituents and our country.

In my district, in particular, we have to protect the progress we have made in the last 2 years that is providing a boost to Memphis; for instance, in healthcare and energy savings we have secured for seniors and others throughout the district under the Inflation Reduction Act and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

These investments are funding improvements and smart development in my district now, but Republicans have tried to defund them. We need to protect Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security, but the Republican majority was trying to take away those benefits from over 20 million Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, we protected Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare in these bills. We needed a clean debt ceiling. We didn't get it. The fact is, the Republicans brought us to this brink because they wanted to extract political damage on President Biden, and if the American people were there as collateral damage, so be it.

When Trump was President, they approved every extension of the debt relief, and yet when Biden is here, no. This is extortion, but we have to deal with it. It is for the benefit of our country and the world's economy, and I will vote "yes."

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to say my good friend, Mr. COLE—because he is my good friend—Mr. COLE had the facts very much incorrect.

The President of the United States was protecting the American people, protecting their future, and being, in essence, the great protector, while my friends on the other side of the aisle were passing legislation that was taking away H.R. 1, 30 million medical appointments for veterans, and throwing millions of Americans off of Medicaid. That is why the President was trying to get a clean debt ceiling, so we could come back as a House, Democrats working to get a fair budget bill.

That did not happen as he waited over and over again to see whether or not the Republicans would do what was done in the last administration and raise the debt ceiling not for debt, but to pay America's bills.

Now, this picture depicts the Speaker Emeritus and Good Hope Baptist Church with the children in daycare. Under the leadership of my friends, without the work that we are doing now to pay our bills, nondiscretionary funding, which takes care of Head Starts and childcare, would have been literally thrown out and families would be standing in line looking for an empty chair for their child to go in so they could go to work. In actuality, that is what Democrats did to ensure that did not happen.

Today, we stand on this floor to say that we will not allow the cruelty of default. We will not allow hostage taking. We will stand for the American people. We will ensure that the expansion of veterans and homeless persons and children in foster care that are now able to get SNAP, that is because we continue to fight, even though we could not get the Republicans to come to the table for 4 or 5 months.

I offered amendments to provide an increase or provision for those students who are still in their families' homes.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to speak on the Rule offered here today in consideration of H.R. 3746, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

It is important to highlight and discuss how we got here and what is at stake with this critical and momentous measure.

I know I am not alone in the disappointment at what steps have been taken to hold our nation's economy hostage and put American lives at risk.

It is shameful that, while we have a bipartisan agreement here today, we have taken painful compromises to get here.

And although arduous efforts on both sides of the aisle allowed for us to move forward with this agreement, and some critical protections for the American people have been preserved—it must be stated that this agreement is not one that entirely reflects what we in Congress should be united on—namely, our most basic and fundamental truths that hold us together as a democracy.

We are a nation that upholds the ability for all to prosper, as well as one that upholds the ability for all Americans to be protected and cared for in our times of greatest need.

It is important to understand that the foundations of a society do not extend only to its political and economic system; they must extend to its social and moral system as well.

Taking all of these in balance there is no other comparable governmental system that has raised the standard of living of millions of people, created vast new wealth and resources, or inspired so many beneficial innovations and technologies.

Governmental structures providing for protections and safety nets for all Americans is what makes us all successful as a nation united.

Creating and preserving such structure is the critical investment in our government, our nation, our security, and our development and growth for current and future generations to benefit from.

Yet, instead of investing in America, many of my Republican colleagues would rather focus on holding our economy hostage to advance unpopular and dangerous priorities.

Holding our nation's debt ceiling as collateral to inflict painful cuts that will impact the lives of millions of Americans and knowing that breaching the debt limit would provoke unprecedented economic damage and instability in the U.S. and around the world is a sad state that we have found ourselves in.

Yes, it is evident that my Republican colleagues will not prioritize the wellbeing, safety, health, and prosperity of the American people when looking at what we have had to give up in this bill.

While much is unknown about the devastating impact this bill will have, we do know that some immediate changes will inevitably cause harm to many American families, children and vulnerable individuals.

That is why I offered several amendments during the Rules Committee that will make additional exemptions and elimination of disqualifications for several additional special populations in which we must protect and continue to support when they are in their most desperate and fragile times of need.

Ensuring that we are not taking critical resources and money for food away from children and families living in poverty is not only the right thing to do, but also the economically smart thing to do.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is the nation's most important and effective anti-hunger program.

Any changes in SNAP will have an incredible impact on millions of Americans and Texans.

As of 2020, there were 18.66 million households relying on SNAP and 7.11 million SNAP households with children.

Texas holds the second highest number of households using the SNAP program in 2023 at 1,167,720, making up 11.5 percent of Texas households.

As of April 2023, there were 284,794 SNAP cases and 615,463 eligible individuals in Harris County, my district's biggest county.

This included 92,214 individuals aged less than 5 and 228,519 individuals between the ages of 5–17.

My first amendment for H.R. 3746, listed on the Rules Committee roster as Amendment #56, would have added a provision to extend exemption regarding current work requirement exemptions in the Food and Nutrition Act for a parent or person responsible for dependent child up to age 24 in SNAP household.

In Texas, 79 percent of SNAP participants are families with children. That's more than the national rate of 69 percent of SNAP participants across the country being families with children.

Further, the SNAP participation rate in Texas for working poor people is 72 percent which is also more than the national rate of 41 percent of SNAP participants nationwide being in working families.

We need to understand that parents continue to support children beyond the age of adolescence impacting financial resources for families well into a child's early twenties.

Across the country there 5.134 million, and 528,000 in Texas aged 18–24 in poverty as of 2021.

Nearly 1 in 3 parents (31 percent) have made a significant financial sacrifice to help their adult children financially.

Over two-thirds (68 percent) of parents of adult children have made or are currently making a financial sacrifice to help their kids financially.

Parents say they sacrificed retirement savings (43 percent), emergency savings (51 percent), paying down their own debt (49 percent) or reaching a financial milestone (55 percent).

Over 40 percent of American children rely primarily on their mothers' earnings for financial support in cross-sectional surveys.

In July 2022, half of adults ages 18 to 29 were living with one or both of their parents.

Significantly higher than the share who were living with their parents in 2010 (44 percent on average that year) or 2000 (38 percent on average).

What this means is that we need to understand that support for families with dependent children under the age of 24 and who are living in poverty need to be protected and extended the grace of an exemption in this bill.

My second amendment for H.R. 3746, listed on the Rules Committee roster as Amendment #59, would have extended the former foster care exemption to all individuals 24 or younger under state custody and aging out of critical support services.

More than 23,000 children will age out of the US foster care system every year.

Every year in Texas, more than 1,200 young adults age out of the foster care system without being adopted.

Less than half of Texas foster care alumni (46.9 percent) were currently employed at least ten hours per week.

Only half of alumni (51.6 percent) reported having a household income that was greater than the poverty line.

By 24 years old, 50 percent of former foster kids had been "couch surfing" since leaving care.

One in ten interviewed alumni (11.1 percent) was currently incarcerated; nearly seven in ten males (68.0 percent) had been arrested since

leaving care, 55.2 percent had been convicted of a crime, and 62.3 percent had spent at least one night incarcerated.

Over 90 percent of foster youth who move more than four times will end up in juvenile justice.

Many youth in the juvenile and criminal justice system are not deemed to be indigent but have also had contact with the foster care system and have been removed from their homes even if they have not been formerly adjudicated as a foster child.

Far too often children in state custody are taken from their homes for significant periods of times during their adolescence and at a time when they are most vulnerable to recidivating upon their return to their homes due to gaps and lack of resources to help them get jobs, education, mental health care, substance abuse and housing.

It is important that we continue to provide necessary resources for all children and youth aging out of state custody where they have been removed from their homes during critical times of development and growth—and often are left to survive on their own and/or cannot return to their homes upon their release.

We need to do more to support youth aging out of state custody.

Despite no Democratic common-sense amendments being accepted at this posture, we have no choice but to continue to move forward and still try to make a better way for our nation. And to stop a devastating default where all Americans would suffer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a testimony, the genesis of which is, I believe that President Biden did the best that he could in developing this legislation. I support him. I thank him for what he has done. I believe that Leader JEFFRIES did an outstanding job in making it perspicuously clear that default was not an option, but here is the essence of my testimony: I had the preeminent privilege of serving in Congress in 2008 September, I believe it was, when we had the downturn in the economy and there was a clarion call for help to do what was called bail out the banks.

I was adamantly, totally, completely opposed to bailing out the banks because I thought it was not the thing to do, given that the banks did not ask for our help in getting into the position that they were in.

I stood in the rear of this Chamber, and I could see the votes as they were being tallied. I could also see the stock market reacting to the votes as they were being tallied. The stock market went down as the bill went down—777 points, a 7 percent drop in the stock market.

My constituents had told me not to vote for that bill, and I concurred with them. The next day my constituents called, Why didn't you vote for that

bill? Why did you let the market go down?

I learned a lesson: Votes like this are votes of conscience, and you have to vote your conscience knowing what the consequences are.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this bill because I understand the consequences of the market tanking. I was here, and I saw it. I understand we have to take care of our people.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for his remarks. I actually voted for that bill in 2008 twice, and I am glad that he is here today. The reality is the bill we are dealing with—it is hard to tell by listening to the debate—is a compromise between House Republicans and the President of the United States.

In that compromise, nobody got everything they wanted. We certainly didn't get everything we wanted, but I think we are acting together, as my friend from Texas suggested, to try and make sure that we don't default; that we don't have a day like we had in 2008. That, at least, is something we can agree on together and celebrate together, and we will continue to try to work together.

However, the preeminent problem we have is my friends on the other side think we can spend forever. President Obama never introduced a budget that balanced—ever—not in 10 years, 20, or 100.

Frankly, President Biden has never introduced a budget that comes into balance at any point. You can't sustain that indefinitely. This effort is to both, one, to responsibly raise our debt ceiling, but to begin to address the underlying spending problem.

I wish we could have done more in that regard, but I am glad we got done what we did, and we will continue to work at this.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the last time I checked, the Republican Conference hasn't provided us with a budget.

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

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support tonight's vote, a vote on the Bipartisan Budget Act.

There are three aspects of this bill, a bill that will avoid default and a bill that protects Social Security and Medicare that I hope my colleagues and fellow citizens take into account. One, we can't keep doing this. The brinkmanship around this question of default and paying our bills has to end. It is a terrible process.

Folks have been calling our offices. They are worried about their Social Se-

curity checks. They are worried about their healthcare. They are worried about whether or not the economy will crash. We cannot keep normalizing this behavior.

Two, the bill does represent the fact that Congress is divided. The President negotiated with Speaker MCCARTHY, and even though a majority of Americans want Congress to balance this budget by fixing the tax code, the majority has said—

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, the majority has said that is off the table. What I needed to see from this bill was that no veterans would lose their benefits and folks would continue to receive Social Security checks and no child would lose access to food through the SNAP program.

This bill does that, so I am voting "yes." We need more bipartisan, pragmatic leaders to stand up and pass this bill tonight and to continue to work on behalf of the American people.

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

Mr. Speaker, just to quickly make a point to my friend, the Democratic Congress didn't produce a budget in 4 years—4 years while they were in the majority, not out of Budget Committee, let alone across the floor of the House. So Democrats left things in quite a mess and it is going to take a while to fix it, but we are working on a budget. I hope we get one.

The reality is, though, the country has allowed itself, primarily under Democratic leadership, to get so deeply in debt, it is pretty tough to write a budget that gets us out of debt in any reasonable time.

This bill is, at least, a step in the right direction. We would have liked to have taken a bigger step. We weren't able to do that given the fact that we have a Democratic Senate and a Democratic President, both of whom seem to think they can spend endlessly, recklessly, and without end indefinitely.

That is not going to happen. Sooner or later that reckoning will come. This is an effort to forestall that and buy some time. I am glad we worked together. I am glad the President came to the negotiating table, despite wasting months saying he wasn't going to. I am glad we made the minimal progress that we did.

Let's not kid ourselves. This is the first step in the right direction, and it is not as big a step as anybody on my side of the aisle would have liked to take.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about messes, let me just remind everybody that the last time my Republican friends were in charge, they left us with the longest government shutdown in U.S. history.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan budget agreement and thank President Biden and his team, particularly OMB Director Shalanda Young, for putting people over politics, defending our values, and protecting the full faith and credit of the United States.

My colleagues across the aisle were prepared to force a disastrous default and crash the economy into the side of a cliff, but Democrats will always put people over politics and our economy's durability over default.

My friend from Oklahoma knows well that Republicans' VA appropriations bill zeroed out guaranteed funding for our toxic-exposed veterans in fiscal year 2025. It is in the bill in black and white. It is why they were afraid to vote on it and pulled the bill from consideration.

Democrats protected toxic-exposed veterans' healthcare, expanded SNAP benefits to more food insecure people, and stopped Republicans' dangerous budget cuts in the default on America act.

Yesterday, CBO officially scored the bill and found that participation rates in SNAP will increase because of this compromise. President Biden negotiated a deal that gets us through the short-term and puts us in a good position to work through the appropriations process.

As an appropriator, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to efficiently finish this year's budget.

Furthermore, I will remind my friend from Oklahoma that under the Trump administration, Republicans blew a hole in the deficit with a \$1.5 trillion tax cut package that was unpaid for, so that is on them.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the underlying legislation.

□ 1530

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

To my good friend from Florida, what unbalanced the budget was COVID. We all know that. We worked, actually, together on that. That is what spent billions of dollars in a relatively short period of time.

Quite frankly, in terms of where we are today, my friends have never submitted a budget that comes into balance. President Obama didn't. The last President to do that who was a Democrat was President Clinton. We disagreed over how to get to balance, but he actually submitted budgets that came to balance in 10 years. President Obama didn't do that. President Biden hasn't done that.

Until you return to the Clinton era, where we actually did believe in balanced budgets but disagreed on how to get there, I think we are going to have a hard time getting on top of our fiscal problem.

On this bill, we do agree that we don't like every part of it. We would have liked to have done more. My friends would have liked to have spent more. The reality is it does move us in the right direction.

I am happy for the bipartisanship, but I do note it took us a long time.

I also note, for my Democratic friends, remember, so far, to this point, the only people who voted to raise the debt ceiling are on this side of the aisle. My friends have not yet provided a single vote to raise the debt ceiling. The body they control, the United States Senate, has not presented a bill, let alone moved one across the floor. We did.

My friends didn't like that bill. We sat down and negotiated and came to something different, but at least we voted to raise the debt ceiling. My friends who are concerned about it have neither presented a plan to deal with it nor have voted to act upon the problem.

I am hopeful today that many of them will actually join us in that effort because the President of the United States has come to the negotiating table, and we will move forward together.

Rest assured, we are not moving forward as fast as we should; we are not going as far as we should; and we have had to bring you to this point kicking and screaming every step of the way.

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

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

The gentleman is absolutely right that COVID did add to the deficit, but he neglected to mention the multitrillion-dollar tax cut for the rich that was unpaid for.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a difference between Democrats and Republicans. I think that Democrats have proven that we can govern and that Republicans have proven they cannot.

We have seen the great things that government is capable of doing.

In the last Congress, with Democrats in charge of the House, we invested to rebuild our neglected infrastructure: airports, roads, bridges, and ports in all of our communities. We will see the benefits of that infrastructure bill for years and years to come. We brought manufacturing back to the United States. We passed the CHIPS and Science Act to drive innovation and create good-paying jobs. We made the largest investment in climate, protecting our water and our air. We strengthened our supply chains and set up new programs to support minority businesses. We lifted a record number of kids out of poverty in this country. We ensured that our veterans get the healthcare they earned.

It is possible for us to deliver for the American people, though I haven't seen much of it this year. Instead, Republicans spent a week in January trying to elect a Speaker. Republicans spent the last 5 months trying to destroy ev-

erything that we built over the last 2 years. They have only enacted three laws in 5 months, and those laws don't do much.

The bill we are debating today may become their fourth law. It will be their biggest legislative accomplishment of the year. Think about that. The biggest accomplishment will be ending a crisis that they created.

We have wasted time going back and forth on how to pay our bills. The fact that we have had to bend and contort ourselves to get this done, to prevent our economy from falling off a cliff because Republicans wanted to play games, is unconscionable and doesn't bode well for the future.

Finally, let me say, I plead with my colleagues on the Republican side to stop this assault against the poor. Every concession in this bill, every demand that Republicans made in this bill, hurts somebody. It hurts the most vulnerable in our country. Going after SNAP for older people, a measly \$6 a day benefit, shame on you for doing that.

We are here to help people. We are here to uplift people. We are not here to demean people. We are not here to try to punish people.

Quite frankly, the narrative that the Republicans have been utilizing in this whole debate doesn't reflect the reality. Talk to the people in your district who are struggling. Let them tell you how difficult it is to make ends meet and how maddening it is to not know whether you can put food on the table.

We can do so much better, but you have to stop this assault against the poor, against the vulnerable in this country.

We need to do better, and I urge all my colleagues, as we move forward in the coming months, to keep that in mind. We are here to bring everybody forward, not just a select few. We are here to represent everybody, not just the rich and powerful and well-connected and people who give to our campaigns.

Again, the contrast here is that we have Members of Congress who accepted government-subsidized loan forgiveness for PPP who are the ones out here demanding that we nickel and dime programs like SNAP and TANF. It is disgusting, quite frankly, that we are even having this debate. We should be able to do so much better.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

My friend ticked through the impressive list of accomplishments in the last Congress. He forgot to mention Democrats also added \$10 trillion to the projected debt the United States will have to deal with over the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, \$10 trillion is a lot of money, but worse than the money was the inflation that they unleashed by their reckless spending. If you care about Americans, you don't push up

the price of gasoline, home heating, and interest rates on any purchase they make and what they pay at the grocery store.

My friends managed to unleash the worst bout of inflation in 40 years. I look around this Chamber, and I am probably the only guy on the floor, Mr. Speaker, who can actually remember that. This was an unprecedented disaster that they unleashed on the country.

Everything in the bill that we fought for, the things that are there and the things that aren't there, were to lower the excess spending and to try to tame inflation. My friends act as if it doesn't exist.

I guarantee you, just go to the grocery store and ask any American who hasn't gotten a 15 or 20 percent raise what their life has been like in the last 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution. With today's bill, we are putting forward commonsense reforms that will save taxpayers money while also preventing an economic crisis.

The reforms included in this bill are historic: the first year-over-year cut in spending in a debt ceiling bill; the large rescission of appropriated but unspent funds in history; the first real reforms to requirements for SNAP and TANF, which will help lift people out of poverty; and real reforms to the permitting process, which will streamline major infrastructure and energy projects and cut the red tape that is holding them back.

Those are reforms, by the way, that my friends did not support. Those were things that were put in the bill by Republicans and negotiated for. Sadly, they weren't willing to work with us on those, and it was only the threat of the debt ceiling that actually brought them to the table.

It is the responsible thing to do to pass this legislation. In the end, the American people will be better off for it.

I do want to be clear on something, Mr. Speaker. This is not the end of House Republicans' fight for necessary fiscal reforms. We have more than \$31 trillion in debt. Programs like Medicare and Social Security, which are the bedrock of our safety net, are growing in an unsustainable manner.

For too long, this Congress has seen fit to just allow mandatory programs to eat up more and more of our budget. Indeed, the President himself refused to talk about those programs. Mandatory programs are now more than two-thirds of what we spend in any given year. Without real reforms to those programs, we will have no chance to right the fiscal imbalance the country finds itself in.

Republicans are committed to preserving America's status as the greatest Nation in the world. To do that, we must get serious about the national debt. At the end of the day, the journey

of a thousand miles begins with a single step. This bill, Mr. Speaker, is that first step.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 382.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 187, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 241]

YEAS—241

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Fitzpatrick | Lawler |
| Alford | Fleischmann | Lee (FL) |
| Allen | Flood | Lee (NV) |
| Amodei | Foster | Lesko |
| Armstrong | Fox | Letlow |
| Arrington | Franklin, C. | Loudermilk |
| Babin | Scott | Lucas |
| Bacon | Fry | Luetkemeyer |
| Baird | Fulcher | Luttrell |
| Balderson | Gallagher | Mace |
| Banks | Gallego | Malliotakis |
| Barr | Garbarino | Mann |
| Bean (FL) | Garcia, Mike | Manning |
| Bentz | Gimenez | Massie |
| Bergman | Gonzalez, | Mast |
| Bice | Vicente | McCarthy |
| Billirakis | Gooden (TX) | McCaul |
| Bishop (GA) | Gottheimer | McClain |
| Bost | Granger | McClintock |
| Buchanan | Graves (LA) | McCormick |
| Bucshon | Graves (MO) | McHenry |
| Burgess | Green (TN) | Meeks |
| Calvert | Greene (GA) | Meuser |
| Cammack | Grothman | Mfume |
| Caraveo | Guest | Miller (OH) |
| Carbajal | Guthrie | Miller (WV) |
| Carey | Hagerman | Miller-Meeks |
| Carl | Harder (CA) | Mills |
| Carter (GA) | Hern | Molinaro |
| Carter (TX) | Hill | Moolenaar |
| Case | Himes | Moore (UT) |
| Chavez-DeRemer | Hinson | Moran |
| Ciscomani | Horsford | Morelle |
| Cole | Houchin | Moskowitz |
| Collins | Hoyer | Moulton |
| Comer | Hudson | Mrvan |
| Correa | Huizenga | Murphy |
| Costa | Hunt | Nehls |
| Courtney | Issa | Newhouse |
| Crawford | Jackson Lee | Nickel |
| Crenshaw | James | Norcross |
| Cuellar | Johnson (LA) | Nunn (IA) |
| Curtis | Johnson (OH) | Oberholte |
| D'Esposito | Johnson (SD) | Ogles |
| Davidson | Jordan | Owens |
| Davis (NC) | Joyce (OH) | Palmer |
| De La Cruz | Joyce (PA) | Panetta |
| Diaz-Balart | Kean (NJ) | Pappas |
| Donalds | Keating | Pascrell |
| Duarte | Kelly (MS) | Peltola |
| Duncan | Kelly (PA) | Pence |
| Dunn (FL) | Kiggans (VA) | Peters |
| Edwards | Kildee | Pettersen |
| Ellzey | Kiley | Pfuger |
| Emmer | Kim (CA) | Phillips |
| Estes | Kustoff | Quigley |
| Ezell | LaHood | Reschenthaler |
| Fallon | LaLota | Rodgers (WA) |
| Feenstra | LaMalfa | Rogers (AL) |
| Ferguson | Lamborn | Rogers (KY) |
| Finstad | Landsman | Rose |
| Fischbach | Langworthy | Rouzer |
| Fitzgerald | Latta | Rutherford |
| | LaTurner | Ryan |

| | |
|---------------|---------------|
| Salazar | Spanberger |
| Santos | Stanton |
| Sealise | Stauber |
| Schneider | Steel |
| Scholten | Stefanik |
| Schweikert | Steil |
| Scott, Austin | Steube |
| Sessions | Stevens |
| Sherrill | Stewart |
| Simpson | Strong |
| Slotkin | Sykes |
| Smith (MO) | Tenney |
| Smith (NE) | Thompson (PA) |
| Smith (NJ) | Timmons |
| Smucker | Turner |
| Sorensen | Valadao |
| Soto | Van Drew |

NAYS—187

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Adams | Foushee |
| Aguilar | Frankel, Lois |
| Allred | Frost |
| Auchincloss | Gaetz |
| Balint | Garamendi |
| Barragan | Garcia (IL) |
| Beatty | Garcia (TX) |
| Bera | Garcia, Robert |
| Beyer | Golden (ME) |
| Biggs | Goldman (NY) |
| Bishop (NC) | Gomez |
| Blumenauer | Good (VA) |
| Blunt Rochester | Gosar |
| Boebert | Green, Al (TX) |
| Bonamici | Griffith |
| Bowman | Grijalva |
| Boyle (PA) | Harris |
| Brecheen | Harshbarger |
| Brown | Hayes |
| Brownley | Higgins (LA) |
| Buck | Higgins (NY) |
| Budzinski | Hoyle (OR) |
| Burchett | Huffman |
| Burlison | Ivey |
| Bush | Jackson (IL) |
| Cardenas | Jackson (NC) |
| Carson | Jacobs |
| Carter (LA) | Jayapal |
| Cartwright | Jeffries |
| Casar | Johnson (GA) |
| Casten | Kamlager-Dove |
| Castor (FL) | Kaptur |
| Castro (TX) | Kelly (IL) |
| Cerflus- | Khanna |
| McCormick | Kilmer |
| Chu | Kim (NJ) |
| Cicilline | Krishnamoorthi |
| Clark (MA) | Kuster |
| Clarke (NY) | Larsen (WA) |
| Cleaver | Larson (CT) |
| Cline | Lee (CA) |
| Cloud | Lee (PA) |
| Clyburn | Leger Fernandez |
| Clyde | Levin |
| Cohen | Lieu |
| Connolly | Lofgren |
| Crane | Luna |
| Crockett | Lynch |
| Crow | Magaziner |
| Davis (IL) | Matsui |
| Dean (PA) | McBath |
| DeGette | McClellan |
| DeLauro | McCollum |
| DelBene | McGarvey |
| Deluzio | McGovern |
| DeSaulnier | Menendez |
| Dingell | Meng |
| Doggett | Miller (IL) |
| Escobar | Moore (AL) |
| Eshoo | Moore (WI) |
| Espaillet | Mullin |
| Evans | Nadler |
| Fletcher | Napolitano |

NOT VOTING—7

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|------|
| Craig | Houlahan | Ross |
| DesJarlais | Jackson (TX) | |
| Gonzales, Tony | Mooney | |

□ 1625

Mr. NEAL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. STEVENS, Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia, MORELLE, Mses. SCHOLTEN, MANNING, Messrs. MEEKS, QUIGLEY, HIMES, STANTON, GALLEGO, MOULTON, PASCRELL, SORENSEN, RYAN, Ms.

JACKSON LEE, Messrs. CORREA, MFUME, FOSTER, MRVAN, and KEATING changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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.

CONDEMNING THE RISE OF ANTI-SEMITISM AND CALLING ON ELECTED OFFICIALS TO IDENTIFY AND EDUCATE OTHERS ON THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE JEWISH AMERICAN COMMUNITY

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 agree to the resolution (H. Res. 382) condemning the rise of antisemitism and calling on elected officials to identify and educate others on the contributions of the Jewish American community, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 429, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]

YEAS—429

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Adams | Burgess | Crockett |
| Aderholt | Burlison | Crow |
| Aguilar | Bush | Cuellar |
| Alford | Calvert | Curtis |
| Allen | Cammack | D'Esposito |
| Allred | Caraveo | Davids (KS) |
| Amodei | Carbajal | Davidson |
| Armstrong | Cardenas | Davis (IL) |
| Arrington | Carey | Davis (NC) |
| Auchincloss | Carl | De La Cruz |
| Babin | Carson | Dean (PA) |
| Bacon | Carter (GA) | DeGette |
| Baird | Carter (LA) | DeLauro |
| Balderson | Carter (TX) | DelBene |
| Balint | Cartwright | Deluzio |
| Banks | Casar | DeSaulnier |
| Barr | Case | Diaz-Balart |
| Barragan | Casten | Dingell |
| Bean (FL) | Castor (FL) | Doggett |
| Beatty | Castro (TX) | Donalds |
| Bentz | Chavez-DeRemer | Duarte |
| Bera | Cerflus- | Duncan |
| Bergman | McCormick | Dunn (FL) |
| Beyer | Chu | Edwards |
| Bice | Cicilline | Elzey |
| Biggs | Ciscomani | Emmer |
| Billirakis | Clark (MA) | Escobar |
| Bishop (GA) | Clarke (NY) | Eshoo |
| Bishop (NC) | Cleaver | Espaillet |
| Blumenauer | Cline | Estes |
| Blunt Rochester | Cloud | Evans |
| Boebert | Clyburn | Ezell |
| Bonamici | Clyde | Fallon |
| Bost | Cohen | Feenstra |
| Bowman | Cole | Ferguson |
| Boyle (PA) | Collins | Finstad |
| Brecheen | Comer | Fischbach |
| Brown | Connolly | Fitzgerald |
| Brownley | Correa | Fitzpatrick |
| Buchanan | Costa | Fleischmann |
| Buck | Courtney | Fletcher |
| Bucshon | Crane | Flood |
| Budzinski | Crawford | Foster |
| Burchett | Crenshaw | Foushee |

Foxx
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
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
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 (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner

Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McGarvey
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Peters
Petersen
Pluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Santos
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 (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Strong
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tanney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)

Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke
NOT VOTING—6
Craig
DesJarlais
Gonzales, Tony
Houlahan
Jackson (TX)
Ross

□ 1637

Mrs. TORRES of California changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, due to unavoidable travel delays, I was unable to be present for this afternoon’s votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 241, H. Res. 456, and “yea” on rollcall No. 242, H. Res. 382.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 25

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman’s request is accepted.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o’clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1915

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP) at 7 o’clock and 15 minutes p.m.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2023

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 456, I call up the bill (H.R. 3746) to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 456, the amendment printed in House Report 118–81 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3746

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 “Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.
- Sec. 3. References.
- DIVISION A—LIMIT FEDERAL SPENDING
- TITLE I—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR DISCRETIONARY CATEGORY
- Sec. 101. Discretionary spending limits.
- Sec. 102. Special adjustments for fiscal years 2024 and 2025.
- Sec. 103. Budgetary treatment of previously enacted emergency requirements.
- TITLE II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
- Sec. 111. Authority for Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Resolution in the House of Representatives.
- Sec. 112. Limitation on Advance Appropriations in the House of Representatives.
- Sec. 113. Exercise of rulemaking powers.
- TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE SENATE
- Sec. 121. Authority for fiscal year 2024 budget resolution in the Senate.
- Sec. 122. Authority for fiscal year 2025 budget resolution in the Senate.
- Sec. 123. Limitation on advance appropriations in the Senate.
- Sec. 124. Exercise of rulemaking powers.
- DIVISION B—SAVE TAXPAYER DOLLARS
- TITLE I—RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS
- Sec. 1. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 2. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 3. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 4. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 5. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 6. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 7. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 8. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 9. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 10. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 11. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 12. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 13. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 14. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 15. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 16. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 17. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 18. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 19. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 20. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 21. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 22. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 23. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 24. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 25. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 26. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 27. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 28. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 29. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 30. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 31. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 32. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 33. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 34. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 35. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 36. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 37. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 38. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 39. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 40. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 41. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 42. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 43. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 44. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 45. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 46. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 47. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 48. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 49. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 50. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 51. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 52. Rescission of unobligated funds.

Sec. 53. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 54. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 55. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 56. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 57. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 58. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 59. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 60. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 61. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 62. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 63. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 64. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 65. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 66. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 67. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 68. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 69. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 70. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 71. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 72. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 73. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 74. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 75. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 76. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 77. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 78. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 79. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 80. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 81. Rescission of unobligated funds.

TITLE II—FAMILY AND SMALL BUSINESS TAXPAYER PROTECTION

Sec. 251. Rescission of certain balances made available to the Internal Revenue Service.

TITLE III—STATUTORY ADMINISTRATIVE PAY-AS-YOU-GO

Sec. 261. Short title.
 Sec. 262. Definitions.
 Sec. 263. Requirements for administrative actions that affect direct spending.
 Sec. 264. Issuance of administrative guidance.
 Sec. 265. Waiver.
 Sec. 266. Exemption.
 Sec. 267. Judicial review.
 Sec. 268. Sunset.
 Sec. 269. GAO report.
 Sec. 270. Congressional Review Act compliance assessment.

TITLE IV—TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS ON FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS; RESUMPTION OF ACCRUAL OF INTEREST AND COLLECTIONS

Sec. 271. Termination of suspension of payments on Federal student loans; resumption of accrual of interest and collections.

DIVISION C—GROW THE ECONOMY

TITLE I—TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY FAMILIES

Sec. 301. Recalibration of the caseload reduction credit.
 Sec. 302. Pilot projects for promoting accountability by measuring work outcomes.
 Sec. 303. Elimination of small checks scheme.
 Sec. 304. Reporting of work outcomes.
 Sec. 305. Effective date.

TITLE II—SNAP EXEMPTIONS

Sec. 311. Modification of work requirement exemptions.
 Sec. 312. Modification of general exemptions.
 Sec. 313. Supplemental nutrition assistance program under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.
 Sec. 314. Waiver transparency.

TITLE III—PERMITTING REFORM

Sec. 321. Builder Act.
 Sec. 322. Interregional Transfer Capability Determination Study.

Sec. 323. Permitting streamlining for energy storage.

Sec. 324. Expediting completion of the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

DIVISION D—INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT

Sec. 401. Temporary extension of public debt limit.

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to “this Act” contained in any division of this Act shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of that division.

DIVISION A—LIMIT FEDERAL SPENDING

TITLE I—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR DISCRETIONARY CATEGORY

SEC. 101. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)(B), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) for fiscal year 2024—

“(A) for the revised security category, \$886,349,000,000 in new budget authority; and

“(B) for the revised nonsecurity category; \$703,651,000,000 in new budget authority; and

“(10) for fiscal year 2025—

“(A) for the revised security category, \$895,212,000,000 in new budget authority; and

“(B) for the revised nonsecurity category; \$710,688,000,000 in new budget authority.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND REDERMINATIONS.—Section 251(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended—

(A) in subclause (IX), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (X), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subclause (X) the following:

“(XI) for fiscal year 2024, \$1,578,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(XII) for fiscal year 2025, \$1,630,000,000 in additional new budget authority.”

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL.—Section 251(b)(2)(C)(i) of such Act is amended—

(A) in subclause (IX), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (X), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subclause (X) the following:

“(XI) for fiscal year 2024, \$604,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(XII) for fiscal year 2025, \$630,000,000 in additional new budget authority.”

(3) DISASTER FUNDING.—Section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of such Act is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “for fiscal years 2012 through 2021” and inserting “for fiscal years 2024 and 2025”; and

(B) by amending subclause (II) to read as follows:

“(II) notwithstanding clause (iv), five percent of the total appropriations provided in the previous 10 years, net of any rescissions of budget authority enacted in the same period, with respect to amounts provided for major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and designated by the Congress in statute as an emergency; and”

(4) REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENTS.—Section 251(b)(2)(E)(i) of such Act is amended—

(A) in subclause (III), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (IV), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subclause (IV) the following:

“(V) for fiscal year 2024, \$265,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2025, \$271,000,000 in additional new budget authority.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SEQUESTRATION REPORTS.—Section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 904) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “2021” and inserting “2025”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2)(A), by striking “2021” and inserting “2025”.

(d) APPROPRIATION FOR COST OF WAR TOXIC EXPOSURES FUND.—In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for investment in the delivery of veterans’ health care associated with exposure to environmental hazards, the expenses incident to the delivery of veterans’ health care and benefits associated with exposure to environmental hazards, and medical and other research relating to exposure to environmental hazards, as authorized by section 324 of title 38, United States Code—

(1) \$20,268,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2023, and shall remain available until September 30, 2028; and

(2) \$24,455,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2024, and shall remain available until September 30, 2029.

(e) APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NONRECURRING EXPENSES FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is appropriated to the Department of Commerce Nonrecurring Expenses Fund for fiscal year 2023, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$22,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which—

(A) \$11,000,000,000 is to carry out programs related to Government efficiencies in fiscal year 2024; and

(B) \$11,000,000,000 is to carry out programs related to Government efficiencies in fiscal year 2025.

(2) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER.—Funds provided by paragraph (1) shall not be subject to any transfer authority provided by law.

(3) REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—Reporting requirements in section 111(a) of division B of Public Law 116–93 shall apply to funds provided by paragraph (1).

(4) STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this subsection shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(5) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this subsection and each succeeding division shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(6) CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–217 and section 250(c)(7) and (c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this subsection shall be estimated for purposes of section 251 of such Act and as appropriations for discretionary accounts for purposes of the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the concurrent resolution on the budget.

(f) ADDITIONAL SPENDING LIMITS.—For purposes of section 302(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, in the following applicable fiscal years,

the following discretionary spending limits shall apply:

- (1) Fiscal year 2026, \$1,621,959,000,000.
- (2) Fiscal year 2027, \$1,638,179,000,000.
- (3) Fiscal year 2028, \$1,654,560,000,000.
- (4) Fiscal year 2029, \$1,671,106,000,000.

SEC. 102. SPECIAL ADJUSTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2024 AND 2025.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) REVISED DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), if on or after January 1, 2024, there is in effect an Act making continuing appropriations for part of fiscal year 2024 for any discretionary budget account, the discretionary spending limits specified in subsection (c)(9) for fiscal year 2024 shall be adjusted in the final sequestration report, in accordance with paragraph (2), as follows:

“(A) For the revised security category, the amount that is equal to the total budget authority for such category for base funding, as published in the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate for the applicable appropriations Acts for the preceding fiscal year (table 1–S of H.R. 2617, published on December 21, 2022), reduced by one percent.

“(B) For the revised non-security category, the amount that is equal to the total budget authority for such category for base funding as published in the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate for the applicable appropriations Acts for the preceding fiscal year (table 1–S of H.R. 2617, published on December 21, 2022), reduced by one percent.

“(2) FINAL REPORT; SEQUESTRATION ORDER.—If the conditions specified in paragraph (1) are met during fiscal year 2024, the final sequestration report for such fiscal year pursuant to section 254(f)(1) and any order pursuant to section 254(f)(5) shall be issued on the earlier of—

“(A) 10 days, not including weekends and holidays, for the Congressional Budget Office and 15 days, not including weekends and holidays, for the Office of Management and Budget and the President, after the enactment into law of annual full-year appropriations for all budget accounts that normally receive such annual appropriations (or the enactment of the applicable full-year appropriations Acts without any provision for such accounts); or

“(B) April 30, 2024.

“(3) REVERSAL.—If, after January 1, 2024, there are enacted into law each of the full year discretionary appropriation Acts, then the adjustment to the applicable discretionary spending limits in paragraph (1) shall have no force or effect, and the discretionary spending limits for the revised security category and revised nonsecurity category for the applicable fiscal year shall be such limits as in effect on December 31 of the applicable fiscal year.

“(e) REVISED DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), if on or after January 1, 2025, there is in effect an Act making continuing appropriations for part of fiscal year 2025 for any discretionary budget account, the discretionary spending limits specified in subsection (c)(10) for fiscal year 2025 shall be adjusted in the final sequestration report, in accordance with paragraph (2), as follows:

“(A) for the revised security category, the amount calculated for such category in section (d)(1)(A); and

“(B) for the revised non-security category, the amount calculated for each category in section (d)(1)(B).

“(2) FINAL REPORT; SEQUESTRATION ORDER.—If the conditions specified in paragraph (1) are met during fiscal year 2025, the

final sequestration report for such fiscal year pursuant to section 254(f)(1) and any order pursuant to section 254(f)(5) shall be issued on the earlier of—

“(A) 10 days, not including weekends and holidays, for the Congressional Budget Office, and 15 days, not including weekends and holidays, for the Office of Management and Budget and the President, after the enactment into law of annual full-year appropriations for all budget accounts that normally receive such annual appropriations (or the enactment of the applicable full-year appropriations Acts without any provision for such accounts); or

“(B) April 30, 2025.

“(3) REVERSAL.—If, after January 1, 2025, there are enacted into law each of the full year discretionary appropriation Acts, then the adjustment to the applicable discretionary spending limits in paragraph (1) shall have no force or effect, and the discretionary spending limits for the revised security category and revised nonsecurity category for the applicable fiscal year shall be such limits as in effect on December 31 of the applicable fiscal year.”

SEC. 103. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF PREVIOUSLY ENACTED EMERGENCY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 905(c) of division J of Public Law 117–58 and section 23005(c) of division B of Public Law 117–159, Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–217, and sections 250(c)(7) and (c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects for any fiscal year for the amounts specified in subsection (b) shall not count for purposes of section 251 of such Act.

(b) AMOUNTS.—The amounts specified in this subsection are—

(1) amounts designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022, in division B of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act (Public Law 117–159);

(2) amounts designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in division J of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117–58); and

(3) amounts designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022, and section 1(e) of H. Res. 1151 (117th Congress) in section 443(b) in division G of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (Public Law 117–328).

TITLE II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 111. AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET RESOLUTION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2024.—For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 2024, the allocations, aggregates, and levels provided for in subsection (b) shall apply in the House of Representatives in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2024 and for fiscal years 2025 through 2033.

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.—In the House of Representatives, the Chair of the Committee on the Budget shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2024 consistent with discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251(c)(9) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as added by this Act, and the outlays flowing therefrom, and committee allocations for fiscal year 2024 for current law mandatory budget authority and outlays, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(2) for all committees of the House of Representatives other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2024 and for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2033 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted, to the extent practicable, for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2024 in accordance with the allocations established under paragraphs (1) and (2), for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal year 2024 and for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2033 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted, to the extent practicable, for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels included in the statement referred to in subsection (b)—

(1) to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office’s updates to its baseline for fiscal years 2024 through 2033; or

(2) for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2024 to fiscal year 2028 or fiscal year 2024 to fiscal year 2033.

(d) EXPIRATION.—Subsections (a) through (c) shall no longer apply if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 112. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, except as provided in subsection (b), any general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, may not provide an advance appropriation.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, activities or accounts identified in lists submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chair of the Committee on the Budget—

(1) for fiscal year 2025, under the heading “ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority;

(2) for fiscal year 2025, under the heading “VETERANS ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS”; and

(3) for fiscal year 2025, under the heading “INDIAN HEALTH ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS” in an aggregate amount not to exceed the total budget authority provided for such accounts for fiscal

year 2024 in bills or joint resolutions making appropriations for fiscal year 2024.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2024, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that first becomes available following fiscal year 2024.

(d) **EXPIRATION.**—The preceding subsections of this section shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 is agreed to by the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 113. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

This title is enacted by the House of Representatives—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House to change such rules (so far as relating to the House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE SENATE

SEC. 121. AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE.

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2024.**—For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels provided for in subsection (b) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2024 and for fiscal years 2025 through 2033.

(b) **COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act that includes—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, committee allocations for fiscal year 2024 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by this Act, and the outlays flowing therefrom, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033, consistent with the May 2023 baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2024 in accordance with the allocations established under paragraphs (1) and (2), for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033, consistent with the May 2023 baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on

the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(5) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033, consistent with the May 2023 baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633, 642); and

(6) a statement under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” for the purpose of enforcing section 123 of this title.

(c) **ADDITIONAL MATTER.**—The statement referred to in subsection (b) may also include for fiscal year 2024 the deficit-neutral reserve fund in section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022, updated by 2 fiscal years.

(d) **EXPIRATION.**—This section shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 is agreed to by the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 122. AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025 BUDGET RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE.

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2025.**—For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), after April 15, 2024, and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels provided for in subsection (b) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2025 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2025 and for fiscal years 2026 through 2034.

(b) **COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.**—After April 15, 2024, but not later than May 15, 2024, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record that includes—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, committee allocations for fiscal year 2025 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by this Act, and the outlays flowing therefrom, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2025, 2025 through 2029, and 2025 through 2034 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2025 in accordance with the allocations established under paragraphs (1) and (2), for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2025, 2025 through 2029, and 2025 through 2034 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending

on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(5) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2025, 2025 through 2029, and 2025 through 2034 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633, 642); and

(6) a statement under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” for the purpose of enforcing section 123 of this title.

(c) **ADDITIONAL MATTER.**—The statement referred to in subsection (b) may also include for fiscal year 2025 the deficit-neutral reserve fund in section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022, updated by 3 fiscal years.

(d) **EXPIRATION.**—This section shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2025 is agreed to by the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 123. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **POINT OF ORDER.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(B) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2024 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2024 or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2025 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2025.

(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(A) for fiscal years 2025 and 2026, for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in a statement submitted to the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(B) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

(C) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(D) for the Department of Health and Human Services for the Indian Health Services and Indian Health Facilities accounts—

(i) for fiscal year 2025, in an amount that is not more than the amount provided for fiscal year 2024 in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2023 or 2024 for programs, projects, and activities that are not prohibited from using amounts provided for fiscal year 2024 in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2023; and

(ii) for fiscal year 2026, in an amount that is not more than the amount provided for fiscal year 2025 in a bill or joint resolution

making appropriations for fiscal year 2024 or 2025 for programs, projects, and activities that are not prohibited from using amounts provided for fiscal year 2025 in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2024.

(3) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(A) **WAIVER.**—In the Senate, paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (1).

(4) **FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this subsection, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment between the Houses shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this paragraph), no further amendment shall be in order.

(b) **EXPIRATION.**—Subsection (a) shall terminate on the date on which a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 or for fiscal year 2025 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 124. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

This title is enacted by the Senate—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change such rules (so far as relating to the Senate) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

DIVISION B—SAVE TAXPAYER DOLLARS

TITLE I—RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS

SEC. 1. Each rescission made by this title shall be applied to the unobligated balances for each applicable appropriation as of the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 2. The unobligated balances from the following appropriations, in the following amounts and subject to the conditions specified below, are hereby permanently rescinded:

(1) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title III of division A of Public Law 116-123, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$59,000,000.

(2) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Public

Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title V of division A of Public Law 116-127, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated.

(3) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title VIII of division B of Public Law 116-136, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$2,127,000,000 and—

(A) any funds that were transferred and merged with the Covered Countermeasure Process Fund authorized by section 319F-4 of the Public Health Service Act; and

(B) any funds that were transferred and merged with funds made available under the heading “Office of the Secretary—Office of Inspector General” pursuant to section 18113 of title VIII of division B of Public Law 116-136.

(4) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available in the first paragraph under the heading “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title I of division B of Public Law 116-139, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$300,000,000, which shall remain available for necessary expenses for program administration and oversight.

(5) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available in the second paragraph under the heading “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title I of division B of Public Law 116-139, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$243,000,000 and any funds that were transferred and merged with funds made available under the heading “Office of the Secretary—Office of Inspector General” pursuant to section 103 of title I of division B of Public Law 116-139.

(6) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title III of division M of Public Law 116-260, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$205,000,000.

(7) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—CDC—Wide Activities and Program Support” in title III of division A of Public Law 116-123, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$195,000,000 and any funds that were transferred and merged with the Infectious Diseases Rapid Response Reserve Fund established by section 231 of division B of Public Law 115-245.

(8) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—CDC—Wide Activities and Program Support” in title VIII of division B of Public Law 116-136, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$446,000,000 and any funds that were transferred and merged with the Infectious Diseases Rapid Response Reserve Fund established by section 231 of division B of Public Law 115-245.

(9) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—CDC—Wide Activities and Program Support” in title III of division M of Public Law 116-260, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$177,000,000.

(10) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “National Institutes of Health—National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases” in title III of division A of Public Law 116-123,

including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated.

(11) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available to “Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services—Program Management” in title VIII of division B of Public Law 116-136.

(12) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2301 of Public Law 117-2, with the exception of \$103,000,000.

(13) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2302 of Public Law 117-2.

(14) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2303 of Public Law 117-2, with the exception of \$69,000,000.

(15) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2401 of Public Law 117-2, with the exception of \$7,323,000,000.

(16) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2402 of Public Law 117-2, with the exception of \$714,000,000.

(17) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2403 of Public Law 117-2.

(18) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2501 of Public Law 117-2.

(19) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2502 of Public Law 117-2.

(20) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2601 of Public Law 117-2.

(21) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2602 of Public Law 117-2.

(22) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2603 of Public Law 117-2.

(23) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2604 of Public Law 117-2.

(24) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2605 of Public Law 117-2.

(25) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2703 of Public Law 117-2.

(26) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2704 of Public Law 117-2.

(27) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2705 of Public Law 117-2.

(28) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2711 of Public Law 117-2.

(29) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2712 of Public Law 117-2.

(30) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2801 of Public Law 117-2.

(31) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 3101 of Public Law 117-2, with the exception of \$793,000,000.

(32) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 511A(a) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 9101 of Public Law 117-2.

(33) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 1150C(a) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 9911 of Public Law 117-2.

(34) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 1947(e) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 9813 of Public Law 117-2.

(35) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 1862(g)(2) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 9401 of Public Law 117-2.

SEC. 3. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Agricultural Programs—Office of the Secretary" in title I of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 4. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 751 in title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded, except for funds made available by section 601 of division HH of Public Law 117-328.

SEC. 5. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 753 in title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 6. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 754 in title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 7. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 762(i) in title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 8. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 764(f) in title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 9. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 1001 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 10. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 4027 of title IV of division A of Public Law 116-136, \$200,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 11. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 4120 of title IV of division A of Public Law 116-136, \$295,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 12. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 7301(c) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 13. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 104A(m) of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.), as added by section 522 of title V of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded, with the exception of \$284,500,000, which shall remain available for necessary expenses associated with the making of awards announced prior to the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 14. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 3301(a)(2)(A) of Public Law 117-2, \$150,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 15. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 411 in subtitle A of title IV of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 16. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by subsection (a) of section 2206 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded, with the exception of amounts allocated under paragraphs (6) and (7) of subsection (b) of such section.

SEC. 17. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2001 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 18. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2002 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 19. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2003 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 20. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Federal Highway Administration—Highway Infrastructure Programs" in title IV of division M of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 21. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 7202(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 22. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by sections 5002(b) and 5006(a)(2) of Public Law 117-2, including any amounts transferred and merged with "Small Business Administration—Disaster Loans Program Account" pursuant to section 90007(b)(2)(A) of Public Law 117-58 that remain unobligated, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 23. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Independent Agencies—Small Business Administration—Disaster Loans Program Account" in title II of division B of Public Law 116-139 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 24. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2118(a) of title II of division A of Public Law 116-136, as added by section 9032 of Public Law 117-2, \$1,000,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 25. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Public and Indian Housing—Tenant-Based Rental Assistance" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 26. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Public and Indian Housing—Native American Programs" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 27. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Housing Programs—Housing for Persons with Disabilities" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 28. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Housing Programs—Project-Based Rental Assistance" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 29. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Housing Programs—Housing for the Elderly" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 30. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 3208(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 31. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Transportation—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and Expenses" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 32. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Transportation—Office of the Secretary—Essential Air Service" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 33. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Transportation—Federal Aviation Administration—Grants-In-Aid for Airports" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 34. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 7101 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 35. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 7102(a)(1)

of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 36. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 501(a)(1) of title V of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 37. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 9601(d)(1) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 38. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 4009 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 39. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Justice—General Administration—Justice Information Sharing Technology" in title II of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 40. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Defense—Procurement—Defense Production Act Purchases" in title III of division B of Public Law 116-136, \$61,381,230 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 41. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of State—Administration of Foreign Affairs—Diplomatic Programs" in title XI of division B of Public Law 116-136 and subsequently transferred to the Department of State's "Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs" account are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 42. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Bilateral Economic Assistance—Department of State—Migration and Refugee Assistance" in title XI of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 43. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Bilateral Economic Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—International Disaster Assistance" in title XI of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 44. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of State—Administration of Foreign Affairs—Sudan Claims" in title IX of division K of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 45. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Bilateral Economic Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—Economic Support Fund" in title IX of division K of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 46. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Federal Communications Commission—Salaries and Expenses" in title V of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 47. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Independent Agencies—Small Business Administration—Emergency EIDL Grants" in title II of division B of Public Law 116-139 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 48. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 323(d)(1)(B) of title III of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 49. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 323(d)(1)(E)(i) of title III of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 50. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 902(c)(5) of title IX of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 51. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 905(b) of title IX of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 52. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 5003(b)(2)(A) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 53. The unobligated balances of amounts described in the tenth proviso under the heading “Administration for Children and Families—Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant” in title III of division M of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 54. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2201(b) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 55. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2204(d)(1) of Public Law 117-2, including any amounts made available by amendments made by such section, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 56. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2205 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 57. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2912(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 58. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 403(c) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 9201 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 59. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 816(f) of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d(f)), as added by section 11004 of Public Law 117-2, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 60. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading “Rural Development Programs—Rural Utilities Service—Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program” in title I of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 61. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 752 of title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 62. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 1002(c) of Public Law 117-2, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 63. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 3207(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 64. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading “Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science” in title IV of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 65. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 6003 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 66. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 11002(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 67. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading “Department of Education—Departmental Management—Program Administration” in title III of division M of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 68. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2007 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 69. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2010 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 70. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2011 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 71. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 11006 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 72. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 6002(a) of Public Law 117-2, all but \$22,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 73. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2101(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded, with the exception of \$1,892,718 for the Office of the Solicitor within the Departmental Management account and amounts allocated for the Office of Inspector General under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of such section.

SEC. 74. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2110(g) of Public Law 116-136, as amended, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 75. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading “General Services Administration—General Activities—Federal Citizen Services Fund” in title V of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 76. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2021 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 77. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2022 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 78. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2023 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 79. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2(c)(2)(D)(v) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (45 U.S.C. 352(c)(2)(D)(v)), as amended, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 80. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2904 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded, with the exception of \$500,000 for the Railroad Retirement Board Office of Inspector General.

SEC. 81. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 7404(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

TITLE II—FAMILY AND SMALL BUSINESS TAXPAYER PROTECTION

SEC. 251. RESCISSION OF CERTAIN BALANCES MADE AVAILABLE TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

Of the unobligated balances of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for activities of the Internal Revenue Service by paragraphs (1)(A)(ii), (1)(A)(iii), (1)(B), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 10301 of Public Law 117-169 (commonly known as the “Inflation Reduction Act of 2022”) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, \$1,389,525,000 are hereby rescinded.

TITLE III—STATUTORY ADMINISTRATIVE PAY-AS-YOU-GO

SEC. 261. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Administrative Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2023”.

SEC. 262. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “administrative action” means a “rule” as defined in section 804(3) of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term “agency” means any authority of the United States that is an “agency” under section 3502(1) of title 44, United States Code, other than those considered to be independent regulatory agencies, as defined in section 3502(5) of such title;

(3) the term “covered discretionary administrative action” means a discretionary administrative action that would affect direct spending;

(4) the term “direct spending” has the meaning given that term in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c));

(5) the term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(6) the term “discretionary administrative action”—

(A) means any administrative action that is not required by law; and

(B) includes an administrative action required by law for which an agency has discretion in the manner in which to implement the administrative action; and

(7) the term “increase direct spending” means that the amount of direct spending would increase relative to—

(A) the most recently submitted projection of the amount of direct spending presented in baseline estimates as defined in section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, under—

(i) the budget of the President submitted under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code; or

(ii) the supplemental summary of the budget submitted under section 1106 of title 31, United States Code;

(B) with respect to a discretionary administrative action that is incorporated into the applicable projection described in subparagraph (A) and for which a proposal has not been submitted under section 263(a)(2)(A), a projection of the amount of direct spending if no administrative action were taken; or

(C) with respect to a discretionary administrative action described in paragraph (6)(B), a projection of the amount of direct spending under the least costly implementation option reasonably identifiable by the agency that meets the requirements under the statute.

SEC. 263. REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS THAT AFFECT DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before an agency may finalize any covered discretionary administrative action, the head of the agency shall submit to the Director for review written notice regarding the covered discretionary administrative action, which shall include an estimate of the budgetary effects of the covered discretionary administrative action.

(2) INCREASING DIRECT SPENDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the covered discretionary administrative action would increase direct spending, the written notice submitted by the head of the agency under paragraph (1) shall include a proposal to undertake 1 or more other administrative actions that would provide a reduction in direct spending greater than or equal to the increase in direct spending attributable to the covered discretionary administrative action.

(B) REVIEW.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall determine whether the reduction in direct spending in a proposal in a written notice from an agency under subparagraph (A) is greater than or equal to the increase in direct spending attributable to the covered discretionary administrative action to which the written notice relates.

(ii) NO OFFSET.—If the written notice regarding a proposed covered discretionary administrative action that would increase direct spending does not include a proposal to offset the increased direct spending as determined in clause (i), the Director shall return the written notice to the agency for resubmission in accordance with this title.

(b) NONDISCRETIONARY ACTIONS.—If an agency determines that an administrative action that would increase direct spending is required by law and therefore is not a covered discretionary administrative action, before the agency finalizes that administrative action, the head of the agency shall—

(1) submit to the Director a written opinion by the general counsel of the agency, or the equivalent employee of the agency, explaining that legal conclusion;

(2) submit to the Director a projection of the amount of direct spending under the least costly implementation option reasonably identifiable by the agency that meets the requirements under the statute; and

(3) consult with the Director regarding implementation of the administrative action.

(c) PROJECTIONS.—Any projection for purposes of this title shall be conducted in accordance with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-11, or any successor thereto.

SEC. 264. ISSUANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDANCE.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue instructions regarding the implementation of this title, including how covered discretionary administrative actions that increase direct spending and nontax receipts will be evaluated.

SEC. 265. WAIVER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director may waive the requirements of section 263 if the Director concludes that the waiver—

(1) is necessary for the delivery of essential services; or

(2) is necessary for effective program delivery.

(b) PUBLICATION.—Any waiver determination under subsection (a) shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 266. EXEMPTION.

This title shall not apply to administrative actions with direct spending cost of less than—

(1) \$1,000,000,000 over the 10-year period beginning with the current year; or

(2) \$100,000,000 in any given year during such 10-year period.

SEC. 267. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

No determination, finding, action, or omission under this title shall be subject to judicial review.

SEC. 268. SUNSET.

This title shall expire on December 31, 2024.

SEC. 269. GAO REPORT.

Within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report on the implementation of this title.

SEC. 270. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT.

Section 801(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B)” the following: “, and shall in addition include an assessment of the agency’s compliance with such requirements of the Administrative Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2023 as may be applicable”.

TITLE IV—TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS ON FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS; RESUMPTION OF ACCRUAL OF INTEREST AND COLLECTIONS

SEC. 271. TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS ON FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS; RESUMPTION OF ACCRUAL OF INTEREST AND COLLECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sixty days after June 30, 2023, the waivers and modifications described in subsection (c) shall cease to be effective.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Except as expressly authorized by an Act of Congress enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education may not use any authority to implement an extension of any executive action or rule specified in subsection (c).

(c) WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS DESCRIBED.—The waivers and modifications described in this subsection are the waivers and modifications of statutory and regulatory provisions relating to an extension of the suspension of payments on certain loans and waivers of interest on such loans under section 3513 of the CARES Act (20 U.S.C. 1001 note)—

(1) described by the Department of Education in the Federal Register on October 12, 2022 (87 Fed. Reg. 61513 et seq.); and

(2) most recently extended in the announcement by the Department of Education on November 22, 2022.

DIVISION C—GROW THE ECONOMY TITLE I—TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY FAMILIES

SEC. 301. RECALIBRATION OF THE CASELOAD REDUCTION CREDIT.

Section 407(b)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 607(b)(3)) is amended in each of subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B), by striking “2005” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 302. PILOT PROJECTS FOR PROMOTING ACCOUNTABILITY BY MEASURING WORK OUTCOMES.

Section 411 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 611) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PILOT PROJECTS FOR PROMOTING ACCOUNTABILITY BY MEASURING WORK OUTCOMES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary may select up to 5 States to which a grant is made under section 403(a) for a fiscal year to negotiate performance benchmarks for work and family outcomes for recipients of assistance under the State program funded under this part, and programs funded with qualified State expenditures. The Secretary shall issue guidance on how States apply for participation in the pilot. The benchmarks shall include—

“(A) the percentage of work-eligible individuals under the State program funded under this part who are in unsubsidized employment during the 2nd quarter after exiting the program;

“(B) the level of earnings of such individuals in the 2nd and 4th quarters after exit; and

“(C) other indicators of family stability and well-being as established by the Secretary.

“(2) LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE BENCHMARK.—The Secretary and a State selected under paragraph (1) shall agree to the requisite level of performance on these benchmarks after developing baseline data in the State and comparative data in other States.

“(3) FAILURE OF STATE TO MEET BENCHMARK.—If a State fails to meet a measured benchmark standard agreed to under paragraph (2) for 2 successive fiscal years, the State, in order to continue in the pilot shall enter into a plan with the Secretary to achieve the required level of performance or, if mutually agreed to, adjust the benchmark

based on new information about the feasibility of meeting such benchmark.

“(4) DURATION.—The pilot under this subsection shall be in effect for 6 fiscal years, with one year to establish benchmark data and negotiate targets and five years to measure performance against the targets, and shall supersede the requirements under section 407 for such fiscal years, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

“(5) APPLICATION OF PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO REDUCE ASSISTANCE FOR RECIPIENTS REFUSING WITHOUT GOOD CAUSE TO WORK.—For purposes of section 409(a)(14), a State operating a pilot must have a system for reducing the amount of assistance payable to a family if an individual refuses, without good cause (including for reasons described in 407(e)(2)), to engage in any such activities as the State has required of such an individual. A State without such a system shall be considered to have failed to comply with the requirements of section 407(e) for so long as the failure to comply continues.

“(6) COLLECTION OF PERFORMANCE DATA.—Each State selected under paragraph (1), in consultation with the Secretary, shall collect and submit to the Secretary data on the performance of the State operating such a pilot program.

“(7) REPORTS.—

“(A) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the status of the program under this section.

“(B) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date on which the programs under this section have terminated, the Secretary shall submit a comprehensive report to Congress on outcomes achieved under such programs.”.

SEC. 303. ELIMINATION OF SMALL CHECKS SCHEME.

Section 407(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 607(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) SPECIAL RULE REGARDING CALCULATION OF THE MINIMUM PARTICIPATION RATE.—The Secretary shall determine participation rates under this section without regard to any individual engaged in work in a family that receives no assistance under this part and less than \$35 in assistance funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)).”.

SEC. 304. REPORTING OF WORK OUTCOMES.

Section 411 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 611), as amended by section 302, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) REPORTING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State, in consultation with the Secretary, shall collect and submit to the Secretary the information necessary for each indicator described in paragraph (2), for fiscal year 2025 and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(2) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—The indicators described in this paragraph for a fiscal year are the following:

“(A) The percentage of individuals who were work-eligible individuals as of the time of exit from the program, who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after the exit.

“(B) The percentage of individuals who were work-eligible individuals who were in unsubsidized employment in the second quarter after the exit, who are also in unsubsidized employment during the fourth quarter after the exit.

“(C) The median earnings of individuals who were work-eligible individuals as of the time of exit from the program, who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after the exit.

“(D) The percentage of individuals who have not attained 24 years of age, are attending high school or enrolled in an equivalency program, and are work-eligible individuals or were work-eligible individuals as of the time of exit from the program, who obtain a high school degree or its recognized equivalent while receiving assistance under the State program funded under this part or within 1 year after the exit.

“(3) DEFINITION OF EXIT.—In paragraph (2), the term ‘exit’ means, with respect to a State program funded under this part, ceases to receive assistance under the program funded by this part.

“(4) REGULATIONS.—In order to ensure nationwide comparability of data, the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor and with States, shall issue regulations governing the reporting of performance indicators under this subsection.”.

SEC. 305. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2024, except for sections 301 and 303 which shall take effect on October 1, 2025.

TITLE II—SNAP EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 311. MODIFICATION OF WORK REQUIREMENT EXEMPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(o)(3) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(6)(o)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A)(i) under 18 years of age; or

“(ii) in—

“(I) fiscal year 2023 over 51 years of age;

“(II) fiscal year 2024 over 53 years of age;

“(III) fiscal year 2025 and each fiscal year thereafter over 55 years of age.”;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or” at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “;”;

(4) adding at the end the following:

“(F) a homeless individual;

“(G) a veteran; or

“(H) an individual who is 24 years of age or younger and who was in foster care under the responsibility of a State on the date of attaining 18 years of age or such higher age as the State has elected under section 475(8)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 675(8)(B)(iii)).”.

(b) APPLICATION.—

(1) STATE AGENCY.—A state agency shall apply section 6(o)(3) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended by subsection (a), to any application for initial certification or recertification received starting 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) SUNSET.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall cease to have effect on October 1, 2030.

SEC. 312. MODIFICATION OF GENERAL EXEMPTIONS.

Section 6(o)(6) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS” and inserting “FISCAL YEARS 2020 THROUGH 2023”;

(B) by striking “(F) through (H)” and inserting “(G) through (I)”;

(C) by striking “year,” and inserting “year through fiscal year 2023.”;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking “(or (E))” and inserting “, (E) or (F)”;

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H) as subparagraphs (G), (H), and (I), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—Subject to subparagraphs (G) through (I), for fiscal years 2024 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State agency may provide a number of ex-

emptions such that the average monthly number of exemptions in effect during the fiscal year does not exceed 8 percent of the number of covered individuals in the State, as estimated by the Secretary under subparagraph (C), adjusted by the Secretary to reflect changes in the State’s caseload and the Secretary’s estimate of changes in the proportion of members of households that receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits covered by waivers granted under paragraph (4)”;

(5) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(H)” and inserting “(I)”;

(6) in subparagraph (C), by striking “(F) and (H)” and inserting “(G) and (I)”;

(7) in subparagraph (D), by striking “(F) through (H)” and inserting “(G) through (I)”;

and

(8) by adding at end the following:

“(J) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR EXEMPTION ADJUSTMENT.—During fiscal year 2024 and each subsequent fiscal year, nothing in this paragraph shall be interpreted to allow a State agency to accumulate unused exemptions to be provided beyond the subsequent fiscal year.”.

SEC. 313. SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM UNDER THE FOOD AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2008.

Section 2 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011) is amended by adding at end the following:

“That program includes as a purpose to assist low-income adults in obtaining employment and increasing their earnings. Such employment and earnings, along with program benefits, will permit low-income households to obtain a more nutritious diet through normal channels of trade by increasing food purchasing power for all eligible households who apply for participation.”.

SEC. 314. WAIVER TRANSPARENCY.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make public all available State waiver requests, including all supporting data from the State, and agency approvals of such requests, including relevant documentation on the utilization of waivers authorized under Section 6(o)(4)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)(4)(A)).

TITLE III—PERMITTING REFORM

SEC. 321. BUILDER ACT.

(a) PARAGRAPH (2) OF SECTION 102.—Section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “inure” and inserting “ensure”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “inure” and inserting “ensure”;

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting “consistent with the provisions of this Act and except where compliance would be inconsistent with other statutory requirements,” before “include in every”;

(B) by striking clauses (i) through (v) and inserting the following:

“(i) reasonably foreseeable environmental effects of the proposed agency action;

“(ii) any reasonably foreseeable adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;

“(iii) a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed agency action, including an analysis of any negative environmental impacts of not implementing the proposed agency action in the case of a no action alternative, that are technically and economically feasible, and meet the purpose and need of the proposal;

“(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man’s environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and

“(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of Federal resources which would be involved in the proposed agency action should it be implemented.”; and

(C) by striking “the responsible Federal official” and inserting “the head of the lead agency”;

(4) in subparagraph (D), by striking “Any” and inserting “any”;

(5) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (I) as subparagraphs (G) through (L), respectively;

(6) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) ensure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussion and analysis in an environmental document;

“(E) make use of reliable data and resources in carrying out this Act;

“(F) consistent with the provisions of this Act, study, develop, and describe technically and economically feasible alternatives;”;

(7) in subparagraph (I), as amended, by inserting “consistent with the provisions of this Act,” before “recognize”.

(b) NEW SECTIONS.—Title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 106. PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION OF LEVEL OF REVIEW.

“(a) THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS.—An agency is not required to prepare an environmental document with respect to a proposed agency action if—

“(1) the proposed agency action is not a final agency action within the meaning of such term in chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code;

“(2) the proposed agency action is excluded pursuant to one of the agency’s categorical exclusions, another agency’s categorical exclusions consistent with section 109 of this Act, or another provision of law;

“(3) the preparation of such document would clearly and fundamentally conflict with the requirements of another provision of law; or

“(4) the proposed agency action is a non-discretionary action with respect to which such agency does not have authority to take environmental factors into consideration in determining whether to take the proposed action.

“(b) LEVELS OF REVIEW.—

“(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—An agency shall issue an environmental impact statement with respect to a proposed agency action requiring an environmental document that has a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

“(2) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—An agency shall prepare an environmental assessment with respect to a proposed agency action that does not have a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the quality of the human environment, or if the significance of such effect is unknown, unless the agency finds that the proposed agency action is excluded pursuant to one of the agency’s categorical exclusions, another agency’s categorical exclusions consistent with section 109 of this Act, or another provision of law. Such environmental assessment shall be a concise public document prepared by a Federal agency to set forth the basis of such agency’s finding of no significant impact or determination that an environmental impact statement is necessary.

“(3) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In making a determination under this subsection, an agency—

“(A) may make use of any reliable data source; and

“(B) is not required to undertake new scientific or technical research unless the new scientific or technical research is essential

to a reasoned choice among alternatives, and the overall costs and time frame of obtaining it are not unreasonable.

“SEC. 107. TIMELY AND UNIFIED FEDERAL REVIEWS.

“(a) LEAD AGENCY.—

“(1) DESIGNATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If there are two or more participating Federal agencies, such agencies shall determine, by letter or memorandum, which agency shall be the lead agency based on consideration of the—

“(i) magnitude of agency’s involvement;

“(ii) project approval or disapproval authority;

“(iii) expertise concerning the action’s environmental effects;

“(iv) duration of agency’s involvement; and

“(v) sequence of agency’s involvement.

“(B) JOINT LEAD AGENCIES.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A), the participating Federal agencies may appoint such State, Tribal, or local agencies as joint lead agencies as the involved Federal agencies shall determine appropriate. Joint lead agencies shall jointly fulfill the role described in paragraph (2).

“(2) ROLE.—A lead agency shall, with respect to a proposed agency action—

“(A) supervise the preparation of an environmental document if, with respect to such proposed agency action, there is more than one participating Federal agency;

“(B) request the participation of each cooperating agency at the earliest practicable time;

“(C) in preparing an environmental document, give consideration to any analysis or proposal created by a cooperating agency;

“(D) develop a schedule, in consultation with each cooperating agency, the applicant, and such other entities as the lead agency determines appropriate, for completion of any environmental review, permit, or authorization required to carry out the proposed agency action;

“(E) if the lead agency determines that a review, permit, or authorization will not be completed in accordance with the schedule developed under subparagraph (D), notify the agency responsible for issuing such review, permit, or authorization of the discrepancy and request that such agency take such measures as such agency determines appropriate to comply with such schedule; and

“(F) meet with a cooperating agency that requests such a meeting.

“(3) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The lead agency may, with respect to a proposed agency action, designate any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal to serve as a cooperating agency. A cooperating agency may, not later than a date specified in the schedule established by the lead agency, submit comments to the lead agency.

“(4) REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION.—Any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency or person that is substantially affected by the lack of a designation of a lead agency with respect to a proposed agency action under paragraph (1) may submit a written request for such a designation to a participating Federal agency. An agency that receives a request under this paragraph shall transmit such request to each participating Federal agency and to the Council.

“(5) COUNCIL DESIGNATION.—

“(A) REQUEST.—If the participating Federal agencies are unable to agree on the designation of a lead agency within 45 days of the request under paragraph (4), then the Federal, State, Tribal or local agency or person that is substantially affected by the lack of a designation of a lead agency may re-

quest that the Council designate a lead agency. Such request shall consist of—

“(i) a precise description of the nature and extent of the proposed agency action; and

“(ii) a detailed statement with respect to each participating Federal agency and each factor listed in paragraph (1) regarding which agency should serve as lead agency.

“(B) TRANSMISSION.—The Council shall transmit a request received under subparagraph (A) to each participating Federal agency.

“(C) RESPONSE.—A participating Federal agency may, not later than 20 days after the date of the submission of a request under subparagraph (A), submit to the Council a response to such request.

“(D) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 40 days after the date of the submission of a request under subparagraph (A), the Council shall designate the lead agency with respect to the relevant proposed agency action.

“(b) ONE DOCUMENT.—To the extent practicable, if a proposed agency action will require action by more than one Federal agency and the lead agency has determined that it requires preparation of an environmental document, the lead and cooperating agencies shall evaluate the proposal in a single environmental document.

“(c) REQUEST FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.—Each notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement under section 102 shall include a request for public comment on alternatives or impacts and on relevant information, studies, or analyses with respect to the proposed agency action.

“(d) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED.—Each environmental document shall include a statement of purpose and need that briefly summarizes the underlying purpose and need for the proposed agency action.

“(e) PAGE LIMITS.—

“(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an environmental impact statement shall not exceed 150 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

“(B) EXTRAORDINARY COMPLEXITY.—An environmental impact statement for a proposed agency action of extraordinary complexity shall not exceed 300 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

“(2) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS.—An environmental assessment shall not exceed 75 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

“(f) SPONSOR PREPARATION.—A lead agency shall prescribe procedures to allow a project sponsor to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the supervision of the agency. Such agency may provide such sponsor with appropriate guidance and assist in the preparation. The lead agency shall independently evaluate the environmental document and shall take responsibility for the contents.

“(g) DEADLINES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), with respect to a proposed agency action, a lead agency shall complete, as applicable—

“(A) the environmental impact statement not later than the date that is 2 years after the sooner of, as applicable—

“(i) the date on which such agency determines that section 102(2)(C) requires the issuance of an environmental impact statement with respect to such action;

“(ii) the date on which such agency notifies the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for such action is complete; and

“(iii) the date on which such agency issues a notice of intent to prepare the environmental impact statement for such action; and

“(B) the environmental assessment not later than the date that is 1 year after the sooner of, as applicable—

“(i) the date on which such agency determines that section 106(b)(2) requires the preparation of an environmental assessment with respect to such action;

“(ii) the date on which such agency notifies the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for such action is complete; and

“(iii) the date on which such agency issues a notice of intent to prepare the environmental assessment for such action.

“(2) DELAY.—A lead agency that determines it is not able to meet the deadline described in paragraph (1) may extend such deadline, in consultation with the applicant, to establish a new deadline that provides only so much additional time as is necessary to complete such environmental impact statement or environmental assessment.

“(3) PETITION TO COURT.—

“(A) RIGHT TO PETITION.—A project sponsor may obtain a review of an alleged failure by an agency to act in accordance with an applicable deadline under this section by filing a written petition with a court of competent jurisdiction seeking an order under subparagraph (B).

“(B) COURT ORDER.—If a court of competent jurisdiction finds that an agency has failed to act in accordance with an applicable deadline, the court shall set a schedule and deadline for the agency to act as soon as practicable, which shall not exceed 90 days from the date on which the order of the court is issued, unless the court determines a longer time period is necessary to comply with applicable law.

“(h) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each lead agency shall annually submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that—

“(A) identifies any environmental assessment and environmental impact statement that such lead agency did not complete by the deadline described in subsection (g); and

“(B) provides an explanation for any failure to meet such deadline.

“(2) INCLUSIONS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall identify, as applicable—

“(A) the office, bureau, division, unit, or other entity within the Federal agency responsible for each such environmental assessment and environmental impact statement;

“(B) the date on which—

“(i) such lead agency notified the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for the major Federal action is complete;

“(ii) such lead agency began the scoping for the major Federal action; or

“(iii) such lead agency issued a notice of intent to prepare the environmental assessment or environmental impact statement for the major Federal action; and

“(C) when such environmental assessment and environmental impact statement is expected to be complete.

“SEC. 108. PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

“When an agency prepares a programmatic environmental document for which judicial review was available, the agency may rely on the analysis included in the programmatic environmental document in a subsequent environmental document for related actions as follows:

“(1) Within 5 years and without additional review of the analysis in the programmatic environmental document, unless there are

substantial new circumstances or information about the significance of adverse effects that bear on the analysis.

“(2) After 5 years, so long as the agency re-evaluates the analysis in the programmatic environmental document and any underlying assumption to ensure reliance on the analysis remains valid.

“SEC. 109. ADOPTION OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.

“An agency may adopt a categorical exclusion listed in another agency’s NEPA procedures for a category of proposed agency actions for which the categorical exclusion was established consistent with this paragraph. The agency shall—

“(1) identify the categorical exclusion listed in another agency’s NEPA procedures that covers a category of proposed actions or related actions;

“(2) consult with the agency that established the categorical exclusion to ensure that the proposed adoption of the categorical exclusion to a category of actions is appropriate;

“(3) identify to the public the categorical exclusion that the agency plans to use for its proposed actions; and

“(4) document adoption of the categorical exclusion.

“SEC. 110. E-NEPA.

“(a) PERMITTING PORTAL STUDY.—The Council on Environmental Quality shall conduct a study and submit a report to Congress within 1 year of the enactment of this Act on the potential for online and digital technologies to address delays in reviews and improve public accessibility and transparency under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) including, but not limited to, a unified permitting portal that would—

“(1) allow applicants to—

“(A) submit required documents or materials for their project in one unified portal;

“(B) upload and collaborate with the applicable agencies to edit documents in real-time, as required;

“(C) upload and display visual features such as video, animation, geographic information system displays, and three-dimensional renderings; and

“(D) track the progress of individual applications;

“(2) include a cloud based, digital tool for more complex reviews that would enhance interagency coordination in consultation by—

“(A) centralizing, across all necessary agencies, the data, visuals, and documents, including but not limited to geographic information system displays, other visual renderings, and completed reports and analyses necessary for reviews;

“(B) streamlining communications between all necessary agencies and the applicant;

“(C) allowing for comments and responses by and to all necessary agencies in one unified portal;

“(D) generating analytical reports to aid in organizing and cataloguing public comments; and

“(E) be accessible on mobile devices;

“(3) boost transparency in agency processes and present information suitable for a lay audience, including but not limited to—

“(A) scientific data and analysis; and

“(B) anticipated agency process and timeline; and

“(4) include examples describing how at least five permits would be reviewed and processed through this portal.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 for the Council on Environmental Quality to carry out the study directed by this section.

“SEC. 111. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—The term ‘categorical exclusion’ means a category of actions that a Federal agency has determined normally does not significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of section 102(2)(C).

“(2) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The term ‘cooperating agency’ means any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency that has been designated as a cooperating agency under section 107(a)(3).

“(3) COUNCIL.—The term ‘Council’ means the Council on Environmental Quality established in title II.

“(4) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—The term ‘environmental assessment’ means an environmental assessment prepared under section 106(b)(2).

“(5) ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.—The term ‘environmental document’ means an environmental impact statement, an environmental assessment, or a finding of no significant impact.

“(6) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The term ‘environmental impact statement’ means a detailed written statement that is required by section 102(2)(C).

“(7) FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—The term ‘finding of no significant impact’ means a determination by a Federal agency that a proposed agency action does not require the issuance of an environmental impact statement.

“(8) PARTICIPATING FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ‘participating Federal agency’ means a Federal agency participating in an environmental review or authorization of an action.

“(9) LEAD AGENCY.—The term ‘lead agency’ means, with respect to a proposed agency action—

“(A) the agency that proposed such action; or

“(B) if there are 2 or more involved Federal agencies with respect to such action, the agency designated under section 107(a)(1).

“(10) MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘major Federal action’ means an action that the agency carrying out such action determines is subject to substantial Federal control and responsibility.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘major Federal action’ does not include—

“(i) a non-Federal action—

“(I) with no or minimal Federal funding; or

“(II) with no or minimal Federal involvement where a Federal agency cannot control the outcome of the project;

“(ii) funding assistance solely in the form of general revenue sharing funds which do not provide Federal agency compliance or enforcement responsibility over the subsequent use of such funds;

“(iii) loans, loan guarantees, or other forms of financial assistance where a Federal agency does not exercise sufficient control and responsibility over the subsequent use of such financial assistance or the effect of the action;

“(iv) business loan guarantees provided by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 7(a) or (b) and of the Small Business Act (U.S.C. 636(a)), or title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.);

“(v) bringing judicial or administrative civil or criminal enforcement actions;

“(vi) extraterritorial activities or decisions, which means agency activities or decisions with effects located entirely outside of the jurisdiction of the United States; or

“(vii) activities or decisions that are non-discretionary and made in accordance with the agency’s statutory authority.

“(11) PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.—The term ‘programmatic environ-

mental document’ means an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment analyzing all or some of the environmental effects of a policy, program, plan, or group of related actions.

“(12) PROPOSAL.—The term ‘proposal’ means a proposed action at a stage when an agency has a goal, is actively preparing to make a decision on one or more alternative means of accomplishing that goal, and can meaningfully evaluate its effects.

“(13) SPECIAL EXPERTISE.—The term ‘special expertise’ means statutory responsibility, agency mission, or related program experience.”.

SEC. 322. INTERREGIONAL TRANSFER CAPABILITY DETERMINATION STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Electric Reliability Organization (as that term is defined in section 215(a)(2) of the Federal Power Act), in consultation with each regional entity (as that term is defined in section 215(a)(7) of such Act) and each transmitting utility (as that term is defined in section 3(23) of such Act) that has facilities interconnected with a transmitting utility in a neighboring transmission planning region, shall conduct a study of total transfer capability as defined in section 37.6(b)(1)(vi) of title 18, Code of Federal Regulations, between transmission planning regions that contains the following:

(1) Current total transfer capability, between each pair of neighboring transmission planning regions.

(2) A recommendation of prudent additions to total transfer capability between each pair of neighboring transmission planning regions that would demonstrably strengthen reliability within and among such neighboring transmission planning regions.

(3) Recommendations to meet and maintain total transfer capability together with such recommended prudent additions to total transfer capability between each pair of neighboring transmission planning regions.

(b) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation shall deliver a study to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which shall publish the study required in subsection (a) in the Federal Register and seek public comments.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the end of the public comment period in subsection (b), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall submit a report on its conclusions to Congress and include recommendations, if any, for statutory changes.

SEC. 323. PERMITTING STREAMLINING FOR ENERGY STORAGE.

Section 41001(6)(A) of the FAST Act (42 U.S.C. 4370m(6)(A)) is amended by inserting “energy storage,” before “or any other sector”.

SEC. 324. EXPEDITING COMPLETION OF THE MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE.

(a) DEFINITION OF MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE.—In this section, the term “Mountain Valley Pipeline” means the Mountain Valley Pipeline project, as generally described and approved in Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket Nos. CP16-10, CP19-477, and CP21-57.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION.—The Congress hereby finds and declares that the timely completion of construction and operation of the Mountain Valley Pipeline is required in the national interest. The Mountain Valley Pipeline will serve demonstrated natural gas demand in the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, and Southeast regions, will increase the reliability of natural gas supplies and the availability of natural gas at reasonable prices, will allow natural gas producers to access additional markets

for their product, and will reduce carbon emissions and facilitate the energy transition.

(c) APPROVAL AND RATIFICATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING AUTHORIZATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) Congress hereby ratifies and approves all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the construction and initial operation at full capacity of the Mountain Valley Pipeline; and

(2) Congress hereby directs the Secretary of the Army, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior, and other agencies as applicable, as the case may be, to continue to maintain such authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the construction and initial operation at full capacity of the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

(d) EXPEDITED APPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 21 days after the date of enactment of this Act and for the purpose of facilitating the completion of the Mountain Valley Pipeline, the Secretary of the Army shall issue all permits or verifications necessary—

(1) to complete the construction of the Mountain Valley Pipeline across the waters of the United States; and

(2) to allow for the operation and maintenance of the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

(e) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court shall have jurisdiction to review any action taken by the Secretary of the Army, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or a State administrative agency acting pursuant to Federal law that grants an authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or any other approval necessary for the construction and initial operation at full capacity of the Mountain Valley Pipeline, including the issuance of any authorization, permit, extension, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval described in subsection (c) or (d) of this section for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, whether issued prior to, on, or subsequent to the date of enactment of this section, and including any lawsuit pending in a court as of the date of enactment of this section.

(2) The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any claim alleging the invalidity of this section or that an action is beyond the scope of authority conferred by this section.

(f) EFFECT.—This section supersedes any other provision of law (including any other section of this Act or other statute, any regulation, any judicial decision, or any agency guidance) that is inconsistent with the issuance of any authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval for the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

DIVISION D—INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT

SEC. 401. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply for the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on January 1, 2025.

(b) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED DURING EXTENSION PERIOD.—Effective

on January 2, 2025, the limitation in effect under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall be increased to the extent that—

(1) the face amount of obligations issued under chapter 31 of such title and the face amount of obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government (except guaranteed obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on January 2, 2025, exceeds

(2) the face amount of such obligations outstanding on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) RESTORING CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY OVER THE NATIONAL DEBT.—

(1) EXTENSION LIMITED TO NECESSARY OBLIGATIONS.—An obligation shall not be taken into account under subsection (b)(1) unless the issuance of such obligation was necessary to fund a commitment incurred pursuant to law by the Federal Government that required payment before January 2, 2025.

(2) PROHIBITION ON CREATION OF CASH RESERVE DURING EXTENSION PERIOD.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall not issue obligations during the period specified in subsection (a) for the purpose of increasing the cash balance above normal operating balances in anticipation of the expiration of such period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this debate was a long time coming, not because it is complicated, but because Democrats couldn't accept the solution.

We are here at the eleventh hour, finally dealing with a debt limit on a bipartisan basis, because President Biden apparently needed 100 days to pick up the phone to talk to Republicans.

During those 100 days, the case for cutting spending as part of a debt ceiling increase has only grown stronger. We have seen the worst inflation crisis in a generation—the direct result of reckless spending—continue to rob the pocketbooks of working families. We have seen interest rates continue to rise, driving up the cost of purchasing a car, a home, or a small business loan.

Interest payments on our national debt are \$110 billion higher over the first 7 months of this fiscal year than they were over the same time last fis-

cal year. In other words, runaway spending is adding to our debt crisis on the front end and the back end.

Something else occurred during those 100 days. House Republicans took action. While the White House was saying they would only accept a blank check debt ceiling increase, an idea that did not and does not have the votes even in a Senate controlled by the President's own party, House Republicans passed a responsible plan to address the debt ceiling while cutting spending and supporting American workers.

We acted on behalf of working families who are tired of paying more to put gas in their cars, clothes on their backs, and food on their tables.

We acted on behalf of the small business owners who are desperate to remove the “help wanted” signs in their storefront windows.

We acted on behalf of the families trapped on government assistance to help provide them with a path to a more prosperous future.

One has to wonder, what was President Biden waiting for? A massive slowdown in the economy? We got that, too. In the first quarter of this year, economic growth slowed significantly to just over 1 percent.

However, these data points do not tell the full story. To get that, Mr. Speaker, you have to go into the communities across this country and listen to those on the front lines of the economy.

At the Ways and Means Committee, we have done just that. From West Virginia to Oklahoma, Georgia to New York, we have listened to American workers, families, farmers, and small business owners who have shared their concerns and their solutions.

At the heart of so much of what we have heard is the simple message: Stop spending money we do not have on policies that do not work.

According to a recent survey, 60 percent of the American people say that an increase in the Nation's debt limit ought to be accompanied by a reduction in the Nation's spending.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act is a step in responding to that request. It does much of what Republicans said we would do: put a check on Washington spending, claw back the pandemic-era funding that everyone should agree is no longer needed, take a bite out of the IRS' recent \$80 billion pay raise, severely dampen the regulatory administrative state, and lift more Americans out of poverty through commonsense work requirements for those who can work.

Does this bill do everything folks might want? No. However, I am reminded of a quote by Thomas Jefferson, where he said, in part: “The ground of liberty is to be gained by inches. We must be contented to secure what we can get from time to time and eternally press forward for what is yet to get.”

This bill keeps alive the precedent that was set decades ago that has been

upheld by Republicans and Democrats alike—even by President Biden when he was a Senator and when he was Vice President. That is, when it comes to addressing the Nation's debt limit, Congress and the White House need to come to the table to also help address the Nation's debt crisis.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that, as the chairman noted, he didn't have the whole story, so we intend to spend the next hour filling in the rest of the story.

We are here tonight because of a reckless position that was adopted by the majority that was prepared to take this Nation to the precipice of default. Thank goodness for Joe Biden's legislative skills, so we will not go over the edge. We will preserve the full faith and credit of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, just think of what was being proposed here. At risk was the dollar as the international currency.

Do people have any idea what role treasuries play in terms of international transactions? The American dollar drives the world's economy, and they were prepared to take us over the edge with the reckless spending plan that they have.

Thanks to Leader JEFFRIES and the measured tone that he took, we find ourselves tonight with an agreement that we might not love—because it is not about perfection. I stopped telling people that I was perfect 46 years ago when I ran for the Springfield City Council. After one legislative session, I never professed to being perfect again.

There is give-and-take to negotiation, and it means precisely that you give and you take. That is what we are acknowledging here this evening.

That old sage of political thought got it right. Mick Jagger said: "You get what you need."

Democrats can proudly say tonight that, with the help of Joe Biden, we protected Social Security, protected Medicare, protected Medicaid, and protected veterans benefits, all of which we have profoundly embraced over these years.

How did we get here? This is about the CARES Act that saved the American economy—22 million jobs gone, now 22 million jobs returned, and 9½ million jobs going unanswered. This was a manufactured crisis that brings us to this evening.

The President's experienced leadership in the face of divided government in this body is one-half of one-third of the Federal Government. We still have a ways to go.

Let's talk about why the bill ran up. It is on the CARES Act. Republicans voted for more defense spending. Some Republicans voted for the CHIPS Act, and some voted for the infrastructure bill.

Let me point out something, and I hope everybody is paying attention to

this: In December 2017, Republicans borrowed \$2.3 trillion to provide a tax cut to the wealthiest among us.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the great irony of that is? Even the wealthy wouldn't say they were asking for that tax cut. That is how we got here.

Their default on America act, in an effort to balance the budget on hard-working Americans' backs, tonight will be compromised. They targeted food security and healthcare while ignoring tax loopholes.

Mr. Speaker, do you think around here we might someday close one tax loophole?

The tax bill that we put out was well received everywhere, and it was pro-growth in nature.

Let me also point out something else by historical record this evening. Republicans are always in favor, Mr. Speaker, of balancing the budget when there is a Democratic President. That is the reality of it. Let's not forget who put us in this situation.

In the last 25 years, Republicans have voted for \$10 trillion worth of tax cuts to the top 1 percent: 2001, \$1.3 trillion; 2003, \$1 trillion; and then their tax plan in December 2017, \$2.3 trillion of borrowed money.

They wanted to take the American economy hostage, and Joe Biden, Leader JEFFRIES, and the Democratic Caucus pushed back to make sure that the position that we have tonight, which we overwhelmingly intend to support, is reasonable policy achieved because of the hard-nosed negotiating of President Biden and Leader JEFFRIES.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), who spent hours, days, and weeks in the negotiation process to help get us where we are today.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in debt limit negotiations, the U.S. Government will spend less money next year than it did this year.

This rates as one of the largest deficit reduction bills in American history, and it will fundamentally change the spending trajectory here in Washington with more work to do and more work ahead.

The bill contains spending cuts that take a step in the right direction toward restoring fiscal sanity in Washington. This agreement will return discretionary spending to 2022 levels.

Additionally, we set top-line spending at 1 percent annual growth over the next 6 years.

We also cut spending through the largest funding rescissions in American history, clawing back billions of dollars in unspent COVID money.

We institute the first-ever statutory paygo to hold President Biden accountable for his administrative actions. If this rule had been in place over the last

2 years, it would have checked regulatory overreach that has cost the economy at least \$1.5 trillion during Biden's Presidency.

This agreement will also change the way Washington operates by compelling a workable appropriations process.

Simply put, this legislation ends the Democrats' spending spree and fights inflation.

This deal will also help grow our economy and lift Americans out of poverty by instituting the strongest work requirements in a generation in some of our social safety net programs. These reforms will combat the labor shortages crippling small businesses by encouraging individuals to contribute to our society and economy while preserving these programs for those who need them most.

Another pro-growth solution in this bill is the transformational reforms to the permitting process and the environmental review process. Cutting this red tape will boost domestic energy production, lower costs for struggling American families, and set us on a path toward energy independence. Furthermore, it will be faster, cheaper, and easier to build things in America, large and small. Whether that is infrastructure, roads, bridges, new homes, new factories, so be it.

This legislation, though, is a product of divided government. Republicans only control the House of Representatives, not the Senate and not the White House. Throughout this process—which was long, laborious, and tough—it has been Speaker MCCARTHY's leadership and House Republicans leading. We passed a plan, and it was that plan and the Speaker's leadership that enabled these negotiations and this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most conservative spending package during my time in Congress. I am proud to support it, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes."

□ 1930

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for yielding, and I thank Mr. NEAL for his tremendous, steadfast leadership in this moment of crisis that was manufactured by extreme MAGA Republicans on the other side of the aisle.

I thank the distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee. I thank House Democrats for your steady hand, for your unity of purpose, for your efforts to make sure that we push back the extreme MAGA Republican efforts to jam rightwing cuts down the throats of the American people that would have undermined the health, the safety, and the economic well-being of everyday Americans.

From the very beginning, House Democrats were clear that we would not allow extreme MAGA Republicans to default on our debt, crash the economy, or trigger a job-killing recession.

Under the leadership of President Joe Biden, Democrats kept our promise. We will continue to do what is necessary to put people over politics.

The question that remains right now is what will the House Republican majority do?

It appears that you may have lost control of the floor of the House of Representatives.

Earlier today, 29 House Republicans voted to default on our Nation's debt and against an agreement that you negotiated.

It is an extraordinary act that indicates just the nature of the extremism that is out of control on the other side of the aisle.

Extreme MAGA Republicans attempted to take control of the House floor. Democrats took it back for the American people.

We will continue to do what is necessary under the leadership of President Joe Biden to build an economy that works for everyday Americans and push back against the extremism on the other side of the aisle.

Under the Trump administration, Democrats helped the former President avoid a default, raised the debt ceiling three times without gamesmanship, partisanship, or brinkmanship because Democrats put people over politics, even though we strongly disagreed with your reckless policies, as Chairman NEAL eloquently outlined.

In 2017, you passed the GOP tax scam where 83 percent of the benefits went to the wealthiest 1 percent here in America and caused our Nation to go \$2 trillion in debt to subsidize the lifestyles of the wealthy, the well-off, and the well-connected. It did nothing to lift up the economy for everyday Americans.

That was the case with your so-called tax cuts under Ronald Reagan, and that was the case under George W. Bush: failed policy; and trickle-down economics that has come to mean only one thing for everyday Americans. You may get a trickle, but you are guaranteed to stay down. Your policies have failed.

Yet despite that failure, despite the fact that you went \$2 trillion into debt to pass your GOP tax scam, House Democrats were there to make sure that America did not default. We were there then, and we are here today, to put people over politics.

I am thankful for my colleagues, for their work, for their commitment, for their patriotism, for their dedication, for their willingness to find the common ground necessary under the leadership of President Joe Biden, who did an extraordinary job under very difficult circumstances to protect values of importance to the American people, notwithstanding your threats to crash the economy, trigger a recession, and default on our debt.

President Biden understood, despite the hostage-taking situation that you unnecessarily thrust the country into, that we had an obligation, a responsibility

to avoid a catastrophic default. That is exactly what President Biden and Democrats have been able to do.

We also made clear that America would not find ourselves back in this hostage-taking situation. You passed the default on America act about a month ago that had extreme rightwing cuts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members, including leadership, are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I did not mention any single Member by name or any single individual on the other side of the aisle.

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated on this floor, House Democrats will continue to put people over politics and push back against the extremism on the other side of the aisle.

I am thankful for the leadership of President Joe Biden in avoiding a catastrophic default. I am thankful for the leadership of President Joe Biden in finding a way to an agreement that will avoid a hostage-taking situation for the balance of the 118th Congress.

I am thankful for the leadership of President Joe Biden and House Democrats who protected Social Security, protected Medicare, protected Medicaid, protected veterans' benefits, protected education, protected public safety, and protected the American people from the draconian 22 percent across-the-board cuts that House Republicans were trying to visit on everyday Americans.

As a result of that effort, that leadership of President Joe Biden, we are going to be able to get through this hostage-taking situation and ensure that we can continue to build an economy that works for everyday Americans.

I thank House Democrats for their leadership. I thank House Democrats for their work. We will continue to show up and stand up and speak up without fear for everyday Americans to ensure that we can continue America's long, necessary, and majestic march toward a more perfect Union.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who has worked for days and weeks to get us to where we are today.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Let me explain why we are in the situation that we are in today. We have watched over the last year as my friends across the aisle have pushed through legislation called the IJJA, called the IRA, the CHIPS Act, the ARP, all these acronyms.

What does it mean to you?

What it means to the American people, Mr. Speaker, is it means that \$10 trillion in extra funds have been spent—\$10 trillion.

Let me tell you what that means. Today, a child born in America is going to inherit about \$4½ million in debt at their birth—\$4½ million—the amount of money they are going to pay over their lifetime, according to the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget.

Right now, we have hit our credit card limit as a Nation. We don't have the ability to pay the monthly payment, and so we are in a quandary.

We have to figure out how we are going to raise that credit card limit. Just like you would do with your own family, you would have a conversation, Mr. Speaker, with your child. You would say, hey, how did you get yourself in this situation? We have to fix it.

The situation we are in right now, we have four options in front of us. There are four.

Number one, we can default on the debt. You cannot pay your credit card bill which means late payment penalties, interest rates going up, and you cause havoc on the American family.

The second option is you can say, hey, we are going to use this 14th Amendment thing that doesn't really exist, and the President can just do it on his own.

The third option is you can get all the moderates together, and they can do a relatively clean debt ceiling that just keeps that debt going up and up and up from \$32 trillion today to \$52 trillion over the next 20 years or so.

Mr. Speaker, 17½ cents of every tax dollar paid over the next 10 years is going to go towards interest on the debt—17½ cents.

The third option we have is, again, a clean debt ceiling, just running it up.

The fourth option we have, the one that is before us today, is the Fiscal Responsibility Act.

It is absolutely historic. For the first time ever, as a result of the strategic nature of this Speaker, we are in a situation where we have legislation before us that will result in the greatest savings in American history that will result in the greatest rescission, or taking back of funds, in our Nation's history.

We have legislation before us today that will strengthen and instill work requirements for welfare.

We have legislation before us today that will rescind funds for additional IRS agents because I have never had a constituent say, gosh, I wish I could have more audits.

We have legislation before us today that, for the first time in 40 years, streamlines the environmental process.

Mr. Speaker, here it is: Historic efforts to raise the deficit, \$6.5 trillion is how much this will result in. This one, \$2 trillion in savings. This is the option.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. There is not an imaginary fifth option, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't exist. Let's be honest with the American people. Support this legislation.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the previous gentleman left out infrastructure

spending, the CARES Act, defense spending, the CHIPS Act, and the PACT Act, all of which had Republican support in terms of the expenditures.

Bill Clinton balanced the budget four straight times during his Presidency, and the money was given away with big tax cuts in 2001 and 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, protecting our country's full faith and credit requires accepting some unacceptable Republican demands.

As one cartoonist aptly described them, Republicans suffer from a form of deficit attention disorder. You see, when Republicans are in charge, they are absolutely obsessed with deficits.

Give them a little power, and their attention—poof. It just magically vanishes as they begin to deplete the Treasury with tax gifts for the well connected.

Like their multitrillion-dollar Trump tax giveaway, they are already planning in coming days to soon borrow more to reward those at the top.

Their boundless affection for tax cheats and for tax expenditures may increase the debt by even more than the cuts that they make today in education, healthcare, and environmental protection, which are so wrong.

As climate deniers, these Republicans sought to repeal our climate law but were held to one pipeline and a weakening of environmental review laws, a troubling setback that we can overcome.

We should be leaping forward instead of moving slowly. Ransom paid; America protected.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Responsibility Act.

Over 100 days ago, President Biden said he would not negotiate. Republicans, acting on behalf of this country, forced him to negotiate.

The bill alters our fiscal trajectory and helps remedy the Federal Government's insatiable spending problem.

This landmark legislation lowers nondefense discretionary spending and forces Congress to employ a functioning appropriations process.

More importantly, the measure doesn't result in new taxes and doesn't touch Social Security, Medicare, or veterans' benefits.

Is the bill perfect? Absolutely not.

Is it a step in the right direction? Absolutely. CBO scores a decrease in spending of \$1.9 trillion.

Let's not forget, Rome was not built in a day. It is now up to Republicans to make the necessary cuts to rein in our terrible spending and our terrible debt of \$31 trillion.

I urge my colleagues to support this landmark legislation.

□ 1945

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. THOMPSON), who spent 6 hours in front of the Rules Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the American people can't afford a default. Default on our debt would be catastrophic, an economic disaster with consequences for every one of our constituents. Congress can't let that happen.

This bill is not perfect, but thanks to President Biden's leadership, the bill before us achieves two key points: One, it prevents default, averting an economic disaster; and, two, it preserves not only key programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, but also maintains virtually all House Democrats' achievements from the last 2 years, including the climate provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act, which I was proud to author with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee.

Despite where Republicans started, the President has negotiated legislation that protects Medicaid and the Inflation Reduction Act, the CHIPS Act, and the PACT Act, which provides for veterans' healthcare.

Now, I share some of my colleagues' concerns with the bill. I am particularly opposed to the Republicans' demand to cut mental health care. After climate change, mental health is the single biggest crisis in our country. There is no reason to cut critical funding for mental health.

Their cuts to the IRS will not decrease the deficit. It will increase the deficit. A fully funded IRS is in everyone's best interests.

Overall, this legislation is a compromise, which is what the American people expect and deserve from a divided government. Most important, it averts the catastrophe of a default.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, when I ran for Congress, I ran on the promise that I would use my position to reverse Washington's debt culture.

In my first term, I was in the minority party, and after 2 years of voting against Democrats' spending proposals, I finally today get the opportunity to vote "yes" on a comprehensive and thoughtful piece of legislation that will serve as the most significant spending cut in American history.

Does this bill achieve everything that I want? No, of course not. That is the reality. However, my support is a significant step forward, reversing our ballooning national debt.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act allows us to cut spending by \$2.1 trillion over the next decade. It is the largest deficit reduction ever. For the first time in 40 years, we will be able to address our permitting process, to be able to address our energy sector and transportation projects from crippling regulations.

This act represents the beginning of what is to come as Republicans govern

in a responsible, productive manner. We fought hard to get this agreement and blew through Democrats' red lines over and over again.

This isn't over. We can responsibly govern, and success today will bring more success in the future. I look forward to casting my vote "yes."

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), my neighbor.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, three times President Biden has had to deal with the Republican-manufactured default crisis around raising the debt ceiling.

Since 1960, Congress has dealt with the debt ceiling 78 times. During the Trump administration alone, it raised the debt ceiling three times without holding the American economy and its people hostage.

President Biden is to be commended for being the adult in the room and providing the leadership to prevent a catastrophic default that hurts the U.S. standing in the global economy and Americans here at home.

That does not excuse the behavior of the Republican majority in the House, who seek to normalize hostage taking in an effort to hurt programs that serve our people the most.

Mr. Speaker, I thank President Biden for protecting Social Security, Medicare, and veterans' benefits. The trust the American people placed in you has been validated again.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this legislation.

The debt ceiling is one of the best pathways to address debt and deficits. In addition to immediate spending cuts and future spending caps, this bill includes provisions to prevent IRS from auditing families and small businesses and helps get Americans back to work.

My bill with Representative STEEL to rescind IRS funding was partially put into this bill. Even though we passed the entire bill by our majority in January, parts of it are in this bill, and House Republicans continue to work to protect every family and small business from IRS overreach.

This bill also modernizes TANF work requirements and ends the scheme of States sending small-dollar checks to people who are already working to artificially raise their TANF work rates. These changes will focus TANF dollars on those who need it the most and will push States to do more to connect work-capable adults with the 9.6 million job openings we have across our economy right now.

We have more to do to get our work done and our fiscal house in order. We need to ensure our economy always rewards hard work, and this bill is a great start.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), one of the most accomplished Speakers of the House in the history of America.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership. I also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BOYLE), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the great remarks of our distinguished leader, Mr. HAKEEM JEFFRIES, who spoke earlier and captured so much of what is so important here today.

Mr. Speaker, our Constitution makes perfectly clear the validity of the public debt of the United States shall not be questioned. In the bipartisan budget agreement, we honor our sworn oaths as lawmakers to uphold this constitutional duty.

While I find this legislation objectionable, it will avert an unprecedented default, which would bring devastation to America's families: millions of jobs eliminated, trillions in savings erased, higher costs on loans, mortgages, car payments, credit card bills, and more.

Let us commend President Biden for his responsible leadership to prevent this unconscionable outcome while protecting Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid; protecting healthcare for our veterans as our Commander in Chief; protecting our progress on climate and infrastructure; and protecting our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, reaffirming to Americans that the full faith and credit of the United States shall not be questioned.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY). He has worked numerous hours, days—in fact, he has been working since January—to get to where we are today.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, let me first say how grateful I am to Congressmen GRAVES and MCHENRY. They have given their time and talents to this effort for more than a month. Our entire Conference and country owes them a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my Conference. They worked hard. When I went to see the President on February 1, I sat in the Oval Office right in the chair across from him. I said, Mr. President, the debt limit is coming.

At that time, Janet Yellen said it would be into maybe July, August.

I said that we should work together. I said that there are only two things, Mr. President: Never raise taxes, and we have to spend less than we spent this year.

He said that we would meet, but for 97 days we would never meet. It wasn't until this House took action to pass a bill. I sit back and I think for one moment, what if that bill didn't pass, because nothing passed in the Senate? If that bill had not passed, the only other option was sitting over here in a discharge petition. It just needs a few more signatures, and it would be: Just raise the debt. Just raise the debt.

But tonight is going to be different. Tonight, we are going to do something

we haven't done before. Tonight, we are going to give America hope. Tonight, we are going to vote for the largest savings in American history: over \$2.1 trillion. That is what we will vote on.

Mr. Speaker, every great nation that has overextended itself has collapsed. Mindful of this truth, George Washington said in his Farewell Address that a healthy public credit is a source of strength and security for a nation.

By that same token, an unhealthy debt burden is a source of weakness and insecurity.

President Washington's words ring true today. We are seeing the negative effects of runaway spending in real time: record inflation, rising interest rates, broken supply chains, and economic uncertainty.

Runaway spending is also making America more dependent on foreign debt holders. The total debt we owe to other countries is \$7.4 trillion. Countries like China are buying more of our farmland, more of our businesses, and more of our debt. This is unsustainable; but what is even worse, it is dangerous.

However, runaway spending is more than a national and economic security problem. My belief, Mr. Speaker, is that it is a moral problem.

Mr. Speaker, this is Halle. Halle was born at 9:58 a.m. on April 11 of this year. She weighed 6 pounds, 7 ounces. Her blue eyes, she got that from her dad. That button nose, she got that from her mom. The \$95,000 bill, she got that from Washington. Not a very good gift for a newborn. That is Halle's portion of the national debt.

Sadly, Halle is not alone. Every child who is born today owes \$95,000 in debt. Mr. Speaker, that is \$10,000 more in debt for every child since this President took office.

It reminds me of what Ronald Reagan once said: "When a business or an individual spends more than it makes, it goes bankrupt. When government does it, it sends you the bill."

Mr. Speaker, to continue Washington's spending addiction is both irresponsible and just wrong, so let's stop it. I will be honest, tonight's bill doesn't stop it, but for the first time, we begin to turn the ship. This shouldn't be our last. It shouldn't even be a debate. We should challenge each other for how could we put ourselves on a fiscal path even better.

For months, President Biden and Senator SCHUMER were adamant that they would not negotiate spending cuts. Mr. Speaker, I remember watching Senator SCHUMER on George Stephanopoulos one Sunday. He said: Just watch, we are going to break them. The Republicans can't get together. They can't pass a bill, and it is going to be a clean debt ceiling. You just watch.

The only person that didn't pass the bill was the person that made that quote. They demanded a clean debt limit, which really means they spend more, and you just pay more in taxes.

House Republicans said no. Over the past 4 months, we fought hard to change how Washington works. We stopped the Democrats from writing a blank check for more spending after the largest spending binge in American history that brought us some of the worst inflation our Nation has ever known.

We used the power we had to force the President to negotiate. You watched me day after day requesting to negotiate with the President. We produced a bill that in a divided government takes a step toward smaller government, less regulation, more economic growth, and more take-home pay.

Unlike previous Speakers, Members didn't have to pass the bill to find out what is in it. They had 72 hours to read it, and it is only 99 pages. Fifteen of those pages were just rescissions, just money that we had spent that sat there.

Here is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker: The Fiscal Responsibility Act is the biggest spending cut in American history.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, don't want to be on the wrong side of history. Yes, I could say I am going to vote "no" because there is something not in the bill. If I took that philosophy, I would never vote "yes."

I simply read the bills in front of me and decide: Is this good for the country? I would say that answer is easily yes.

□ 2000

Taxpayers will save an additional \$2.1 trillion. For the first time in more than a decade, Congress will spend less next year than this year.

In fact, the Fiscal Responsibility Act is the only bill that reduces overall spending, reduces nondefense spending, and reduces the deficit, unlike any other debt limit increase in recent history.

We are finally bending the curve on discretionary spending because of this bill. We are doing it while at the same time raising our national defense, with our veterans fully funded, with Social Security and Medicare preserved, and without raising a penny in new taxes.

That is a major victory.

Mr. Speaker, it is only part of the story. Tens of billions of dollars in unspent COVID funds will be clawed back for taxpayers because of this bill's spending rescissions, the largest in American history. If you add up all the rescissions in American history, this is larger than that. I think it is only common sense that if the pandemic is over, but billions of dollars have not been spent, why would you spend them now if the pandemic is over? Why don't we provide them back to the hard-working taxpayer that has to pay it, like Halle.

Mr. Speaker, just listen to some of the programs we are slashing:

\$400 million from the CDC's global health fund. Don't get worried because

that is not going to help you. That is your hardworking taxpayer money being sent to countries like China. I guess that is to help China be able to buy our bonds, and we will pay for their healthcare. I would rather focus on America.

What about work-capable adults without dependents? They are going to get a job. They are going to learn new skills, and they are going to earn a paycheck because of this bill's new welfare reforms. These reforms are going to change people's lives. When we vote on this bill today, somebody is going to have a better job tomorrow because of your vote. Families will be stronger and more self-sufficient. People will be lifted out of poverty.

Don't believe anyone who says our plan hurts America's social safety net. We are such a generous Nation, and when people fall on tough times, we help them. That will not change.

This is important: Assistance programs are supposed to be temporary, not permanent—a hand up, not a hand-out; a bridge to independence, not a barrier.

If you also vote for this bill tonight, new roads, bridges, highways, and pipelines are going to be built sooner and faster because of this bill's permitting reform.

Mr. Speaker, I know that is a bipartisan view. We talk about it all the time. We see it in our homes. We get frustrated that you will vote for a transportation bill, you will serve 10 years in the Congress, and once you leave, the person who follows you 6 years later will be at the groundbreaking because we spent all that time studying.

I think America wants to compete. They want to cut the red tape. They just want a fair process.

This is going to save families money and make America less dependent on China, changing America for the better for decades to come.

Finally, taxpayers will be more protected from harassment and costly new burdens. We rejected every single one of President Biden's demands for new tax hikes and new government mandates. Believe me, from the person sitting in the room with the President, he asked every single time.

Instead, this bill eliminates the funding that would have been spent this year to hire Biden's army of new IRS agents. Overall, we have cut more than \$20 billion from Biden's IRS slush fund. To date, they haven't been able to hire a single one of Biden's 87,000 new IRS agents. I will come back year after year to keep it that way because the government should work for you, not go after you.

Mr. Speaker, passing the Fiscal Responsibility Act is a crucial first step for putting America back on track. It does what is responsible for our children, what is possible in a divided government, and what is required by our principles and promises. Yes, it may not include everything we need to do,

but it is absolutely what we need to do right now.

Moving forward, House Republicans will build on its structural reforms. As we do, the American people can be confident in this: I am never giving up. I heard the detractors.

I am an optimist. I have to be. I sat there 15 rounds.

I am an optimist. I waited 97 days and listened to the President tell me he will never meet with me, but I woke up every morning thinking this might be the day.

I am an optimist. I watched division in this House, but tonight, we might come together and do something very big for this Nation.

Don't mistake that it is the solution. It is the beginning. We should wake up the next morning on how we can do even better tomorrow. You see, I will never give up on the American people, and I will never give up on keeping our Commitment to America.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a champion of the Inflation Reduction Act and the tax credits that were included.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how the Republicans can make political drama appear smaller than life: major questions with extremists are reduced to parody and political theater.

We may have averted catastrophe, but it doesn't mean there was not a real cost to America. We should commit to never again allow such political hostage taking. Instead, lay the foundation for using the clear language of the 14th Amendment to avoid the debt ceiling altogether.

We should collect billions of dollars already payable from some of the wealthiest individuals and corporations. It would be a strong signal about the fairness of our tax system.

It is ironic that Republicans are worried about pressing rich people for taxes they already owe, but would subject poor people to more harassment and meaningless paperwork.

We should instead concentrate on changing policies to reduce the deficit. If there will be time limits on benefits, maybe we could start with 20,000 rich farmers who got a million dollars a year or more for 37 consecutive years.

If we act in good faith, it shouldn't be so hard, and America will be the better.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority leader.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Missouri for yielding and for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in years, this Congress is actually debating a bill that will reduce spending from one year to the next. Let me repeat that: reduce spending from one year to the next. That is not something you hear around this town often.

Usually, the debate is: How much more money will Washington spend?

In fact, if Republicans were not in the majority in this House, that is exactly the debate that would be going on, how much more to spend, how many more taxes to raise because that is what President Biden wanted at the outset of this debate on the debt ceiling.

Just for a little background, let's be clear what the debt ceiling is. The debt ceiling is the Nation's credit card. For the last 2 years, you saw out-of-control, reckless spending to the tune of trillions of dollars where President Biden and his allies racked up so much debt that they maxed out the Nation's credit card.

We are at this point to address that problem.

Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it make sense at the same time that we are addressing the problem that President Biden created with years of spending money that we don't have that we also have an honest discussion and start solving the problem that caused the Nation to max out the credit card? That is what this debate has been about for the last few months. Frankly, I think it is a debate that has been a long time coming in this Nation.

Over months of debate, while no one gets everything they want, I think it is important that we talk about the things that we got, that we talk about the things that the American people will get out of this bill that will help start turning the trajectory of our Nation's spending in Washington, finally putting our country back on a path where we can keep this debate going.

This is the first step. Let's make no mistake about it, this bill doesn't solve all the problems that have been created over years and decades, but it starts to finally turn the ship of state in the right direction. It starts with real savings, over \$2 trillion in actual spending cuts. That is in the bill.

Again, this is a very historic first step. It doesn't mean that is where we stop. It means that is where we start. You don't get the next round of trillions in spending cuts if you don't lock in the first \$2.1 trillion that is in this bill.

Now, something else we do is we actually go and reclaim for the taxpayers of America what has been identified as \$28 billion in slush funds floating around Washington, all under the name of COVID. President Biden himself actually said COVID is over.

We passed legislation here in this House under this Republican majority to end the pandemic so we can get our country and our economy back going again. Yet, there is \$28 billion out there still unspent that liberals in Washington want to spend. If we don't pass this bill, they will spend that money in the name of COVID, even though COVID is over.

There is \$28 billion that should go back in savings to the taxpayer. Well, guess what is in this bill, Mr. Speaker? Those \$28 billion are reclaimed so the taxpayers get that money back. That is in this bill.

Let's talk about the IRS. In my years in public service on the State level or in Congress, I have never gotten a single call from a constituent going: Do you know what? The thing we really want you to do is go add more people to the IRS.

Yet, President Biden, for some reason, decided he wanted to more than double the size of the IRS. He wanted to go from about 80,000 people—to add not up to 87,000, but to add an additional 87,000 people. According to the Congressional Budget Office, they confirmed that it would break President Biden's promise.

You heard it over and over again that if you make less than \$400,000 a year, don't worry, you won't pay any more in new taxes. Well, maybe they are redefining what lower income means because if you are making less than \$100,000, according to the CBO, those new IRS agents will be going after lower income family workers and the single mom that is working two jobs at a restaurant. That is who they will be going after.

We step in and say no, we have to end that madness—over a billion dollars in cuts to the IRS to stop them from doing just that.

Let's talk about another big area of savings. A lot of people take out loans—a loan to buy their first home. I know that is harder to do under the Biden economy because interest rates are so high because of the out-of-control spending in Washington. This bill finally starts to address that so, hopefully, interest rates can go down. Hopefully, families can afford to buy their first home again.

There is something else that people do. Usually, a first loan a lot of people take out is a student loan. I know I did when I was a student. I signed the document, and it helped me get through college. I also worked my way through college.

When I graduated, there was never a day where I thought somebody else, some single mom working two jobs, ought to pay that loan back instead of me. I paid those loans back, and most Americans have done that. About 13 percent of the American people take out student loans.

Yet, for some reason, the President decided that he thinks all Americans, 100 percent of American taxpayers, should pay the student loans of the 13 percent that don't want to pay them back. Is that fair? Does anybody think that is fair to all of those people who are working hard and barely getting by in a tough economy?

What we do is we actually start those loan payments back. That is \$60 billion in savings just this year, in the first year, so that people don't have to carry the burden for something that somebody else said they would do.

□ 2015

This is America. We make our choices. If you want to take out a loan, you should have that ability, but you

shouldn't expect somebody else to go pay it for you. Let's get back to the values that made this country so great.

We put real permitting reforms in place, something we haven't seen in decades. Anybody that is trying to build anything in America, if you are trying to build a factory, if you are trying to maybe add on to your farm, if you have got a barn and you want to add on to it, they find a puddle in the back and under Waters of the U.S., next thing you know, you have got five different Federal agencies where groups are suing to stop you from getting that permit, even though you have done everything right. You followed all the rules.

We finally fixed that. We created a one-stop-shop so that if you are trying to get a permit, if you are playing by the rules, somebody else can't go game the system to try to kill your project by going to one agency and you spend 2 years fighting that lawsuit, you win that one. The next day they file another lawsuit with another agency and another and another, and next thing you know, it is 10 years later, and you just give up and walk away. It happens all the time in America.

We will have a one-stop-shop, but we also put shot clocks on the unelected bureaucrats because, you know what, Mr. Speaker, if a Federal agency tells you that you have to get them some information back, they don't say, hey, get it to us whenever you want to. They give you a deadline and it is usually pretty soon, and if you don't meet that deadline, you don't get your permit.

But if you get them all the information, you might wait 6 months, a year, or longer to hear back from the Federal agency. These are people that work for the taxpayers of America. Shouldn't they have the same requirements and a shot clock on them that they put on you, the American people paying their salaries? That is in this bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, real work requirements. I don't think there has ever been a time in America where there are more jobs that are open, people looking for workers. You can go to a restaurant, if you want to take your family out for a nice dinner, and you will see a third of the tables empty, yet they are not seating anybody because they don't have enough workers.

Why is that? Because the Federal Government is paying millions of people right now not to work. Think about that.

In America, where everybody is looking for workers, the Federal Government is borrowing money from countries like China to pay people not to work. This is insanity.

For all the people out there that are working, they are paying that freight. Why don't we say, for people who are able-bodied, who are able to get back into the workforce—there is a social safety net for people who run on hard times. If you just choose to sit at home

and turn down jobs, that is your prerogative as an American. Just don't ask someone who is working two jobs to pay for you to sit at home and turn down work.

By putting work requirements back in place, something Joe Biden himself voted for as a Senator, you also strengthen Social Security and Medicare, two programs that are going bust under President Biden's runaway spending that we shored up in this bill, actually strengthening those programs that are so important to the people who paid into it.

There is more work to be done, absolutely, and we will get to work tomorrow working on the next round of things we need to do to keep getting this country back on track, but we never get there if we don't start with the first step.

That is what we are doing here tonight. That is why we need to get this bill passed, and then go to work on the next reforms we have got to do to continue strengthening this great Nation, the United States of America. I urge passage.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader failed to mention that we raised the national debt three times during Donald Trump's Presidency. He failed to point out that \$8.7 trillion was added to the national debt during Donald Trump's Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a productive member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, the only problem is our tax system is broken, and you don't want to talk about it. We made strides to fix this problem with a historic IRS investment.

The IRS is coming after you. I saw those commercials. You are better than that, guys and gals. You are better than that. No one's putting an arm together, but we want to make sure everybody pays their fair share.

What in God's name is wrong with that?

That is what we are talking about. If you look at the IRS estimates of those people who are getting away with murder, that is what the average American knows about, thinks about, but does little talking about because he figures he can't do anything about it. You can.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. So, Article I is ignored many times by both parties, both sides of the aisle. It is the Congress that has the power to put a budget together. It is pretty simple.

All Americans must understand what is happening here. President Biden put forward a budget to boost opportunity for working Americans, increase access to healthcare, and improve tax fairness.

Mr. Speaker, in the greatest country in the world, if we don't fix our tax system, we have not done our job as Congress, folks.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Democrats often say that the new IRS funding will only be used to go after the wealthy. This is simply not the case.

I include in the RECORD a CBO blog post from 2021 examining the Biden administration's \$80 billion proposal and stating that it would return the audit rates to the levels of about 10 years ago, and that that rate would rise for all taxpayers. Our calculations show that this would mean 600,000 more audits per year for taxpayers making less than \$75,000 a year.

[From CBO Blog, Sept. 2, 2021]

THE EFFECTS OF INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE IRS

(By Phill Swagel)

Last month, the Congressional Budget Office published An Analysis of Certain Proposals in the President's 2022 Budget. Since then, CBO has completed its analysis of another proposal in the President's budget, an increase in spending for the Internal Revenue Service's (IRS's) enforcement activities. CBO estimates that portions of the Administration's proposal to increase funding for the IRS by \$80 billion over the 2022–2031 period would increase revenues by approximately \$200 billion over those 10 years. That estimate does not include changes in revenues resulting from portions of the proposal that involve new information-reporting requirements and other changes to the tax code; those changes are estimated by the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT).

THE PROPOSAL

The Administration proposes funding for the IRS that is \$80 billion greater over 10 years than the amounts in CBO's July 2021 baseline projections (which reflect the assumption that current laws generally do not change). Two types of funding would be provided: discretionary appropriations, which would mainly be used for enforcement activities; and mandatory funding, which would be used for a variety of activities (not only enforcement but also operations support, business-systems modernization, and taxpayer services).

Spending would increase in each year between 2021 and 2031, though the highest growth would occur in the first few years. By 2031, CBO projects, the proposal would make the IRS's budget more than 90 percent larger than it is in CBO's July 2021 baseline projections and would more than double the IRS's staffing. Of the \$80 billion, CBO estimates, about \$60 billion would be for enforcement and related operations support.

The Administration also proposes that financial institutions increase their reporting about account inflows and outflows. Part of the increased funding would support the implementation of a new information-reporting system to be used by those institutions. The resulting effects on revenues are estimated by JCT and are not included in CBO's estimate of an approximately \$200 billion increase.

HOW CBO ESTIMATES THE EFFECT ON REVENUES OF INCREASED IRS FUNDING

CBO's estimate of revenues is based on the IRS's projected returns on investment (ROIs)

for spending on new enforcement initiatives. The IRS estimates those ROIs by calculating the expected revenues that would be raised from taxes, interest, and penalties as a result of the new initiatives and dividing them by their additional cost. (The agency has provided ROIs over the past five years as part of its budget justification.) The IRS's ROIs ramp up over three years as staff become trained and fully productive, arrive at the peak level, and then stay there. In recent years, peak ROIs have ranged from 5 to 9. That is, a \$1 increase in spending on the IRS's enforcement activities results in \$5 to \$9 of increased revenues.

CBO adjusts the ROIs so that they better reflect the marginal return on additional spending. First, CBO expects the IRS to prioritize the enforcement activities that it thinks will have the highest average return; additional enforcement spending would therefore have lower returns than previous spending. Second, CBO expects taxpayers to adapt to the IRS's enforcement activities and adopt new ways of evading detection, so an enforcement activity may have a lower return in later years. Finally, the productivity of the IRS's enforcement activities will also depend on the IRS's other capabilities. For example, modernized information technology that stored all of a taxpayer's information in digital form could increase the productivity of examiners (the employees who detect taxpayers' noncompliance).

CBO's estimate of revenues also accounts for the timing of collections resulting from enforcement activity by new hires. Taxes are assessed at the end of an audit; if taxpayers disagree with the assessment, they can appeal and continue to litigate. The length of each step depends on the complexity of the case. CBO estimates that an audit of medium complexity would take 24 months to complete. That time, combined with the expected training time for an experienced new hire, suggests that the IRS would begin to collect revenues 30 months after the new hire joined the agency. (The timing would be longer when cases were more complex or when the taxpayer did not agree to the assessment and appealed.)

What is Incorporated Into CBO's Estimate. CBO's estimate of the change in revenues is relative to the amount of revenues collected under current law (which is reflected in CBO's baseline budget projections). Under guidelines agreed to by the legislative and executive branches, this change in revenues typically would not be included in a cost estimate for legislation that brought about the change, but it would be reflected in CBO's baseline budget projections once the legislation was enacted.

CBO's estimate reflects the assumption that the proposed increase in funding would follow the proposed expansion of information reporting. Expanded information reporting might allow the IRS to better target potentially noncompliant taxpayers; it might also prompt taxpayers to file more accurate tax returns. It might have a positive effect on revenues collected, but it might also reduce the ROIs from enforcement activities, because if returns are more accurate, there will be less noncompliance to audit. In CBO's and JCT's judgment, those effects roughly offset each other, on net, resulting in a small positive effect on ROIs.

CBO's estimate includes "direct revenues" and "protected revenues." Direct revenues are generated from the IRS's auditing and collection efforts. Protected revenues result when the IRS prevents a taxpayer from recouping previously assessed and paid taxes—for example, when the IRS prevents fraudulent refunds or disallows claims in taxpayers' amended returns.

The estimate reflects CBO's expectation that the increased enforcement activities

would change the voluntary compliance rate—that is, the share of taxes owed that are paid voluntarily and on time—only modestly. The magnitude of that effect is highly uncertain, however, and the empirical evidence about the effects of audits on taxpayers' behavior is inconclusive. Research about such deterrence finds varying responses, depending on the type of taxpayer. People generally increase their reported income in the years following an audit, but people with higher income generally do not, and neither do corporations. (For more discussion, see Box 1 in CBO's July 2020 report Trends in the Internal Revenue Service's Funding and Enforcement.)

How the Current Analysis Differs From Previous Analyses. In that July 2020 report, CBO estimated that a \$40 billion increase in enforcement funding would raise \$103 billion (for a net effect of \$63 billion). The methods used for this estimate differ in several ways from the methods used for that one.

First, CBO used updated ROIs that incorporated the IRS's most recent estimates of the return on enforcement activities. CBO then adjusted the ROIs to reflect both direct revenues and protected revenues, increasing the peak ROI from 6.4 to 7.1.

Second, CBO's current methods allow for positive interaction between enforcement spending and other IRS funding. That is, CBO accounts for ways in which increased capabilities, such as more digitization of taxpayers' information and greater visibility of income flows, can increase the productivity of enforcement activities.

Third, this analysis reflects a longer time frame for receiving enforcement revenues because of the complexity of audits associated with high-wealth individuals, large corporations, and partnerships. Taxpayers with greater resources may be more likely to appeal assessments or to litigate their disputes in the U.S. Tax Court, delaying the receipt of assessed taxes. As a result, revenues from some audits will not be received until later than CBO estimated in its July 2020 analysis.

Sources of Uncertainty. The change in revenues resulting from an increase in the IRS's funding could be different from CBO's estimate. It depends on the IRS's ability to hire experienced candidates, changes in voluntary compliance, and the interaction of enforcement funding with the IRS's other capabilities.

The IRS intends to hire mid- and senior-level people with private-sector experience who will not require a great deal of training to become productive. But it might not be able to hire its desired mix of candidates. If it hired less experienced candidates, it would have to spend more resources training them. Not only would they take longer to become productive, but current staff members would have to devote more time to training them. A related source of uncertainty in CBO's estimate is attrition: if it proved higher than expected, personnel would have fewer years at full productivity.

An increase in the IRS's funding could signal that the agency was more capable of detecting noncompliance, thus increasing voluntary compliance and revenues. However, if there were fewer noncompliant taxpayers to audit, the ROIs from the IRS's enforcement activities would drop, and the direct revenues from increased enforcement would be lower than CBO estimated.

Finally, it is unclear how much the greater information reporting or the increased IRS spending in areas other than enforcement (such as technology) could improve examiners' productivity. Greater nonenforcement spending might increase overall revenues but decrease ROIs—for example, if improved services for taxpayers enabled those taxpayers to more accurately determine their

tax liability, reducing the pool of noncompliant taxpayers to audit.

EFFECTS ON TAXPAYERS

The proposed increase in spending on the IRS's enforcement activities would result in higher audit rates than those underlying CBO's baseline budget projections. Between 2010 and 2018, the audit rate for higher-income taxpayers fell, while the audit rate for lower-income taxpayers remained fairly stable. In CBO's baseline projections, the overall audit rate declines, resulting in lower audit rates for both higher-income and lower-income taxpayers. The proposal, by contrast, would return audit rates to the levels of about 10 years ago; the rate would rise for all taxpayers, but higher-income taxpayers would face the largest increase. In addition, the Administration's policies would focus additional IRS resources on enforcement activity aimed at high-wealth taxpayers, large corporations, and partnerships. CBO estimates that if the proposals were enacted, tax compliance would be improved, and more households would meet their obligation under the law.

Higher audit rates would probably also result in some audits of taxpayers who would later be determined not to owe additional taxes. However, the Administration's proposal for more information reporting, as well as additional spending on IRS technology, might reduce the burden on compliant taxpayers by allowing the IRS to better target noncompliant ones and to reduce the number of audits that resulted in no change in tax assessment.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I come from a town called Butler, Pennsylvania, and in that area, it is Pennsylvania's 16th Congressional District. In that district, the average annual income for a family of four is about \$52,000.

Now, down here people laugh and say nobody can live on \$52,000 a year. I said, in my district they do. In my district they do.

But let's talk about this in kitchen-table economics. Last year, we had about \$4.9 trillion in revenue. We spent \$6.22 trillion.

Kitchen-table economics is that you tell that family that earned \$49,000, go out and spend \$62,000, and they look at you like there is something wrong with your head. They say, you can't do that. I said, your government does. Your government does. They do it every year, and they do it with your tax dollars.

Listen, this is America's wake-up call. This isn't about the blue side of the House or the red side of the House. Look up in the gallery. That is red, white, and blue. That is America. Those are the people that pay our taxes.

All we are asking tonight is we look at the Fiscal Responsibility Act. What a weird name to be used in Washington. I wish we could stop playing this game of who struck John. Both parties have spent too much money for far too long.

Tonight is the night to turn this ship around. This is the USS *Abraham Lincoln*, and it takes more than one person at the wheel. We have all got to grab

that wheel, and we have got to start pulling on that wheel to turn this ship around.

Tonight is a wake-up call, America. It is not a Republican wake-up call or a Democrat wake-up call, but it is an American wake-up call. Please, wake up.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend President Biden, Leader JEFFRIES, and all of our negotiators for the great work they have done to keep us from defaulting on our debts.

This agreement protects critical funding for children and families. I am especially pleased with the protections for homeless youth in school, foster children who have aged out of care, and veterans in need of health services. It protects Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

This bill protects historic investments in clean energy. It also protects the 40 million student loan borrowers under President Biden's student loan relief plan, and it provides relief for some of my concerns about SNAP and work benefits and work requirements in TANF.

I still have some serious concerns about how it affects the environment and responds to climate control issues. The bill is not everything I wanted, but it does give us an opportunity to pay our debt and protect the good work we have done during the first term of President Biden.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), the Budget chairman.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as I have repeatedly warned, the fiscal state of our Nation is in decline. Our financial health is rapidly deteriorating, and our national debt is unsustainable, and, by the way, both parties bear some blame.

One thing is for sure, Mr. Speaker. We didn't get here overnight, and we won't get out of this mess with just one piece of legislation.

Here is my admonition to my colleagues. This can't just be a one-off deal. It must be the beginning of a movement to restore fiscal sanity in our Nation's Capitol. We must end the era of Big Government funded on the backs of our children and change the culture in Washington to continuously and repeatedly rein in our out-of-control deficit spending.

Today, there is only one deal on the table, and only one question for me and my colleagues to answer: Do the biggest cuts to the wasteful and bloated bureaucracy, record rescissions of Federal funds and reforms to welfare and environmental regulations constitute a meaningful step in the right direction?

Mr. Speaker, the answer is unequivocally, yes. As I have said all along, we will pay our bills. We will protect the good faith and credit of the United

States, but we will not give politicians a blank check to bankrupt our country.

The American people gave Republicans the majority in the House to stop our Democratic colleagues' unbridled spending and reverse Biden's failed economic policies, and I believe the Fiscal Responsibility Act is certainly a good start, which is why I support this piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), a very capable member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan budget agreement in order to protect Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, while also preventing a devastating default on our debt.

To be clear, this bill is far from perfect, but it prevents a default, it prevents future efforts to hold this Nation hostage for the rest of the 118th Congress, and it prevents cruel Republican cuts.

This budget agreement that President Biden negotiated protects funding for education, healthcare, veterans' benefits, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Most importantly, it prevents Republicans from forcing a devastating default that would kill countless jobs in my district and destroy our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing my frustration with the crisis that my Republican colleagues have manufactured. The American people deserve better than a Republican majority that chooses to govern crisis by crisis. Let's lift this debt ceiling and get on with the people's business in the people's House.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

□ 2030

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Responsibility Act. How could I not support a bill that claws back billions in unspent COVID funds, a bill that cuts trillions in Biden's out-of-control spending, a bill that caps spending levels for years to come, and a bill that enacts work requirements to bring more Americans back into the workforce, lift households out of poverty by connecting them with the best antipoverty program—a good job. Most importantly, this bill is the beginning. It is a start to put our Nation on a better fiscal trajectory.

Our debt-to-GDP today is at the highest level ever since the end of World War II. If we do nothing to curb spending, our Federal debt will be double our GDP by 2050. This is a start to change our trajectory.

Now, I wish I could be voting for more than this. I liked our original bill a heck of a lot better, but the fact is, the President and the Democrats who

control the Senate fought hard to maintain their spending addiction.

Given that we only control the House, I am very pleased with all that is in this bill. It is most definitely an improvement over existing law, and I am disappointed that some of my colleagues don't see that.

This bill will give our creditors the confidence that we can govern by putting us on a better path.

It is a step in the right direction, and I am proud to support it.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, there isn't anybody in this Chamber who believes that Republicans will abide by a cap on defense spending in the next year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a champion of the child tax credit.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Budget Agreement. This deal will protect American families and our economy from a devastating default on our Nation's bills in just 5 days. It will also shield our veterans, seniors, law enforcement, and schools from the worst of the extreme demands my Republican colleagues issued while holding our economy hostage.

This deal is far from perfect, but we can't allow perfect to be the enemy of the good when the stakes are this high. A default would mean an immediate recession, millions of jobs lost, devastated retirement accounts, and higher borrowing costs for Americans.

Compromise means that no one gets everything they want, so we have a choice between a catastrophic outcome or a chance to move forward with a bipartisan compromise. The worst outcome here would be a default.

Mr. Speaker, let's get this done and over to the Senate so we can take default off the table.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, the Rolling Stones said, "You can't always get what you want . . . you get what you need," and we need to avert a default that would stop checks to our seniors, benefits for our veterans, hurt the U.S. dollar, and Americans' retirement savings. We also need to change the fiscal trajectory of our Nation.

This bill does both by reducing inflationary spending for the first time in over a decade with the largest savings in history, imposing spending caps, and adding checks and balances on the executive branch.

We started from a place where the President and the Senate refused to negotiate, and we ended with conservative wins that include stopping Biden's plan to hire additional IRS agents this year, clawing back unused COVID funds, expanding work requirements to reduce dependency on public benefits, and cutting costly red tape that slows down critical infrastructure projects.

While no deal is perfect, this is only the beginning, and we cannot allow

perfect to be the enemy of the good. Republicans, under the leadership of Speaker MCCARTHY, have restored balance to government. We put an end to the Democrats' massive inflationary spending sprees, and we will continue to fight for the American taxpayers as we proceed in this process to stop reckless policies that fuel inflation.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a very capable woman and member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Republicans claim they just had to threaten the economic well-being of every American man, woman, and child because the \$31 trillion debt was too high.

Well, hypocrisy, thou hast a name, GOP. Because what they insisted on, their red line was not financial at all; it was to double down on the so-called "work requirements." Thank God the White House negotiations pushed back on the worst of these changes in TANF that would have saved \$6 million over 10 years.

Speaker after speaker has insisted on denying food to poor, old women who are primarily Black and Brown. It seems like the pound of flesh that you get is more delicious than having savings, but just wait. Before the ink is dry on this bill, you will be pushing for \$3.5 trillion in business tax cuts. Hear my words. You heard it here first.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, while the Fiscal Responsibility Act is not perfect and God knows we need serious corrections, but there are at least ten conservative American provisions in this bill that will benefit our economy and advance a higher level of fiscal responsibility.

Let's be honest, this is the most conservative bill that can pass with a Biden White House and a Schumer Senate. The Fiscal Responsibility Act stops the excessive spending, stops the bleeding, and adds to our workforce with work requirements. It includes the most important Federal and environmental permitting reforms in 40 years.

Don't take my word for it. This is coming from the Associated General Contractors of America, the American Petroleum Institute, the Marcellus Shale Coalition, and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Virtually every small business association, every group committed to sound, fiscal policy, such as Americans for Tax Reform and Americans for Prosperity have endorsed this legislation. This bill reins in the Biden administration's executive order spending which accounted for over \$1 trillion in spending over the last 2 years.

There is also a reduction of the IRS for \$20 billion, it protects Social Security, and all the while we will avoid a

catastrophic default. I urge support of this bill.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), whose voice and health have been returned.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, paying America's bills isn't an option. Defaulting on our debt would have a consequence for every single American and, in fact, would have global consequences. It would increase every families' costs. It would eliminate millions of jobs, and threaten the retirement security of seniors and families all across this country.

Let me be clear: We shouldn't be in this position. We shouldn't be close to default. It is a manufactured crisis. The House Republican majority created this crisis because they didn't have the will to submit their ideas to the legislative process, rather holding us all hostage to exact this price, to exact this legislation when we could have simply gone through the legislative process of making decisions about the priorities for this country.

They have the majority on the Appropriations Committee, on the Ways and Means Committee, and on the Budget Committee. They ought not fear the argument over these issues. We need to make sure that we accept the fact that we have come to a compromise to protect Medicare and Medicaid. It protects the American people from catastrophic default. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3746.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in my 15 years in Congress that I have voted to increase the debt limit. I do so today because this measure places real constraints on future spending, more than \$2 trillion. That makes this bill the most important victory for fiscal conservatism in more than a decade.

The debt is but a symptom of the central problem—reckless spending. Once we have spent a dollar, there are only three ways to pay for it: Taxes, inflation, or debt. It is the spending, stupid.

We have got a long way to go, but until the American people have had enough and replace the President and the Senate majority, this is a remarkable step forward. The many progrowth provisions in the bill provide the most potent antidote to debt—economic expansion.

Mr. Speaker, defeating this bill would create a financial and political panic that will quickly forfeit the many hard-won reforms that are in this bill. We cannot let that happen.

Mr. NEAL. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this imperfect bill.

Mr. Speaker, look, I would have much rather voted for a clean debt limit increase as we did three times under the previous President. I do believe it is profoundly wrong that Republicans chose to hold our economy hostage, using the American people as leverage to demand concessions, and it was unnecessary.

We are in a divided House. They have all the leverage they need to negotiate this through the regular appropriations process.

Our values sometimes overlap, but they don't here when they want to protect the wealthiest tax cheats and we just want everyone to pay their fair share.

Look, President Biden and his negotiating team worked skillfully and successfully to prevent a majority of the draconian tax cuts. This bill could have been so much worse, but it would be a catastrophe if we didn't pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote "yes," and I continue to urge my colleagues to permanently abolish the debt ceiling, which could cause a real disaster someday soon if we don't get rid of it.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for the Fiscal Responsibility Act. As I have said from the very beginning, we must negotiate, we must cut spending, and we cannot default.

The FRA reduces discretionary spending for the first time in decades, and it is the largest deficit reduction in our Nation's history. It cuts non-defense and nonveteran spending to below 2022 levels, one of the primary goals of the Limit, Save, Grow Act.

It saves taxpayers \$2.1 trillion over the next 6 years while blocking \$5 trillion in new taxes proposed by the Biden administration. The bill also caps spending at 1 percent growth over the next 6 years and through the appropriations process, House Republicans will have the opportunity to reduce spending even more.

That will help us take on the Biden administration's reckless spending head on, crack down on record inflation, and get our economy on the right track. This bill also protects Social Security, Medicare, and veterans' benefits, despite previous false claims by my Democratic colleagues that we were going to cut those vital programs.

It enacts critical permitting and NEPA reform, enacts safeguards on executive spending, and forces Congress to engage in a functional appropriations process.

The bottom line is this: With a divided government, no party is going to get 100 percent of what it wants. We all have a responsibility to govern, and default is not an option.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act puts us on the path to fiscal sanity, protects our commitment to veterans and seniors, and raises the debt ceiling so we will not default. This is a bill we

should all support, and I will vote "aye."

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is far from perfect; however, the full faith and credit of the United States is at risk, and we cannot let Republicans drive us to default.

Defaulting on the national debt would disrupt Social Security benefits for 92,000 households in my congressional district. I will not stand by and let harm come to our Nation, seniors, and disabled people. I urge my colleagues not to draw out this debt crisis and instead return to our focus of lowering the costs for working families.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTHRIE). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 4 minutes remaining.

□ 2045

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), another very capable member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan budget agreement and President Biden's work to ensure the Nation pays our bills and avoids a catastrophic, self-inflicted economic crisis.

This legislation protects the many bipartisan achievements realized in the last Congress, such as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, CHIPS and Science Act, PACT Act, as well as the Inflation Reduction Act with its historic investments in addressing climate change.

With this vote, we will protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid and prevent devastating cuts sought to life-sustaining SNAP and TANF programs. With this vote, we will keep America moving forward to meet the challenges ahead of us.

Compromise requires give-and-take, and both sides made difficult concessions to achieve this agreement. This is the result of bipartisan dealmaking, and I look forward to holding up the President's side of this bargain.

I hope this is a learning moment, and we can avoid future political brinkmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to put the American people over politics and support this important bill.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), a very capable member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I support the bipartisan budget agreement to raise the debt ceiling because if we

don't, we will devastate the global markets and undermine the faith of the world's most important financial system, the United States of America.

I support a clean raising of the debt ceiling, but elections have consequences. My colleagues on the other side wanted to use their leverage for concessions. In a divided government, governing means compromise, and it gets us this bill, legislation that would: one, raise the debt ceiling until 2025; two, stop the drastic cuts desired by the Republicans and protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Although it limits SNAP for certain ages, it expands those types of benefits for veterans and our homeless.

Finally, we protect the historic legislation we passed last Congress to invest in our infrastructure and manufacturing, reduce drug costs, and care for veterans. Part of this bill even furthers our transition to clean energy.

I will vote for this bill, but we have a lot more to do if we want to get serious about reducing our debt and deficit. That only begins when we stop governing by crisis and start governing by leadership.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my district, the most important energy district in the country, on behalf of American energy independence, and on behalf of all Americans who are searching for a reasonable solution to a looming crisis.

There are approximately, right now, 229 major fossil fuel projects in the United States currently awaiting permit approval. A recent study found that \$157 billion in energy investment was stuck in the NEPA pipeline and that simply a 2-year NEPA deadline would spur \$67 billion in energy investment. Killing energy projects by the bureaucratic red tape nightmare and the slow-walking that we have seen is unacceptable. No more.

I am extremely proud of the energy reforms, the NEPA reforms, and the EPA reforms in this bill, the first in over 40 years, which will speed up over 200 projects to lower costs for consumers and protect our national security.

No, this bill is not perfect, and arguably, it shouldn't be. A divided government yields compromise and slows the heavy hand of government, but saving \$2 trillion, lifting families out of poverty, and defunding IRS agents is worth it. Vote "yes" for America's energy independence.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), an alum of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, Democrats' leadership has protected our hard-earned and historic economic recovery. That team secured an agreement that prevents Republicans from forcing devastating default and rejects their most extreme cuts in the GOP default on America bill. President

Biden's agreement protected Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans' healthcare.

This was a negotiation with individuals whose top priority was cutting food assistance and protecting the wealthy. That was their main priority across the entire negotiation.

Fiscal responsibility? Their only responsibility was to protect their tax cuts for the ultrawealthy that grew the debt by \$7 trillion in the first place.

The President successfully insisted that if this agreement was going to include time limits on SNAP, it needed to include meaningful improvements to SNAP.

Republicans protected the wealthy at the feet of the neediest Americans.

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Democrats understand the needs of the American people and our most vulnerable Americans, as well as the full faith and credit of the American people.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that because of the Republican Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the bottom 20 percent of earners saw their average Federal tax rate fall to its lowest level in 40 years. Low- and middle-income families of four saved at least \$2,000 on their tax bill each year.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a most historic night.

First of all, I thank President Biden. President Biden invited me, along with the other leaders, ranking member, and chairman of our Agriculture Committee. It gave me a chance to talk straight to the President about the serious food shortage that is coming to our veterans.

Many of you may not know this, but the veterans are living in more food-insecure households than anybody else—7.4 percent higher than the general public. When I told President Biden that, he said that we have to do something about it. That is when he moved, with his energy, to be able to take not only the veterans but others off of SNAP work requirements.

God bless this President for his leadership.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN).

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress to solve problems, and this legislation averts a crisis. A default would jeopardize millions of people with unemployment, increase interest rates, and put retirees at risk and devastate their 401(k)'s.

A default would also jeopardize numerous investments in the American

worker in the 117th Congress, including the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. That bill not only created jobs but also, with a strong "buy American" provision, strengthened our domestic steel and manufacturing base and also allows for our veterans to be protected and provides funds dedicated to the health benefits and resources for the toxic exposures fund.

I appreciate the dedicated work of the administration and my Democratic colleagues.

For my neighbor Gretchen, who had anxiety about her 401(k), this bill supports the American worker. It supports American industry, the steel industry, and it also protects the American Dream. I am voting "yes."

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this has been an elevating conversation about how we arrived here tonight. Our colleagues on the other side voted for the infrastructure bill, voted for the CHIPS Act, voted for the CARES Act, voted for the defense spending increases, and they voted for a tax cut in 2017 that borrowed \$2.3 trillion that was added to the national debt.

Now, for those who might be paying attention tonight, the national debt is the cumulative effect of deficits. These were annual deficits that were run up.

Neither party is responsible for the pandemic. On March 11, 2020, we were warned what was coming. Twenty million jobs evaporated. Tonight, in some measure because of the leadership of Joe Biden, every one of those jobs has been returned and 9½ million jobs go unanswered.

In this negotiation, which means you don't get everything you want, there are some quality moments that we take great credit for. We defended Social Security despite the fact that there were three Republican Senators who proposed cuts to Social Security. That is the reality. We defended Medicare. We defended Medicaid. We defended veterans benefits. We are very proud of the fact that we wrote the pandemic relief act.

There is a group here tonight—I have been here long enough to know this—that was against this before they were against it. They were against it years ago, never mind tonight—this moment of bringing the Nation to default, what it would do to the American dollar as the currency of choice for the world, what this would do in treasury markets for liquidity purposes, what this would do to the hard-earned 401(k) plans of the American family, to take us to this moment, this showdown that we had.

This argument tonight was never about perfection. All 435 Members of this House would probably have written a different version of this bill. In a

divided government, that is not reality.

The last point I want to make is this: In the coming days, after this righteous debate about balancing the budget, our Republican colleagues are about to offer a massive tax cut. We need to be ready because of the fiscal rectitude that they have offered on this floor tonight. The corresponding responsibility of all of us is to point out what they intend to do with another tax cut—2001, \$1.3 trillion, and by the way, with two wars and 2 million more veterans that we need to support.

The other reality is that back in 2003 was another trillion dollars of tax cuts. The worst one of all was that tax cut in December 2017, where they borrowed \$2.3 trillion for a tax cut that went to the wealthiest among us and had very meager economic growth.

□ 2100

This debate tonight was a good and spirited one because we also, I think, have found a common purpose in passing this legislation.

Let's engage in this debate going forward. If we want the things that we say they want, then we are going to have to pay for them. That means, at some point, revisiting these tax cuts that have been put on the table in an arbitrary fashion and, as I noted, with borrowed money.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we hear the other side of the aisle over and over talk about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Let me tell you about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Mr. Speaker. Last year, we had record revenue into the United States of \$4.9 trillion, which was \$900-plus billion more than what the Joint Committee on Taxation and the CBO predicted would happen upon passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act delivered for a family of four who makes less than \$60,000 a year. They paid zero in Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about tax cuts. The other side passed something called the Inflation Reduction Act, and it was tax cuts for their wealthy donors. In fact, the CBO just came out with a new score saying that it cost over \$700 billion.

Guess what? Ninety percent of your tax credits go to corporations with more than \$1 billion in revenues, and \$125 billion goes to China. That is what your tax cuts did.

After years of Washington running in the wrong direction, we have an opportunity to take meaningful steps in the right direction on addressing America's debt crisis.

The American people deserve nothing less. They see what inflation, caused by reckless spending of the Democratic Party, has done to their family budgets, to their retirement security, and to their small business plan.

We have the opportunity to end the constant doling out of tax dollars under the guise of COVID relief.

We have the opportunity to downsize the \$80 billion pay raise that was given to the IRS last year. The IRS does not need a raise. It needs a reckoning.

We have the opportunity to support those who can work to find work and climb out of poverty.

We have the opportunity to put some guardrails on the administration, so if they are going to spend tax dollars by executive fiat, then they have to find savings somewhere else.

We have the opportunity and the responsibility to address our debt crisis as we address the debt ceiling.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill to prevent a catastrophic default, which would jack up interest rates, eliminate 700,000 jobs, raise mortgage rates to over 8 percent, cut housing vouchers, and hurt small businesses and consumers.

All of this, because Republicans, who added \$6.7 trillion to the debt under twice-impeached former President Trump.

Republicans claim they care about debt reduction.

But their leader, former President Trump said, "I'm the king of debt. I'm great with debt. Nobody knows debt better than me." He said this to Norah O'Donnell in an interview on CBS.

Very recently, Trump said, "I say to the Republicans out there—Congressmen, Senators—if they don't give you massive cuts, you're going to have to do a default."

Democrats support this bill because we refuse to allow our country to default on its debt.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3746, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

This bill is not perfect. Some will say that it is not even good. But I say it is better than the extortion bill pushed through this House last month by this Republican majority that would have forced Congress to either default on paying our nation's bills or make devastating cuts that would hurt the health, safety, and wellbeing of the American people.

This bill prevents a default that would trigger an economic catastrophe, a global market panic, and a job killing recession.

The most egregious cuts that the Republicans originally proposed last month in their Default on America Act will be avoided.

Cuts that were originally proposed to the Toxic Exposure Fund created by the bipartisan PACT Act have been reversed as have the reductions in veterans' health care and benefits.

I have been very concerned about the cuts to rural development programs, nutrition for women and children, and funding for economically distressed farmers which have been reduced.

We must pay our debts and debate issues of spending and revenue through regular order and not under threat of default.

No, this bill is not perfect. And to many it may not be good. But it is a better way forward than the chaos and consequences of a

first ever default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Section 321 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (FRA) employs the term "reasonably foreseeable" in four instances. The intent of using the term "reasonably foreseeable" in subsection (a) of section 321, which amends section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act, is to narrow the scope of NEPA's requirements. NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare "a detailed statement . . . on the environmental impact" of any proposed federal project "significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)(i). This detailed statement is colloquially known as an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). At present, NEPA requires that an EIS must include, inter alia, a detailed statement on "the environmental impact of the proposed agency action" and "any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented[.]" 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)(i) and (ii).

Ultimately, in amending NEPA to include the concept of reasonable foreseeability, Congress intends to establish in statute *Sierra Club v. Marsh*, 976 F.2d 763 (1st Cir. 1992). In *Sierra Club*, the court stated succinctly that "[n]ot all impacts need be discussed in exhaustive detail. First, only those effects that are 'likely' (or 'foreseeable' or 'reasonably foreseeable') need be discussed . . . and, as in other legal contexts, the terms 'likely' and 'foreseeable,' as applied to a type of environmental impact, are properly interpreted as meaning that the impact is sufficiently likely to occur that a person of ordinary prudence would take it into account in reaching a decision." *Sierra Club* at 765 (internal citations omitted). Through use of the term "reasonably foreseeable" in section 321 of the FRA, Congress intends to narrow NEPA's scope by establishing in statute the ordinary prudence standard with respect to NEPA analysis.

Section 321(a) of the FRA amends 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)(i) and (ii) with the intent to narrow the scope of what must be included in an EIS. Clause (i) is amended from "the environmental impact of the proposed action" to "reasonably foreseeable environmental effects of the proposed agency action". The intent of this amendment is to narrow the scope from "any environmental impact", which can be broadly construed, to only those "environmental effects" that would be a "reasonably foreseeable" result "of the proposed agency action." In executing this amendment to NEPA, Congress seeks to clarify that an agency need not evaluate all effects of a proposed action, but rather only those effects that are "reasonably foreseeable."

Clause (ii) is amended from "any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented" to "any reasonably foreseeable adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented". The intent of this amendment is to narrow the scope from "any adverse environmental effects", which can be broadly construed, to only those adverse environmental effects that are also "reasonably foreseeable." In each of these instances, it is Congress's intent to enshrine in statute the ordinary prudence standard with respect to the content of an EIS.

Similarly, section 321(b) of the FRA also employs the term "reasonably foreseeable" in

establishing in statute levels of review under NEPA. By qualifying the "significant effect" with the term "reasonably foreseeable", Congress again intends to employ the ordinary prudence standard to make clear the circumstances in which an agency must issue an EIS. Specifically, Congress intends to limit preparation of an EIS to only those instances where the significant effect on the quality of the human environment is also "reasonably foreseeable" as opposed to merely possible or any or all potential significant effects. The term "reasonably foreseeable" is again employed with respect to an "environmental assessment" for consistency and to provide clarity in the distinction between circumstances in which an EIS versus an environmental assessment is required.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to speak on H.R. 3746, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

It is important to highlight and discuss how we got here and what is at stake with this critical and momentous measure.

I know I am not alone in the disappointment at what steps have been taken to hold our nation's economy hostage and put American lives at risk.

It is shameful that, while we have a bipartisan agreement here today, we have taken painful compromises to get here.

And although arduous efforts on both sides of the aisle allowed for us to move forward with this agreement, and some critical protections for the American people have been preserved—it must be stated that this agreement is not one that entirely reflects what we in Congress should be united on—namely, our most basic and fundamental truths that hold us together as a democracy.

We are nation that upholds the ability for all to prosper, as well as one that upholds the ability for all Americans to be protected and cared for in our times of greatest need.

It is important to understand that the foundations of a society do not extend only to its political and economic system; they must extend to its social and moral system as well.

Taking all of these in balance there is no other comparable governmental system that has raised the standard of living of millions of people, created vast new wealth and resources, or inspired so many beneficial innovations and technologies.

Governmental structures providing for protections and safety nets for all Americans is what makes us all successful as a nation united.

Creating and preserving such structure is the critical investment in our government, our nation, our security, and our development and growth for current and future generations to benefit from.

Yet, instead of investing in America, many of my Republican colleagues would rather focus on holding our economy hostage to advance unpopular and dangerous priorities.

Holding our nation's debt ceiling as collateral to inflict painful cuts that will impact the lives of millions of Americans and knowing that breaching the debt limit would provoke unprecedented economic damage and instability in the U.S. and around the world is a sad state that we have found ourselves in.

Yes, it is evident that my Republican colleagues will not prioritize the wellbeing, safety, health, and prosperity of the American people when looking at what we have had to give up in this bill.

While much is unknown about the devastating impact this bill will have, we do know that some immediate changes will inevitably cause harm to many American families, children and vulnerable individuals.

That is why I offered several amendments during the Rules Committee that will make additional exemptions and elimination of disqualifications for several additional special populations in which we must protect and continue to support when they are in their most desperate and fragile times of need.

Ensuring that we are not taking critical resources and money for food away from children and families living in poverty is not only the right thing to do, but also the economically smart thing to do.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is the nation's most important and effective anti-hunger program.

Any changes in SNAP will have an incredible impact on millions of Americans and Texans.

As of 2020, there were 18.66 million households relying on SNAP and 7.11 million SNAP households with children.

Texas holds the second highest number of households using the SNAP program in 2023 at 1,167,720, making up 11.5 percent of Texas households.

As of April 2023, there were 284,794 SNAP cases and 615,463 eligible individuals in Harris County, my district's biggest county.

This included 92,214 individuals aged less than 5 and 228,519 individuals between the ages of 5 through 17.

My first amendment for H.R. 3746, listed on the Rules Committee roster as Amendment No. 56, would have added a provision to extend exemption regarding current work requirement exemptions in the Food and Nutrition Act for a parent or person responsible for dependent child up to age 24 in SNAP household.

In Texas, 79 percent of SNAP participants are families with children. That's more than the national rate of 69 percent of SNAP participants across the country being families with children.

Further, the SNAP participation rate in Texas for working poor people is 72 percent—which is also more than the national rate of 41 percent of SNAP participants nationwide being in working families.

We need to understand that parents continue to support children beyond the age of adolescence impacting financial resources for families well into a child's early twenties.

Across the country there 5.134 million, and 528,000 in Texas aged 18 through 24 in poverty as of 2021.

Nearly 1 in 3 parents (31 percent) have made a significant financial sacrifice to help their adult children financially.

Over two-thirds (68 percent) of parents of adult children have made or are currently making a financial sacrifice to help their kids financially.

Parents say they sacrificed retirement savings (43 percent), emergency savings (51 percent), paying down their own debt (49 percent) or reaching a financial milestone (55 percent).

Over 40 percent of American children rely primarily on their mothers' earnings for financial support in crosssectional surveys.

In July 2022, half of adults ages 18 to 29 were living with one or both of their parents.

Significantly higher than the share who were living with their parents in 2010 (44 percent on

average that year) or 2000 (38 percent on average).

What this means is that we need to understand that support for families with dependent children under the age of 24 and who are living in poverty need to be protected and extended the grace of an exemption in this bill.

My second amendment for H.R. 3746, listed on the Rules Committee roster as Amendment No. 59, would have extended the former foster care exemption to all individuals 24 or younger under state custody and aging out of critical support services.

More than 23,000 children will age out of the US foster care system every year.

Every year in Texas, more than 1,200 young adults age out of the foster care system without being adopted.

Less than half of Texas foster care alumni (46.9 percent) were currently employed at least ten hours per week.

Only half of alumni (51.6 percent) reported having a household income that was greater than the poverty line.

By 24 years old, 50 percent of former foster kids had been "couch surfing" since leaving care.

One in ten interviewed alumni (11.1 percent) was currently incarcerated; nearly seven in ten males (68.0 percent) had been arrested since leaving care, 55.2 percent had been convicted of a crime, and 62.3 percent had spent at least one night incarcerated.

Over 90 percent of foster youth who move more than four times will end up in juvenile justice.

Many youth in the juvenile and criminal justice system are not deemed to be indigent but have also had contact with the foster care system and have been removed from their homes even if they have not been formerly adjudicated as a foster child.

Far too often children in state custody are taken from their homes for significant periods of times during their adolescence and at a time when they are most vulnerable to recidivating upon their return to their homes due to gaps and lack of resources to help them get jobs, education, mental health care, substance abuse and housing.

It is important that we continue to provide necessary resources for all children and youth aging out of state custody where they have been removed from their homes during critical times of development and growth—and often are left to survive on their own and/or cannot return to their homes upon their release.

We need to do more to support youth aging out of state custody.

Despite no Democratic common-sense amendments being accepted at this posture, we have no choice but to continue to move forward and still try to make a better way for our nation.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 456, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2797.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 314, noes 117, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

AYES—314

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Adams | Dunn (FL) | Kim (NJ) |
| Aderholt | Edwards | Krishnamoorthi |
| Aguilar | Ellzey | Kuster |
| Allen | Emmer | Kustoff |
| Allred | Escobar | LaLota |
| Amodei | Eshoo | LaMalfa |
| Armstrong | Estes | Lamborn |
| Arrington | Evans | Landsman |
| Auchincloss | Ezell | Langworthy |
| Babin | Feenstra | Larsen (WA) |
| Bacon | Ferguson | Latta |
| Baird | Fitzgerald | LaTurner |
| Balderson | Fitzpatrick | Lawler |
| Balint | Fleischmann | Lee (FL) |
| Barr | Fletcher | Lee (NV) |
| Bean (FL) | Flood | Leger Fernandez |
| Beatty | Foster | Letlow |
| Bentz | Foushee | Levin |
| Bera | Fox | Lieu |
| Bergman | Frankel, Lois | Lofgren |
| Beyer | Franklin, C. | Loudermilk |
| Bice | Scott | Lucas |
| Bilirakis | Frost | Luetkemeyer |
| Bishop (GA) | Gallagher | Lynch |
| Blumenauer | Gallego | Magaziner |
| Blunt Rochester | Garamendi | Malliotakis |
| Boyle (PA) | Garbarino | Manning |
| Brown | Garcia, Mike | Massie |
| Brownley | Garcia, Robert | Matsui |
| Bucshon | Gimenez | McBath |
| Budzinski | Golden (ME) | McCarthy |
| Burgess | Gonzalez, | McCaul |
| Calvert | Vicente | McClain |
| Caraveo | Gottheimer | McClellan |
| Carbajal | Granger | McClintock |
| Cárdenas | Graves (LA) | McCollum |
| Carey | Graves (MO) | McGarvey |
| Carl | Green (TN) | McHenry |
| Carson | Green, Al (TX) | Meeks |
| Carter (GA) | Greene (GA) | Menendez |
| Carter (LA) | Grothman | Meuser |
| Cartwright | Guthrie | Mfume |
| Case | Harder (CA) | Miller (OH) |
| Casten | Higgins (NY) | Miller (WV) |
| Castor (FL) | Hill | Miller-Meeks |
| Chavez-DeRemer | Himes | Molinaro |
| Cherfilus- | Hinson | Moolenaar |
| McCormick | Horsford | Moore (UT) |
| Cicilline | Houchin | Morelle |
| Ciscomani | Houlahan | Moskowitz |
| Clark (MA) | Hoyer | Moulton |
| Cleaver | Hudson | Mrvan |
| Clyburn | Huizenga | Mullin |
| Cohen | Issa | Murphy |
| Cole | Ivey | Napolitano |
| Comer | Jackson (IL) | Neal |
| Correa | Jackson (NC) | Neguse |
| Costa | Jackson Lee | Nehls |
| Courtney | Jacobs | Newhouse |
| Crawford | James | Nickel |
| Crenshaw | Jeffries | Norcross |
| Crow | Johnson (GA) | Nunn (IA) |
| Cuellar | Johnson (LA) | Obernolte |
| Curtis | Johnson (OH) | Omar |
| D'Esposito | Johnson (SD) | Owens |
| David (KS) | Jordan | Pallone |
| Davidson | Joyce (OH) | Panetta |
| Davis (IL) | Joyce (PA) | Pappas |
| Davis (NC) | Kaptur | Pascarell |
| De La Cruz | Kean (NJ) | Payne |
| Dean (PA) | Keating | Pelosi |
| DeGette | Kelly (IL) | Peltola |
| DelBene | Kelly (MS) | Pence |
| Deluzio | Kelly (PA) | Perez |
| Diaz-Balart | Kiggans (VA) | Peters |
| Dingell | Kildee | Pettersen |
| Doggett | Kiley | Pfluger |
| Duarte | Kilmer | Phillips |
| Duncan | Kim (CA) | Pingree |

Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rogers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill

Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Stell
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Swell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus

Tokuda
Tonko
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Orden
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym

NOES—117

Alford
Barragán
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Bonamici
Bost
Bowman
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Burchett
Burlison
Bush
Cammack
Carter (TX)
Casar
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Collins
Connolly
Crane
Crockett
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Donalds
Españillat
Fallon
Finstad
Fischbach
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
García (IL)
García (TX)

Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Hunt
Jackson (TX)
Jayapal
Kamlager-Dove
Khanna
LaHood
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (PA)
Lesko
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mann
Mast
McCormick
McGovern
Meng
Miller (IL)
Mills
Mooney
Moore (AL)

Moore (WI)
Moran
Nadler
Norman
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles
Palmer
Perry
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Ramirez
Rose
Rosendale
Roy
Santos
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Self
Sessions
Spartz
Stansbury
Steube
Strong
Tiffany
Timmons
Tlaib
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Vargas
Velázquez
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

Banks
Boebert

□ 2121

Mr. MENENDEZ changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 243.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 243.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL INVESTORS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unin-

ished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2797) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to require certification examinations for accredited investors, and for other purposes, as amended, 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, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 18, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—383

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle (PA)
Brecheen
Brown
Brownley
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Connolly
Correa
Costa

Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D’Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Estes
Evans
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Poster
Foushee
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (TX)
García, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)

Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McGarvey
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas

Payne
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Posey
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rogers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Rutherford
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Ogles
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury

Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Stell
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Strong
Swell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—18

Bowman
Bush
Casar
Crockett
Frost
García (IL)

García, Robert
Gomez
Jayapal
Lee (PA)
McGovern
Ocasio-Cortez

Omar
Porter
Pressley
Ramirez
Tlaib
Tokuda

NOT VOTING—34

Auchincloss
Buchanan
Buck
Chavez-DeRemer
Cicilline
Clyburn
Comer
Craig
Crane
Gonzales, Tony
Harris
Himes

Keating
Krishnamoorthi
Luna
Lynch
Magaziner
McBath
McClain
Miller (IL)
Mooney
Moulton
Nadler
Norman

Pascrell
Pelosi
Ross
Ruppersberger
Salazar
Santos
Simpson
Trahan
Velázquez
Wilson (SC)

□ 2129

Mrs. SPARTZ changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 31, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I write to inform you that I am resigning my position as the Member of the United States Congress representing the First Congressional District of Rhode Island, effective at the close of the legislative day of May 31, 2023.

It has been the honor of my lifetime to represent the First Congressional District of Rhode Island in the United States House of Representatives, and I am eternally grateful for the trust and faith that the people of the First District placed in me to serve as their Member of Congress for the past twelve years.

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter I have submitted to Rhode Island Governor Daniel J. McKee.

Sincerely,

DAVID N. CICILLINE,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 31, 2023.

Hon. DANIEL J. MCKEE,
Office of the Governor,
Providence, RI.

DEAR GOVERNOR MCKEE: I write to inform you that I am resigning my position as the Member of the United States Congress representing the First Congressional District of Rhode Island, effective at the close of the legislative day of May 31, 2023.

It has been the honor of my lifetime to represent the First Congressional District of Rhode Island in the United States House of Representatives, and I am eternally grateful for the trust and faith that the people of the First District placed in me to serve as their Member of Congress for the past twelve years.

Please contact me if I may be of assistance in any way during the forthcoming transition process.

Sincerely,

DAVID N. CICILLINE,
Member of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(z) of House Resolution 5, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 1, 2023, at 11 a.m.

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:

Mr. Graves of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 43. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (Rept. 118-82). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. SANTOS:

H.R. 3757. A bill to prohibit the availability of Federal funds to institutions of higher education that fund Confucius Institutes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Ms. CROCKETT, and Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN):

H.R. 3758. A bill to incentivize States and localities to improve access to justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WILD, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. BOWMAN, and Ms. CROCKETT):

H.R. 3759. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program to facilitate the installation, on bridges, of evidence-based suicide deterrents, including suicide prevention nets and barriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana (for himself, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. IVEY, Mrs. MCCLELLAN, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BROWN, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 3760. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to strengthen the mental health workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 3761. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for an increased Federal medical assistance percentage for State expenditures on certain behavioral health services furnished under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. COHEN:

H.R. 3762. A bill to require the Federal Aviation Administration to establish evacuation standards for transport category airplanes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri):

H.R. 3763. A bill to amend the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 with respect to the application of the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule to certain farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. BICE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mr. COLLINS):

H.R. 3764. A bill to amend title IV of the Weather Research and Forecasting Innova-

tion Act of 2017 to research the impact of obstructions on radar detection and prediction capabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 3765. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to provide for a single point of contact at the Social Security Administration for individuals who are victims of identity theft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3766. A bill to amend the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to require recipients of Federal awards to collect and report data relating to subawards granted to entities outside of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon):

H.R. 3767. A bill to require the Council on Environmental Quality to submit to Congress a report on the potential for online and digital technologies to address delays in reviews and improve public accessibility and transparency under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 3768. A bill to address maternity care shortages and promote optimal maternity outcomes by expanding educational opportunities for midwives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 3769. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require the Attorney General to submit an annual report to Congress on gang activity, reporting, investigation, and prosecution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself and Mr. GOLDEN of Maine):

H.R. 3770. A bill to amend the definition of section 804 of title 5; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN of New Jersey:

H.R. 3771. A bill to establish a multiagency Middle School Mental Health Task Force at the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mrs. PELTOLA, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 3772. A bill to amend the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 to extend the aviation workforce development program and provide grants to develop aviation manufacturing and supplier workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, and Mr. KUSTOFF):

H.R. 3773. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit institutions of higher education that authorize Anti-Semantic events on campus from participating in the student loan and grant programs under title IV of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself and Mr. MOSKOWITZ):

H.R. 3774. A bill to impose additional sanctions with respect to the importation or facilitation of the importation of petroleum products from Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 3775. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Green Alert plans throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3776. A bill to authorize a new type of housing choice voucher to help achieve the goals of ending homelessness among families with children, increasing housing opportunities, and improving life outcomes of poor children; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROUZER (for himself and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 3777. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide assistance for common interest communities, condominiums, and housing cooperatives damaged by a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 3778. A bill to provide for the entry of infant formula and infant formula base powder free of duty and free of quantitative limitation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIFFANY:

H.R. 3779. A bill to establish a 1-year moratorium on the enrollment of land in the conservation reserve program under the Food Security Act of 1985 and to prohibit the enrollment of prime farmland in such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. BROWNLEY):

H.R. 3780. A bill to modify the termination of the aviation consumer protection advisory committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas (for himself, Mr. BARR, and Mr. OGLES):

H.J. Res. 66. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau relating to "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B)"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H. Res. 458. A resolution requiring foreign state media outlets with credentialed members in the House news media galleries to comply with the Foreign Agents Registration Act by prohibiting the admission into such galleries of reporters and correspondents who are representatives of such outlets who are not in compliance with the requirements of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. RYAN, Ms. KAMLAGERDOVE, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTA, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. QUIGLEY,

Ms. NORTON, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. FROST, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TRONE, Ms. CHU, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BROWN, Ms. MENG, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. TITUS, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PORTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. CARSON, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CROW, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. MCCLELLAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. ROSS, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. BALINT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. WILD):

H. Res. 459. A resolution Expressing support for the designation of June 2, 2023, as "National Gun Violence Awareness Day" and June 2023 as "National Gun Violence Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, and Mr. FROST):

H. Res. 460. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should enact the Older Americans Bill of Rights to establish that older

Americans should have the right to live with dignity and with independence; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and 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.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII 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. SANTOS:

H.R. 3757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Constitution, Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the availability of Federal funds to institutions of higher education that fund Confucius Institutes.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 3758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Civil Rights

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 3759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Legislating

By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana:

H.R. 3760.

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, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to strengthen the mental health workforce, and for other purposes.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 3761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare" of Americans.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Student Mental Health

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Aviation

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 3763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 with respect to the application of the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule to certain farms, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 3764.

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:

To establish a Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Program to ensure the continued performance of weather radar detection and prediction capabilities with physical obstructions in the line of sight of such radar.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 3765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

The single subject of this legislation is: Social Security contact.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3766.

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:

Executive Branch transparency

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 3767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

A study on digital and online technologies to address delays in NEPA reviews.

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 3768.

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:

Amends Title VII and Title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to address maternity care shortages and promote positive maternity care and birth outcomes by expanding educational opportunities for midwives.

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 3769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Requires an annual, comprehensive collaborative report from the US Attorney General, working with the US Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and state and local law enforcement, on gang activity in the United States.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 3770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amends the definition of Section 804 of Title 5 to require that economically significant guidance documents be subject to a public notice and comment period.

By Mr. KEAN of New Jersey:

H.R. 3771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Childhood Mental Health

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 3772.

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 the Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 2018 to support the Department of Transportation's aviation workforce development program

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 3773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit institutions of higher education that authorize Anti-Semitic events on campus from participating in the student loan and grant programs under title IV of such Act.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 3774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To impose additional sanctions with respect to the importation or facilitation of the importation of petroleum products from Iran, and for other purposes.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is: Veterans Affairs

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 3776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize a new type of housing choice voucher to help achieve the goals of ending homelessness among families with children, increasing housing opportunities, and improving life outcomes of poor children.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 3777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide assistance for common interest communities, condominiums, and housing cooperatives damaged by a major disaster.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 3778.

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:

This bill permanently repeals tariffs on infant formula and infant formula base powder, eliminates the quota for infant formula, and clarifies necessary HTS codes.

By Mr. TIFFANY:

H.R. 3779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Places a 1-year moratorium on the enrollment of farmland in the Conservation Reserve Program and prevent prime farmland from being enrolled in the future.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is: Aviation

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.J. Res. 66.

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:

A resolution disapproving of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection's final rule implementing small business lending data collection as directed by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Section 1071.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 45: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 188: Mr. KILEY.

H.R. 220: Mr. NEHLS.

H.R. 239: Ms. CROCKETT and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 243: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 277: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 288: Mr. FRY.

H.R. 316: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 343: Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H.R. 396: Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 415: Ms. PORTER and Mr. CASAR.

H.R. 480: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 549: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FROST, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 565: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 589: Mr. BERA and Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H.R. 625: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 630: Mr. GALLEGU.

H.R. 656: Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 694: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 700: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. FINSTAD, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 708: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 758: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 766: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 782: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 800: Mr. DONALDS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 994: Mr. SANTOS.

H.R. 1010: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1042: Mrs. SPARTZ.

H.R. 1117: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1118: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1147: Mr. OWENS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. CARL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 1191: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1255: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1267: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1293: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1321: Ms. LOFGREN and Mrs. STEEL.

H.R. 1351: Mr. KILMER and Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 1399: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 1406: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. MANN.

H.R. 1425: Mr. BRECHEEN.

H.R. 1484: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1579: Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 1602: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1608: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

H.R. 1615: Mr. KILEY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mrs. PELTOLA.

H.R. 1640: Mr. KILEY, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mrs. PELTOLA.

H.R. 1685: Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 1691: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1694: Mr. PFLUGER.

H.R. 1707: Mrs. LUNA and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1711: Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 1748: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1777: Mr. BURLISON.

H.R. 1808: Mr. MULLIN, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1812: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 1818: Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Ms. MACE, and Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 1833: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. SABLON.

- H.R. 1843: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 2407: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2463: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2535: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 2629: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2630: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2693: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2743: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. ESTES.
H.R. 2766: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 2777: Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MFUME, Mr. BOWMAN, Mrs. PELTOLA, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2783: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2810: Mrs. SYKES.
H.R. 2812: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 2830: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 2845: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2849: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2855: Mrs. LUNA.
H.R. 2867: Ms. PEREZ.
H.R. 2885: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2891: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. BARR, Mr. LANGWORTHY, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2935: Ms. CROCKETT.
H.R. 2996: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3004: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 3018: Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BROWN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TRONE, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 3033: Mr. ELLZEY.
H.R. 3065: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 3092: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 3143: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 3146: Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3152: Mr. BACON, Mr. FINSTAD, and Mr. MAST.
H.R. 3185: Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. FULCHER, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3199: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 3202: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 3203: Ms. VAN DUYNÉ.
H.R. 3204: Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. SOTO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
H.R. 3238: Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. STEIL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. KILEY.
H.R. 3260: Mr. MOYLAN.
H.R. 3266: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 3272: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 3284: Ms. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 3309: Ms. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 3325: Mr. NEHLS and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3375: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 3376: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 3389: Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. KILEY, and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 3397: Mr. OGLÉS.
H.R. 3413: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BACON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 3443: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. KILMER, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 3448: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 3503: Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3510: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 3519: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3537: Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3554: Mrs. LUNA.
H.R. 3562: Mrs. BOEBERT.
H.R. 3564: Mr. YAKYM.
H.R. 3610: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. IVEY.
H.R. 3625: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 3645: Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BALINT, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.
H.R. 3647: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3650: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 3656: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 3660: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3663: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.
H.R. 3679: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 3682: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CROCKETT, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3721: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 3741: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H.R. 3749: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 3750: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 3752: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.J. Res. 13: Mrs. SYKES.
H.J. Res. 53: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. MCCORMICK.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H. Con. Res. 46: Mrs. SPARTZ.
H. Res. 61: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 250: Mrs. HAYES, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 285: Mr. BARR.
H. Res. 346: Mr. DUNCAN.
H. Res. 351: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.
H. Res. 358: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 372: Mr. BEYER.
H. Res. 406: Mr. VAN DREW.
H. Res. 410: Mr. VAN DREW.
H. Res. 434: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. LEE of Nevada.
H. Res. 450: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 2023

No. 93

Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 30, 2023)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, we trust in Your un-failing love and commit our lives to You. Thank you for listening to our prayers. Help us to live in purity so that we will never dishonor You.

Lord, guard our minds so that our thoughts will please You, as we passionately seek Your truth.

Today, strengthen the Members of this body in their work. Use them to bring comfort and courage to the marginalized. Help our Senators to give their hearts to You and seek to please You in all they say and do. Empower them to live in such a way that by the wisdom of their words and the power of their example others may be moved to follow You.

We pray in Your awesome 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, May 31, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH 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.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, later this afternoon, the House of Representatives will vote on a bipartisan agreement that will protect the U.S. economy and eliminate the risk of a disastrous default. Once this bill reaches the Senate, I will move to bring it to the floor as soon as possible. Although the House still has more work to do, Senators should be prepared to move on this bill quickly once it is the Senate's turn to act.

I cannot stress enough that we have no margin—no margin—for error. Either we proceed quickly and send this bipartisan agreement to the President's desk or the Federal Government will default for the first time ever.

It is imperative that we avoid a default. The consequences of slipping past the deadline would reverberate across the world and take years to recover from. Remember, a default would

almost certainly trigger another recession, send costs soaring, kill millions and millions of jobs—hard-working people thrown out of work through no fault of their own. That would be a catastrophic nightmare for our economy and millions—millions—of American families.

So any needless delay, any last-minute brinksmanship at this point would be an unacceptable risk. Moving quickly and working together to avoid default is the responsible and necessary thing to do.

Nobody on either side thinks this agreement is perfect, that is for sure. Nobody got everything they wanted. But this agreement still accomplishes two major goals: It spares the American people from the catastrophe of default, and it preserves the most important investments we have passed over the past few years, many of them on a bipartisan basis. So moving forward on this agreement is the sensible, responsible, and very necessary thing to do.

We are getting close to finally putting the threat of default behind us, but there is more work to do. I hope that the House does its job when it takes up the bill later today. I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to be prepared to move quickly when the time comes.

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. President, now on the student debt CRA. Today, Senate Republicans will begin pushing a terrible measure that would end the pause on student loan payments and overturn President Biden's historic loan cancellation program.

Let me be clear. I strongly—strongly—oppose Republicans' cruel attempt to deny millions of student loan borrowers the critical relief they so desperately need. We should be in the business of helping Americans saddled with student loan debt, not making

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1813

their problem worse, as this measure would clearly do.

Even a casual examination of the Republican measure exposes it for what it is—a cruel, punitive, and extreme broadside against millions of American borrowers.

For one, the Republican measure would repeal the student loan payment pause—which has been a lifeline for millions of Americans—and even force borrowers to confront several months of retroactive payments from September to December of 2022. Let me say that again. This is so important. This measure not only repeals the payment pause, it forces many borrowers to make retroactive payments as well.

The Republican measure also targets our public service employees—first responders, nurses, educators, service members—by jeopardizing their eligibility for the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program. Americans willingly chose career paths that pay less, and it is a slap in the face of these public servants to suddenly take away their eligibility for loan forgiveness.

Now, my Republican colleagues talk a big game about helping working families, but this legislation shows how callous and uncaring they are by trying to block relief that would immediately improve the lives of millions of borrowers. Republicans have tried to paint President Biden's plan as a "tuition bailout," and a "giveaway to high earners."

That is just false. Republicans need to look at the facts: Under President Biden's plan, nearly 90 percent—90 percent—of relief dollars would go to out-of-school borrowers making less than \$75,000 a year. Under President Biden's plan, no one in the top 5 percent of income would receive a penny in debt relief. So the Republican hypocrisy is enormous. They are willing to give huge tax breaks to billionaires and very wealthy people and big corporations, but now they say that 90 percent of former students making less than \$75,000 dollars a year can't get this? Wow. Wow. What a canard.

President Biden's plan, which this Republican CRA would overturn, lifts up Americans from all walks of life: students of color, children of immigrants, poor Americans, and working families struggling to either get to the middle class or stay there.

So I will oppose this Republican CRA to overturn student debt relief and will continue working to make sure relief reaches every single borrower in need.

REMEMBERING KARL SODERSTROM

Finally, Mr. President, I want to conclude my remarks this morning by expressing my sorrow in the passing of a legendary New York educator, Karl Soderstrom, who passed away this week.

Karl was a teacher and longtime Head of School at Long Island's Stony Brook School. His influence on generations of students is undeniable, as is his influence on this body through his daughter, Sharon Soderstrom, who we

all know is Leader MCCONNELL's Chief of Staff.

Our thoughts are with Sharon and the Soderstrom family. May they find peace knowing that Karl is now reunited with his beloved Jean.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING KARL SODERSTROM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wanted to start this morning by expressing my condolences to my chief of staff, Sharon Soderstrom, who lost her father a few days ago. Here is what she had to say about him.

She said:

My dad truly was one of the great good gifts of my life. I hope to be back tomorrow.

I think Sharon pretty well summed it up. Her dad was a special, special person, and our thoughts and prayers are with Sharon and her family this week.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. President, back in February, as Speaker MCCARTHY waited for President Biden at the negotiating table, the Democratic leader predicted the future:

The side that's unified has an upper hand.

Well, it is safe to say that our colleague from New York was exactly right. House Republicans stood united behind Speaker MCCARTHY. They lined up behind the only legislation that addressed the debt limit as well as out-of-control government deficits. They committed to the direct negotiations that I said repeatedly, going back to February, were the only way to avoid default, and they secured an outcome that confronts Washington Democrats' reckless spending in a serious way.

Republicans stood united. They forced President Biden to do his job, and they reached an agreement that preserves the full faith and credit of the United States and starts getting its financial house in order.

Along the way, the Speaker and his team notched important progress toward freeing American infrastructure from endless bureaucratic review. They put a dent in Washington Democrats' campaign to stand up a new army of IRS agents, and they slapped actual costs on the administration's regulatory overreach.

But here is the bottom line: The Senate will have an opportunity very soon to pass legislation that reduces Federal Government spending by \$1.5 trillion over the next decade. That is \$1.5 trillion that won't be put on the American taxpayers' tab. It is a downpayment on more progress that is yet to come.

House Republicans' unity gave them the upper hand, and they used it to se-

cure a much needed step in the right direction. When this agreement reaches the Senate, I will be proud to support it without delay.

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. President, on another matter, this week, the Senate will have yet another opportunity to pump the brakes on Washington overreach using the Congressional Review Act. This time, we are up against an especially ridiculous example of leftwing spending fantasy from the Biden administration—student loan socialism.

For years, higher education in this country has been a choice. Some American families choose to cash in hard work and diligent savings to earn a college degree. Some even volunteer for military service with the promise of tuition assistance. Millions of others choose to avoid taking on extra debt and to pursue their careers without—without—going to college. It is a choice that families get to make for themselves, but on President Biden's watch, Washington Democrats have decided to try to take this choice away.

The way the Biden administration sees it, working Americans should foot the bill for the advanced degrees whether they choose to pursue them or not. The administration's outrageous plan would shift hundreds of billions of dollars in debt from the doctors, lawyers, and other high-earning professionals who chose—chose—to incur it onto American taxpayers, who wanted nothing to do with it. We are talking about the highest educated Americans, folks who already take in higher salaries on average. Apparently, Democrats have surveyed the devastation of their reckless spending and runaway inflation and decided these are the people who need their help the most.

For the party behind a long list of egregious and pandering giveaways, student loan socialism just might actually take the cake, and the Supreme Court is deciding right now whether the whole thing is actually downright illegal. But this week, thanks to the leadership of Ranking Member CASSIDY of the HELP Committee, along with Senator CORNYN and Senator ERNST, the Senate has a chance to intervene and stop the madness now. Their resolution would overturn the Biden administration's attempt to pad the pockets of elite professionals with taxpayer dollars. I would urge each of our colleagues to support it.

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.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we got some good news over the weekend with the announcement that the President

and Speaker MCCARTHY had reached an agreement on debt ceiling legislation. The bill they agreed on, the Fiscal Responsibility Act, will increase the debt ceiling and finally—finally—after 2 years of out-of-control spending, begin to rein in our Nation's budget.

I am tremendously grateful to Speaker MCCARTHY and to House Republicans for their tireless work to make sure that any legislation to raise the debt ceiling was paired with meaningful spending reforms. The Fiscal Responsibility Act cuts discretionary spending next year and then limits discretionary spending increases to 1 percent each year over the subsequent 5 years. It claws back unspent COVID funds, repeals excess IRS spending, and ends the student loan repayment moratorium, which is currently costing taxpayers \$5 billion a month.

In fact, the bill rescinds more unobligated government money than any bill in American history. It also places into statute pay-go rules on the executive branch which would require government Agencies to accompany new spending proposals with proposals that would save taxpayer dollars.

On top of all this, the Fiscal Responsibility Act makes a downpayment on permitting reform to help get energy projects off the ground more quickly, which will help encourage domestic energy production and drive down energy prices for American families. It also strengthens work requirements in Federal programs to help able-bodied Americans move from welfare to work.

And while this legislation doesn't go as far as it should and as Speaker MCCARTHY wanted, when it comes to funding for needed military modernization and readiness, the bill does provide an increase in defense funding and avoids a continuing resolution, while leaving open the possibility of supplemental funding as needed. And it is worth noting that this is the first time in recent history we have increased defense spending while decreasing non-defense spending.

Perhaps just as important as what is in the bill is what is not in the bill: tax increases. Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans held the line and ensured that the debt ceiling increase was not used as a vehicle to collect more taxpayer money, and they also ensured that the bill did not contain any new government programs.

Now, is this a perfect bill? Does it have everything Republicans would like included to get our Nation's fiscal house in order? No, it doesn't. But perfect bills are rare, and they are even more rare in a time of divided government. This is a good bill and, thanks to the efforts of Speaker MCCARTHY, a better bill than we might have hoped for. Let's not forget that Democrats wanted to pass a debt ceiling increase without any spending reforms at all. This bill may not be perfect, but it makes a real start at getting spending under control.

Now, our efforts can't end with this bill. Our national debt has already ex-

ceeded the size of our economy, and the interest on our debt is going to consume a greater and greater share of the Federal budget. On our current trajectory, within a few short years, we are going to be spending more just meeting the interest on our Nation's debt than we will on national defense. By 2044, we will be spending more on interest than on Medicare. And by 2050, we will be spending more on interest than on Social Security.

Think about that for just a minute: more on interest than on Social Security. Social Security is the largest line item in our Nation's budget and consumes approximately one-fifth of total Federal spending each and every year. The very fact that our national debt is on track to grow to the point where we are paying more just on interest than on Social Security should be a wake-up call to lawmakers in both parties that spending reform has to be a top priority here in Washington.

And let's be very clear: We have a spending problem, not a revenue problem. Tax revenues in 2022 reached a multidecade high of 19.6 percent of our gross domestic product, which is well above the historical average. We are not suffering from a lack of revenue. Federal spending, however, has soared to unsustainable levels. The Federal budget for 2023 is up approximately 40 percent from 2019, the last budget before the pandemic—a 40-percent increase going back to 2019. That is just not sustainable; it is not.

And whatever Democrats may say, we are not going to be able to fund that kind of reckless spending by taxing better-off Americans. We just flat have to get spending under control.

Now, any American who has ever found himself or herself mired in credit card debt knows that serious debt has serious consequences. Our national debt is already reducing the economic growth that we could otherwise achieve, and if our debt continues along its current trajectory, the consequences will be severe: diminished economic opportunities and growth and increasing difficulty meeting our government's most basic responsibilities, from national defense to Social Security and Medicare.

The best thing that we can do for the future of our country and for hard-working American families is to get our Nation's spending under control. So I want to once again express my gratitude to Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans for ensuring that the debt limit increase that we will be voting on is matched with real spending reforms. They have achieved an important victory, and I hope that the Fiscal Responsibility Act will be just the first step in a larger campaign to get our Nation's fiscal house in order and ensure a better economic future for the American people.

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. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put us in recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:24 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. ROSEN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

STUDENT LOANS

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I rise today in opposition to Republican efforts to block President Biden's student loan debt relief plan, rescind the payment pause extension, and upend the lives of millions of hard-working Americans.

Now, it is no surprise that Republicans have prioritized an effort to block the President's plan to deliver critical relief to 43 million working- and middle-class student loan borrowers. Republicans in Congress have shown time and time again that they would much rather deliver relief to giant corporations and protect tax cheats than help working Americans whose biggest sin is to try to get an education.

I support the President's actions to help these hard-working Americans. But let's be very clear. The Republican plan goes far beyond rescinding President Biden's plan to cancel student debt. Republicans could have written their resolution to simply overturn debt cancelation. But, instead, they demanded something that is much more extreme. The Republican proposal would void the student loan payment pause that was in effect from last September through last December during the pandemic.

This means that if this CRA passes, it would rescind the President's plan to cancel debt for families that need it most. But it also means that everyone—everyone—whose payment was paused would immediately owe 4 months of back payments, plus interest. Republicans are asking Americans who benefited from a pause in payments to immediately pay back potentially thousands of dollars to Uncle Sam. Nearly 40 million Americans who are saving an average of \$233 a month from the pause would be called on to cut a check to the Government for months of retroactive student loan

payments, plus interest, all because they relied on the U.S. Government's statement that their loan payments were paused.

This extreme Republican resolution would harm millions of hardworking Americans. But there is even more. By rescinding the payment pause extension, this Republican legislation also endangers our public servants: teachers, nurses, firefighters, servicemembers, and others who are working toward paying down their debt program through the Public Service Loan Forgiveness, or PSLF.

If you are a public servant enrolled in public service loan forgiveness, every month of the pause counts toward your total of 120 payments before your balance is forgiven.

According to the Department of Education, more than 400,000 borrowers received Public Service Loan Forgiveness credit during September through December payment pause last year. This CRA would retroactively disqualify those months of credit toward PSLF, leaving teachers and nurses and firefighters further behind on their path to being debt-free.

And if you are one of the 260,000 public servants around the country who received credit for your final payment since September of last year, and you finally got your student debt balance forgiven, you, under the Republican plan, would be at risk of seeing your relief clawed back and being thrown back into debt.

Just to give an example for that: In Massachusetts, more than 5,500 public servants across our Commonwealth could see their loan balances restored. So they owe the money again.

In Louisiana, more than 3,600 of Senator CASSIDY's own constituents could see their Public Service Loan Forgiveness taken away, and they would have to now pay more money.

Republicans have tried to sell this CRA as their attempt to block President Biden from canceling up to \$20,000 of student debt for the working families that need it most. And they say there is nothing more here to see.

But make no mistake: Voting for this CRA is not just a vote against the President's student debt cancellation plan. It is also a vote to force nearly 40 million hardworking Americans to immediately pay back months of student loan payments and interest and restore an estimated \$20 billion of student debt to the balances of tens of thousands of public servants.

Regardless of your feelings about student debt cancellation, that is a slap in the face to middle-class families, to working families everywhere in this country. And that is why labor unions, civil rights groups, and even centrist policy organizations are fighting against the Republican CRA, and it is why I urge every one of my colleagues to join me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, over the last few years, President Biden and Washington Democrats have unveiled a large range of socialist-inspired policies. The ill-fated "Build Back Broke" plan, for example, would have driven up daycare costs for countless working families. Thankfully, that bill couldn't get enough votes to pass.

Then there was electric vehicles socialism, which actually did become law as part of Democrats' misnamed Inflation Reduction Act, which, by the way, did not reduce inflation. So thanks to them, today families earning up to \$300,000 a year can receive a taxpayer handout to buy an electric vehicle made with batteries from China. It seems like a bad idea to me.

And last fall, President Biden rolled out his plan for student loan socialism. Over the last few years, liberal activists have called on Democrats to cancel student debt. But those calls were largely ignored until President Biden came along and decided to try it on his own. Not by coming to Congress and not by passing legislation, but with the stroke of a pen.

Last August, he announced he would cancel student loans for millions of borrowers. Well, ask any family with a mortgage, a car payment, a credit card debt, they all understand there is no such thing as canceling debt. Every dollar that was borrowed will eventually have to be repaid by someone. It is just a matter of who that someone is. Well, you can look around at the person you are sitting next to. You will be the ones to pay it back, the taxpayer.

Traditionally, the responsibility falls to the borrower—the person who agreed to repay the debt, the person who willingly took out tens of thousands, or even hundreds of thousands, of dollars in student loans.

The President decided to throw tradition and personal responsibility out the window in favor of a socialist approach where everyone chips in whether they want to or not. In other words, the American taxpayer. He said he would erase—erase—up to \$20,000 in student loans for tens of millions of borrowers; thereby sticking taxpayers with the tab.

Well, to state the obvious, the vast majority of Americans do not benefit here, because 87 percent of Americans have no student debt.

Some people didn't go to college. Maybe they didn't want to. Maybe they couldn't afford it. Many worked while pursuing a degree. Many paid off their loans after graduating, just as they agreed to do.

Still, President Biden expects every person without college debt to shoulder the cost for someone else. In total, his plan would cost taxpayers more than \$400 billion, even though only 13 percent of Americans would reap the benefits.

A college degree is not a shared experience. It is not like roads, hospitals, or police departments, which benefit everyone. Individuals in debt made the

decision to borrow the money, and they alone will reap the benefit of that degree, whether it is in the form of increased compensation or other opportunities. It is fundamentally unfair to expect taxpayers with zero student debt to cover the cost of someone else's degree.

To state the obvious, the President does not have the authority to stick the taxpayers with this debt. And I hope the Supreme Court rules on that in the near future.

In the meantime, this is irresponsible overreach at its finest. And I am glad the Senate will have an opportunity to vote to overturn this reckless rule.

Senators CASSIDY, ERNST, and I introduced a Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn President Biden's student loan socialism. Our resolution would prevent the President from transferring the burden of student loans from willing borrowers to unwitting Americans. It would also end the pause on student loan payments—another renegade act by President Biden for which he has zero authority.

This is costing Americans \$5 billion a month. This first went into effect in March of 2020 as the pandemic took hold. Now, more than 3 years later, it is time for borrowers to resume payment. Even President Biden has finally accepted how disruptive this never-ending pause is for our country.

He agreed to reinstate student loan payment requirements through the bipartisan debt ceiling deal that will soon be voted on by the House.

President Biden's student loan socialism is unfair, and it is irresponsible. And I hope it will soon be overturned by the Senate through this resolution.

I want to say, again, how much I appreciate Senator CASSIDY's leadership on this. And I encourage all our colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 8 minutes prior to the rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, the Senate will soon vote on a Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval to overturn the Biden administration's unfair student loan schemes. These schemes transfer the burden of \$400 billion in Federal student loans from those who willingly took on that debt to American taxpayers who never went to college and have already fulfilled their commitment to pay back their loans.

The resolution would also end the pause on student loan payments which, by August, will cost taxpayers almost \$200 billion. President Biden has extended this pause 6 times for a total of 31 months, far beyond the original justification of the ongoing pandemic.

Make no mistake, these reckless student loan schemes do not forgive debt. They transfer the burden from those

who willingly took out the loans to go to college to make more money when they graduated to Americans who never attended college or who already paid back their loans.

These policies are as unfair as they are responsible. Where is the forgiveness for the guy who didn't go to college but is working to pay off the loan on the truck he takes to work? What about the woman who paid off her student loans but now struggles to afford her mortgage? Is the administration providing them relief? No. Instead, the administration would not only have them pay their bills but the bills of those who decided to go to college to make more money.

President Biden's plan does nothing to address the problems that created the debt in the first place. It doesn't hold colleges or universities accountable for rising costs.

According to the college board, in the last 30 years, tuitions and fees have jumped at private nonprofit colleges by 80 percent. Public 4-year institutions have jumped 124 percent.

According to the Center for Responsible Federal Budget, if the student loan transfer goes into effect, students and taxpayers would be back in the same situation in 5 years. In 5 years, we will be right back where we are now because we are not reforming that which got us here. And total debt will again reach \$1.7 trillion.

What is the plan for 5 years from now? The scheme also does not ensure that students are prepared for life after college. It creates a terrible moral hazard that signals to students that Federal student loans are not real commitments. It tells colleges that no matter how high they raise their prices or how low the quality of education they provide, the Federal Government will cover the tab, courtesy of the American taxpayer.

This is not leadership. We cannot spend our way out of the problem of ever-increasing costs of higher education. For Americans who cannot afford their debt or who want a proactive approach for paying off their loan commitments, Congress has already authorized 31 different active programs that help or forgive student loans. That is 31 different programs already in place to help forgive or offset student loans. They range from total forgiveness for teachers to loan cancellations for law enforcement officers, military, early childhood educators, and social workers, to name a few.

There is also repayment for high-demand fields where education is specialized and the need is a public good. For example, through the Department of Health and Human Services, a variety of different healthcare providers, including therapists, behavioral health providers, and those needed to help our children as we face this mental health crisis, are eligible for loan repayment.

In addition, there are five different programs already to keep payments low compared to a person's income and

which cap the total time for repayment.

The mass transfer of debt, though, under this reckless student loan scheme forgets that these existing programs were set up to target limited taxpayer resources, to benefit those using their degrees to serve, and to fill broader public needs or who demonstrate that they themselves have a personal individual need.

Our resolution prevents average Americans—87 percent of whom do not have student loans—from being stuck with a policy that the administration is doing not to be fair to all but, rather, to favor the few.

Our resolution also protects the rule of law, which President Biden must know he is violating. During Supreme Court arguments on the legality of student loan forgiveness in February, Justice Roberts clearly indicated that if \$400 billion was to be spent on student loan cancellation, it would require congressional approval. That has not been given.

This is a clear example of this administration attempting to subvert Congress for what appears to be purely political purposes. It sets a wildly dangerous precedent if left unchecked.

President Biden, Secretary Cardona, come to the table. There are real problems in the student loan system and Federal financing of higher education. Let's fix them legally through a bipartisan, lasting solution.

I will close by encouraging all my colleagues to join me in voting to pass this Congressional Review Act resolution to prevent these unconstitutional student debt forgiveness schemes. It is unfair to the hundreds of millions of Americans who will bear the burden of paying off hundreds of billions of dollars of someone else's student debt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to legislative session.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS OF FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. CASSIDY. I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 45) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Waivers and Modifications of Federal Student Loans".

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Mr. CASSIDY. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Leg.]

YEAS—51

| | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Barrasso | Graham | Paul |
| Blackburn | Grassley | Ricketts |
| Boozman | Hagerty | Risch |
| Braun | Hawley | Romney |
| Britt | Hoeven | Rounds |
| Budd | Hyde-Smith | Rubio |
| Capito | Johnson | Schmitt |
| Cassidy | Kennedy | Scott (FL) |
| Collins | Lankford | Scott (SC) |
| Cornyn | Lee | Sinema |
| Cotton | Lummis | Sullivan |
| Cramer | Manchin | Tester |
| Crapo | Marshall | Thune |
| Cruz | McConnell | Tuberville |
| Daines | Moran | Vance |
| Ernst | Mullin | Wicker |
| Fischer | Murkowski | Young |

NAYS—46

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Baldwin | Heinrich | Reed |
| Blumenthal | Hickenlooper | Rosen |
| Booker | Hirono | Sanders |
| Brown | Kaine | Schatz |
| Cantwell | Kelly | Schumer |
| Cardin | King | Shaheen |
| Carper | Klobuchar | Smith |
| Casey | Lujan | Stabenow |
| Coons | Markey | Van Hollen |
| Cortez Masto | Menendez | Warnock |
| Duckworth | Merkley | Warren |
| Durbin | Murphy | Welch |
| Feinstein | Murray | Whitehouse |
| Fetterman | Ossoff | Wyden |
| Gillibrand | Padilla | |
| Hassan | Peters | |

NOT VOTING—3

| | | |
|--------|--------|--------|
| Bennet | Tillis | Warner |
|--------|--------|--------|

The motion was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS OF FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 45) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8

of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Waivers and Modifications of Federal Student Loans”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Illinois.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my colleague Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina has been my friend and ally in many causes, and we notably disagree on others. He recognizes—and I share with him—the importance of continued support for Ukraine. He has been a steadfast partner in support of that country and holding Russia accountable for war crimes, but not addressing the manufactured debt ceiling crisis also could threaten to undermine continued U.S. support.

My colleague has raised concerns about the level of growth of defense spending in the bipartisan debt deal that was announced this last weekend. Specifically, the budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2024 is \$886 billion, at a 3-percent rate of growth over the previous year. That funding level does not threaten our national security. We are still, and we will be for the foreseeable future, the global leader in defense spending—the world’s global leader in defense spending.

Now, there are valid concerns about China and Russia and the amount of money they are spending on the military, especially with the war in Ukraine and aggression in the South China Sea.

I have a chart here which demonstrates, in one respect, the difference. You can clearly see, when you look at the United States expenditure, when it comes to military spending in the year 2022, that it is dramatically larger than any other country. In fact, when it comes to our defense budget, the United States continues to outspend the next 10 countries in the world combined.

In the decade following the horrific attacks on September 11, U.S. military spending increased 50 percent, adjusted for inflation, compared to a fraction of that for other discretionary spending priorities.

Our spending wisely goes to competitive pay for servicemembers—to recruit and retain the best, most powerful, all-volunteer force. On average, the Chinese Army pays their soldiers \$108 per month, compared to \$1,733 per month average here in the United States.

Russian contract soldiers can make \$1,100 a month. Conscripts can be paid as little as \$25 a month in Russia.

Our spending has gone toward 11 world-class aircraft carriers. China just barely acquired a third carrier, which according to even Chinese analysts is still a long way from competing with the United States in that category.

Finally, our spending goes toward maintaining a global presence, ensuring sea lanes are open to commerce, and fostering stability in key areas of

the world. Russia and China don’t have that priority. Instead, they focus on aggression closer to their borders and exploiting other nations.

Now, much of the current budget discussion is also focused on responsible spending and oversight, and Congress has an important oversight responsibility.

Pentagon spending keeps increasing—and not just because of inflation but because of increased prices from defense companies—and as recently pointed out on the television show “60 Minutes,” in some cases because of what seems like obvious price gouging.

Put simply, increased defense spending does not automatically go toward deterring China or Russia. I chaired the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee for several years and was ranking member as well. It is an awesome responsibility. More than half of our Federal budget goes through that one subcommittee. Many times, I stopped in the middle of our deliberations about the appropriate spending to keep America safe and to protect our allies and interests around the world and asked how these other countries managed to be so powerful and spend so much less.

One explanation I have already accounted for, and that is, they pay their soldiers a lot less. We value the men and women in uniform. We want the best. We want to stand by them. We want them to make a career of service in the military, in many instances, and we need to pay them accordingly. I get it. But if you even take that and put it aside, it still puzzles me how many of these countries spend so little and yet compete with us in so many high-cost categories here in the United States.

We all know that global security goes beyond hardware and soldiers. The conflicts of today and tomorrow are no longer fought just on battlefields. Technology is dramatically transforming warfare through advanced platforms that can allow a single ship to perform what several ships did decades ago to a mass dissemination of propaganda that disrupts democracies and downplays autocracies.

Climate change also will fuel future conflicts and instability.

To quote former Defense Secretary Robert Gates, “There are limits to what even the strongest and greatest nation on Earth can do—and not every outrage, act of aggression, oppression or crisis should elicit a U.S. military response.”

An even bigger defense budget doesn’t equal complete security. China knows this. It is investing billions on spending related to national security outside of defense: infrastructure projects, clean energy, artificial intelligence.

I can recall a trip to Israel on a congressional delegation led by Harry Reid. Shimon Peres was the leader in Israel and a well-respected man for many decades. And when Harry Reid

asked him what is the greatest threat to the United States, he said very quickly: China. Don’t you see it?

Of all the answers he could have given us—terrorism, loose nukes, other responses—he said it was China.

And I started asking the question then of visitors from foreign countries to my office here in Washington: What is the presence of China in your country? Without exception, every one of them said: Oh, China has a growing presence in our country. They are an important part of our economy and our future.

And I was thinking to myself, China has a plan. It has a vision. It is insinuating itself in countries all around the world. The Belt and Road project is a good example of that. Do we have a plan in the United States? Sometimes I wonder. We certainly have the right values. I have no question about that in my mind. But do we sell those values the way the Chinese sell their interests? I don’t think we do. I think when it comes to the U.S. involvement in countries around the world, we believe that the magic of capitalism and free markets will be appreciated by so many other countries and that they will come to our side naturally. I think it takes more effort—effort like the Chinese.

It is interesting in research to compete on cutting-edge technology. My colleagues know this because they have supported the CHIPS and Science Act to precisely address the issue of America’s place in the world. China uses these investments as diplomatic influence all over the world with its Belt and Road Initiative.

My colleague has been an excellent chair—LINDSEY GRAHAM—and ranking member of the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee. He knows the importance of these investments and the overall strength of the United States. If you want to beat China on spending on national security, we need to look beyond the Pentagon box and look at all the other Agencies that are facing caps and focus on the strength of our capabilities.

Here is the reality. The greater harm to national and global security is not perceived lower defense spending but rather a default on our debt. Let’s hope we can avoid that this week, this manufactured political crisis. Not paying our bills would result in a loss of trust in the stability of the United States. That feeds right into Russia and China’s narrative that the West is now weak, and they are strong.

A short-term debt limit extension will not project strength or stability. We have a responsibility in Congress to send a message of stability to the world. The choice is simple for me, and I hope my colleagues can see the greater picture as well.

I would just conclude on the obvious difference of opinion I have with Senator GRAHAM. He and I will agree on more than we disagree, but on this particular issue, I believe that larding the

budget at the Department of Defense has a deleterious impact on us in the long haul. We have to incentivize the people making these decisions to be careful about the money being spent, to spend it wisely, and not to overspend. The procurement system in the U.S. military, I am sad to say, the Department of Defense, is desperately in need of reform and improvement. That would be part of saving some money that doesn't make us any stronger but costs the taxpayers too much.

So this illustration here of the United States at this dramatic \$877 billion compared to \$292 billion in China is an indication of our spending and what we can expect from it for the security of our country. We can do a lot better. Just throwing money at the problem is not a solution.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. President, this past weekend marked a sacred and solemn day for Americans. On Memorial Day, we remember those who gave their lives for this country. And on this Memorial Day, we were reminded once again that the struggle to defend freedom is never over.

The peace and freedom, for which more than 1 million American servicemembers gave their lives for in World War II, is now threatened again in the same theater by a delusional despot, drunk on the fantasy of reclaiming a bygone Russian Empire. And once again, the free nations of the world are united in our determination to defend peace and freedom as we did in World War II.

Over the last 2 weeks, the world witnessed a stark contrast between a dictator seeking to crush democracy and leaders determined to defend it. We saw Ukrainian President Zelenskyy travel to the Arab League summit in Saudi Arabia and eloquently argue that nations cannot sit on the sidelines during Russia's brutal war of aggression. He said:

Unfortunately, there are some in the world, and here among you, who turn a blind eye to . . . illegal annexations. . . . I am here so that everyone can take an honest look, no matter how hard the Russians try to influence."

These were courageous and wise words to an important audience. Saudi Arabia did the right thing by inviting President Zelenskyy to address the Arab League, and it can do more to rehabilitate its tarnished international image by helping Ukraine.

President Zelenskyy then joined the G7 summit in Hiroshima, where he spoke with leaders of the world's major industrialized democracies. It is worth remembering that Russia was kicked out of that organization, what was then called the G8, nearly 10 years ago for its initial unprovoked invasion of the Crimea region of Ukraine.

At this most recent G7 summit, there was no longer any delusion that Russia is a struggling democracy or a major industrial power. Under Putin, Russia has become a mortal threat to freedom

and to global security and prosperity. In pledging \$375 million in additional military support for Ukraine, President Biden vowed, "Together with the entire G7, we have Ukraine's back and I promise we're not going anywhere." The words of President Biden.

He confirmed the United States would join European allies in training Ukrainians to fly F-16s, a move I fully support.

At the G7, President Zelenskyy also met with Indian Prime Minister Modi, who said that India would do everything it could to stop the war, noting: For me, it is a matter of humanity.

Prime Minister Modi's comments are welcome. I hope he will at long last formally and forcibly condemn Russia's war and rethink India's troubling purchases of Russian oil.

Now contrast President Zelenskyy's statesmanship with the reprehensible conduct of Putin's Russia. I want to show a photo here of what, unfortunately, has been too common. It shows the near total destruction of Bakhmut, a once thriving Ukrainian city of more than 70,000 people; Russia's ongoing indiscriminate missile and drone attacks on civilian targets in Kyiv, including children; Putin's continued cowardly jailing of anyone in Russia who dares to speak out against him or his illegal war, including Vladimir Kara-Murza, Alexei Navalny, and more than 500 other innocent political prisoners; the outrageous hostage-taking of Wall Street Journal reporter Evan Gershkovich, whose only offense is daring to report the truth about the rot inside Putin's Russia.

The prisons in Russia are not large enough to hide the truth forever.

Last week, Yevgeny Prigozhin, leader of the paramilitary Wagner Group and a longtime ally of Putin, said publicly that instead of "demilitariz[ing]" Ukraine, Russia's failed invasion has instead turned Ukraine's military into one of the "most powerful in the world."

That was a quote from the head of the Wagner Group.

Let me reiterate on the Senate floor for Vladimir Putin and his enablers: You have lost the war in Ukraine. Global opposition to your illegal war is growing. Your legacy will be one of an indicted war criminal and a failed leader who weakened his nation, strengthened and expanded NATO, robbed countless Ukrainians of their futures, and sent thousands of Russian conscripts to their graves for your political hubris. And despite your transparent and petty attempts to divide America, the world's democracies stand against Russian tyranny.

The overwhelming majority in Congress of both political parties understand this. President Biden understands it. Putin's warped Soviet nostalgia blinds him to the warning of President Ronald Reagan, who said: "It is the Soviet Union that runs against the tide of history," accurately predicting its place on the ash heap of his-

tory among other tyrannies. The Soviet Union failed. So will Vladimir Putin's bloody and delusional attempt to resurrect it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING ROBERT ZIMMER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to take just a few minutes to speak about Robert Zimmer, the former president of the University of Chicago.

Barbara and I, first, want to express our condolences to Shadi, his wife, and their three children.

President Zimmer's time at the University of Chicago was defined by his relentless defense of freedom of expression. As a result of his commitment, the University of Chicago remains a place where diversity of viewpoint is always welcome, and the enforcement of that welcoming is very sincere.

In 2014, President Zimmer appointed the university's Committee on Freedom of Expression. That committee issued what is called the Chicago Principles, which declare the importance of uncensored thought and inquiry in the university experience.

I think it was also common for the president to make sure that a letter went out to first-year students. I have never read the complete letter, but in reading about it, I get the impression that the letter said to those first-year students what this policy from the Committee on Freedom of Expression was all about and that if you have to worry about having safe spaces or if you are worried about being confronted by somebody you might disagree with because of their ideology, then don't come to this university.

But President Zimmer's impact is not limited just to that one university; his courage in pushing for free speech on college campuses has been felt nationwide. In my opinion, it is not as much as it should be, but still he has made a big impact. The Chicago Principles have now been adopted in some form by over 80 colleges and universities. You can see that the number 80 is small compared to the thousands of colleges and universities and community colleges we have in our country. That doesn't mean there are not more than 80 colleges that would have the principle of freedom of expression, but we know that 80 colleges have adopted the Chicago approach.

President Zimmer and the principles he stood for are absolutely right because college is a place for learning, not for coddling. Campus, then, should be a place where ideas run rampant. After all, you go to college to prepare yourself for life after college. Where

you go for a job or anyplace else, there are probably not these safe spaces that some students think they have to have while they are at various universities for a period of 4 years out of a possible life through the other 60 years they are going to live, on average, after they get out of college.

That mission is not possible if colleges only pursue the appearance of diversity instead of real diversity. That just isn't diversity from the standpoint of ethnicity, religion, color, gender; it is about diversity of thought and the willingness to discuss those diverse opinions among people so they can learn from each other and respect each other.

In recent years, campus administrators have retreated from free speech, even punishing professors who try to do the right thing by having honest discussions about issues of any kind, particularly controversial issues.

So we need students, we need professors, and we need alumni willing to sound the alarm about the chilling of debate on our university and college campuses. Most importantly, we need campus leaders like President Zimmer who will stand up for freedom of expression in the face of diversity. Without President Zimmer and his principles, our next generation will be taught regurgitation, not independent thought.

We ought to honor his legacy by advocating for learning and free expression and respecting people's opinions whom you might disagree with, even being willing to sit down and discuss with those people you might disagree with.

So with his death, I think he is going to be sorely missed, and I hope that college presidents across the country can learn from his example.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. LEE. Madam President, \$32 trillion—it is a colossal sum burdening every single American taxpayer. It is a tangible reflection of the prodigious debt accumulated over many decades of reckless spending.

Now, the ramifications of our bloated national debt are far-reaching, felt in the daily lives of hard-working families crushed under the weight of relentless inflation. The prices of everyday necessities continue to rise, eroding purchasing power and placing an intolerable burden on the shoulders of every American family. The staggering figure ought to jolt us from our complacency, send shivers down our spines, and compel us to confront the dire con-

sequences of Congress's longstanding recklessness when it comes to fiscal matters.

Amidst the gravity of our Nation's current predicament, we find ourselves standing at a precipice, a pivotal moment where our choices today will inevitably shape our economic outlook tomorrow and for years and, in fact, decades to come. The burden of our national debt and the relentless grip of inflation have placed us at this critical juncture, demanding nothing less than a resolute and visionary response.

Regrettably, the lopsidedly negotiated Fiscal Responsibility Act, as it is called, heralded by Speaker MCCARTHY and President Biden, fails to provide the respite our Nation desperately needs. Rather than offering substantive solutions to tackle the root causes of our fiscal woes, it appears to be a palliative pill. It is a bad deal for America, a missed opportunity to confront our challenges, an abdication of our responsibility to protect Americans' economic security and well-being.

We can and must do better. We must abandon the complacency that has brought us to this point and chart a new course, a course that values something approaching fiscal sanity. We can no longer afford to settle for half measures or short-term fixes, and we desperately need a comprehensive and responsible plan, one that addresses the root causes of our fiscal predicament, curtails the bloated bureaucracy, and empowers American families once again to thrive.

It is time to go back to the drawing board. Failure to do so and to do so right now, at this very moment, is to ignore the lessons of history. Nations that neglect their fiscal health often face economic calamity and social upheaval as a result. We are obligated to ourselves and to future generations of Americans to break free from this cycle of debt and inflation and forge a path of prosperity and sustainability.

I talk about it in terms of the cycle of inflation and debt because the two go hand in hand. We cause inflation when we spend more than we have and spend more than we should. That makes every dollar that Americans earn, save, or have previously saved purchase less.

So I must express my profound disappointment over the Orwellian-named Fiscal Responsibility Act. In harsh juxtaposition to the Limit, Save, Grow Act, the ambitious plan by the House of Representatives, the meager offerings of the Biden-McCarthy deal are profound.

First, House GOP leadership proclaims that the Fiscal Responsibility Act will save \$1.5 trillion over a 10-year period through the 2-year caps deal. But, see, therein lies the deception. The supposed savings are largely—in fact, almost entirely—illusory. The bill contains a mandatory 2-year caps deal for discretionary spending; but, in reality, the spending limits for the other 4 years, the out years, are unenforce-

able and easily waived—in fact, easily ignored.

It is a shell game of sorts, a carefully orchestrated act to create the false illusion of savings. But history has shown us that no caps deal has ever been fully enforced against future appropriations. The most recent and relevant example of this may well be Congress, in its decision in the Budget Control Act of 2011, to impose statutory caps on discretionary spending and then to raise those caps on four separate occasions, in a bipartisan fashion, over the decade that followed the adoption of those caps, completely negating the stated purpose of that bill.

And unlike the BCA's 10-year statutory caps, all of which were, in fact, statutory, the FRA has only 2 years, which can be maneuvered around themselves. Just 2 years of statutory caps; that is all. You can get around those, too. It is just a little bit harder. But after those first 2 years, it is not even a difficult thing because these aren't statutory caps at this point.

It is a largely symbolic and ultimately feckless gesture. Yet House leadership wants us in the Senate to rubberstamp a mammoth increase of \$4 trillion in new debt in exchange for supposedly \$1.5 trillion of claimed deficit reduction, the vast majority—in fact, the overwhelming share—of which will never be realized.

I am confident stating that, predicting it, right now. This is a pipe dream, and they know it.

And what did they demand in return for raising the debt ceiling, effectively by \$4 trillion? What did they extract to ensure that this colossal sum, once borrowed, wouldn't go unchecked? A meager \$12 billion, a drop in the ocean compared to our Nation's monumental burden. And that is a best-case scenario.

Considering that rather than raising the debt ceiling by a specific amount—which, I think, is the right way to do this and the way that Congress has usually done this in the past—the deal raises it; it suspends the debt ceiling altogether through January 1, 2025. It grants the Treasury authority to issue debt without any numerical limit to restrain its appetite. It is a *carte blanche*, a blank check of sorts, for the government to spend, to borrow more money without accountability.

This deal begs the question: With Republicans like these, who needs Democrats?

We deserve better. We deserve a deal that genuinely reflects the urgency of our economic challenges and delivers meaningful results. To grant such a colossal debt ceiling increase while settling for a mere \$12 billion in immediate savings is also an act of fiscal irresponsibility and betrayal of the trust placed in us by those who elected us.

Equally disheartening is the state of work requirements within the deal. These work requirements were supposed to be part of the deal and a

meaningful change in the law and supposed to help things get better, help us not spend as much money, help people get out of poverty, help make sure that we don't have to come back to the well just 18 months or so from now and raise the debt ceiling yet again.

Limit, Save, Grow championed a robust approach, acknowledging the importance of promoting self-sufficiency through work requirements. In contrast, this swamp deal that we are actually facing offers only token requirements, riddled with exemptions and phaseouts. It is a farce of sorts. It is a charade that perpetuates the vicious cycle of entitlement, leaving countless Americans trapped in the clutches of dependency.

Limit, Save, Grow adds significant work requirements for TANF, food stamps, and for Medicaid. This bill strips the Medicaid work requirements altogether. With respect to TANF, arguably, it doesn't do much at all, if anything. With respect to food stamps, according to some figures that we are studying from CBO, it arguably costs more money than it saves.

In matters of fiscal prudence, Limit, Save, Grow stood firm in its determination to repeal the Democrats' \$1.2 trillion Inflation Reduction Act. Talk about Orwellian names, that is one for you. Yet in its lamentable capitulation, the McCarthy-Biden deal preserves every cent of the Inflation Reduction Act, leaving our Nation mired in a quagmire of unsustainable and expensive policies that have done anything but reduce inflation.

In fact, when you go throwing around trillion-dollar increments that you don't have, that is what it does cost. It is more inflation, and that is, indeed, what it has caused.

Now, the consequences of this surrender in this bill are grave. If enacted, this bill would grant President Biden everything without meaningful safeguards or provisions to address the pressing issues.

While it may be hailed as some sort of triumph of bipartisanship, the American people will ultimately bear the brunt of its shortcomings. You see, not everything that is bipartisan is, in fact, in the interest of the American people.

Bipartisanship and compromise are an inevitability in anything that moves through the U.S. Congress. Some work for the benefit of the American people, but when a small handful of Members of Congress get together and decide what will be easiest for them, what will work best for them, what will make them look the best, without due regard to how it will impact the American people, that is not compromise. That is better described as collusion.

Look, it is the American people who will bear the brunt of this bill with the implementation of President Biden's half-trillion-dollar student loan plan—a plan which now stands as a testament to President Biden's misplaced prior-

ities, a millstone around the neck of hard-working individuals who will never benefit from such largesse.

It is a stark reminder that, while the government claims to champion the cause of equality and opportunity, it is very often the very policies it enacts that perpetuate inequality and hinder genuine progress. The hard-working veterans, the diligent plumbers, and countless others are made to shoulder the weight of others' degrees—often, degrees of people who now earn a whole lot of money—while relegating their own aspirations and dreams to the sidelines. It is a profound injustice when we shift the burden of personal choices and individual responsibilities onto those who have already toiled and sacrificed.

That is what we are voting for with this bill. We are saying that it is OK to force those who labor in essential trades to bear the financial burden of others' educational pursuits.

This is a patently unfair and bold-faced patronage racket. And, like all good rackets, you need your strong-armed collector, and this administration found theirs in the IRS.

The egregious expansion of the IRS is epitomized by the Democrats' allocation of \$80 billion to this bloated Agency with a demonstrated history of unethical targeting of conservative non-profits, among others.

The compromise reached between Biden and MCCARTHY, which retains 98 percent of the IRS expansion—98 percent—is nothing short of a surrender, an anticipatory capitulation of sorts. It is a thing that is going to cause more problems.

And so armed with a hefty budget and a woke agenda, the IRS will become an even stronger instrument of political bias and partisan manipulation. The merging of ideology and bureaucracy poses a grave threat to the fabric of our Republic, eroding the trust and confidence that should underpin our tax system.

It might be true that this bill attempts to claw back some of the unspent COVID funds and the CDC global health funding. But while they point to rescinding roughly \$28 billion in unspent COVID funds, we must acknowledge that much of that will merely offset spending increases elsewhere. This deal falls woefully short, failing to seize this opportunity to maximize the potential of these unutilized resources.

Perhaps the cherry on top of this deal from hell is the glaring omission of an essential regulatory reform measure, called the REINS Act. The REINS Act is a proposal. It is an acronym. It stands for Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny. Limit, Save, Grow, the debt ceiling bill passed by the House about a month ago, incorporated the REINS Act, which seeks to ensure that every major regulation put forth by a Federal Agency has to pass through congressional scrutiny. It has to be affirmatively enacted by Congress.

This is already required by the Constitution. The very first operative provision of the Constitution—the first clause, the first section of the first article—says: “All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.”

Legislative powers or the power to make law—article I, section 7 makes it clear that this is the only path to do it. Article I, section 7 reiterates and builds upon the legislative powers clause of article I, section 1 by saying that, in order to pass a law—a Federal law—any Federal law must become law only after it has been passed by the House and the Senate and presented to the President for signature, veto, or acquiescence. You cannot make a Federal law otherwise.

Executive branch Agencies have been getting around this for a long time with the assistance, sadly, of Congress. Congress has delegated, increasingly, lawmaking power to unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats—people who don't work for the American people, who can't be fired by them. This is a big problem.

Now, look, Limit, Save, Grow incorporated the REINS Act, and that would have done a lot of good by subjecting this lawmaking power to elected lawmakers to give them—us, the people elected to make laws—the final say.

We were finally going to close that loop and say that Agencies can write laws that would be considered proposed bills—bill proposals—within Congress, but only Congress can enact them.

They are laws—laws made by the unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats who have no constitutional lawmaking authority—that would not, under the REINS Act, be self-executing. Congress would have to be the lawmaker, as the Constitution already makes clear.

The REINS Act really is about so much more than regulatory reform. It is about accountability to the public, the same kind of accountability that was envisioned by the Founding Fathers when they wrote article I, section 1 and article I, section 7. It is about the republican form of government as a whole. It is about representative government, about people through the democratic process being able to elect those who will create laws to which they will become subject. It is about the American people being put adequately on notice as to what their legal responsibilities and obligations are.

James Madison, in Federalist 62, spoke somewhat presciently when he wrote:

It will be of little avail to the people, that the laws are made by men of their own choice, if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood: if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes, that no man who knows what the law is today, can guess what it will be tomorrow.

We are now suffering through a circumstance where not only are our laws

so voluminous, complex, and ever-changing that we can't read them and understand what they require of us, but they weren't even written by men and women of our own choosing. This is wrong. This is as big of a miscarriage of justice as exists in this country. This is unreviewable legislative discretion of the sort that has historically been reserved for despots and tyrants.

Despotism and tyranny to this degree, in this unique way, exist in America today in our executive branch Agencies. Limit, Save, Grow was going to address this through the REINS Act. But, sadly, that provision was removed from this measure.

Now, the sudden excuse for this glaring exclusion—something that was really important to Republicans and should be really important to Republicans and Democrats and everyone else—is that the deal imposes an administrative pay-as-you-go provision, or pay-go, as it is known. However, this is easily waived. It is bereft of any significant congressional role in the regulatory process.

Let's not be naive to the realities of implementation. This process will be artfully manipulated in the hands of the Biden-appointed Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

The bureaucrats—the masters of their bureaucratic chicanery—will exploit every nook and cranny of the legislation, every nook and cranny that generates fake direct savings. The noble intentions behind this provision will be buried beneath a mountain of smoke and mirrors.

So when you read section 263 of the Biden-McCarthy deal, you will see this regulatory pay-go measure. But if you keep reading and you get to section 265, you see that section 265 destroys it. It takes it away. It effectively nullifies it. A restriction on a government actor that is then in a subsequent section, 265, given the power to exempt herself from that restriction is nothing at all. See, within the fine print of that loophole, in section 265, is language that renders the entire endeavor of regulatory pay-as-you-go completely toothless. The OMB Director possesses complete waiver authority. If she deems it "necessary for program delivery," then she can circumvent the provisions that purport to rein in the excesses of the bureaucratic machinery—section 263. This is akin to placing the fox in charge of the henhouse and then granting the fox discretion to determine when the rules apply and when they can be conveniently cast aside. If the fox wants to consume the hen, the fox will, if the fox deems it necessary and appropriate.

Don't believe me?

Well, it didn't take long yesterday for the OMB Director to say the quiet part out loud. When asked about the PAYGO waiver authority included in the Biden-McCarthy deal, OMB Director Shalanda Young said:

If that waiver is deemed necessary to make sure President Biden's agenda is carried forward, we're going to use that authority.

Translation. This means one thing: The regulatory PAYGO measure means nothing. It is worth no more than the paper it is printed on. Less than that, in fact. Nothing. It does nothing.

So if you are tempted to vote for this, perhaps taking some comfort in the idea that this is going to rein in regulatory excesses, please look elsewhere for comfort. It does not exist here.

What irks me is not just that the REINS Act measure was removed—that is plenty irksome in and of itself. It shouldn't have been removed. We should have insisted it be in there. If some objected to it, we should have at least insisted it be in there as long as this debt ceiling issuance Mardi Gras remains in effect. It should be there. If you are going to take that out and replace it with the regulatory PAYGO measure, don't claim that it is real when, in fact, it is fake.

This is appalling. With Republicans like these, who needs Democrats?

Look, they are not even pretending to negotiate in good faith. In fact, while Republicans claim that this is a big victory for Republicans, meanwhile, the Democrats are doing everything they can to hide their excitement over this deal. Representative JAMAAL BOWMAN, a Democrat from New York, Member of the House of Representatives who is listed as undecided, said President Biden "kicked MCCARTHY'S butt." Fair point; he did.

Madam President, in contemplating the magnitude—the sheer weight, volume, mass of our national debt, a colossal sum of \$32 trillion—\$32 trillion that will soon escalate to \$36 trillion under this awful deal—one cannot help but be seized by a sense of awful foreboding. This staggering figure should serve as a haunting reminder of the consequences of our profligate ways, a testament to the grave irresponsibility that has permeated our political landscape for decades far too long.

Instead of confronting this existential threat head-on, this deal is racked with complacency and false, cowardly compromise—placating the disconnected without addressing the root of the problem. It is the child of uncertainty, born out of cowardly fear of confrontation and lack of conviction; and it represents the victory of expediency over integrity. I cannot support it, and I will emphatically vote no absent material changes that will render this bill something other than what it is—a fake response to burdensome debt.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

MR. SANDERS. Madam President, my friend from Utah would be happy to know not everybody in the Democratic caucus thinks this is a great victory for President Biden. In fact, the original debt ceiling legislation that Republicans passed in the House would have, over a 10-year period, made unconscionable cuts to programs that working families, that children, the sick,

the elderly, and the poor desperately need. It is a totally unconscionable piece of legislation passed by the Republican House.

And the best thing that I can say or that I think can be said about the current deal on the debt ceiling is that it could have been much worse. Instead of making massive cuts to healthcare, education, childcare, nutrition assistance, and other vital programs that low-income and working-class families depend upon over the next decade, this bill proposes to make modest cuts to these programs over a 2-year period.

This bill will also prevent an economic catastrophe by extending the debt ceiling until January 1, 2025, when, by the way, we will have to go through this absurd process once again.

Having said that—having said and made clear that what we have before us is far, far better than what emanated in the Republican House, I have to make clear that I cannot vote for this bill.

At a time of massive wealth and income inequality, at a time when the people on top have never had it so good while the middle class shrinks and millions of working-class families live in desperation, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for a bill that takes vital nutrition assistance away from women, infants, children, and seniors while refusing to ask billionaires to start paying their fair share of taxes.

So, again, not as bad by any means as the bill passed in the House, this bill will cut nutrition programs for kids and the elderly; and, yet, the billionaires continue to laugh all the way to the bank. They don't have to pay a nickel more in taxes. I cannot, in good conscience, vote for a bill that makes it harder for working families to afford the outrageously high price of childcare, housing, and healthcare while making it easier for the wealthiest people and most profitable corporations in America to cheat on their taxes.

It is no great secret that the people on top and the large corporations with all their lawyers and accountants know how to avoid their fair share of taxes.

Last year, we took a step forward to put money into the IRS to address that. This bill makes cuts in that effort.

At a time when climate change is, by far, the most existential threat that this country has perhaps—and this world have ever faced, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for a bill that makes it easier for fossil fuel companies to pollute and destroy the planet by fast-tracking the disastrous Mountain Valley Pipeline. When the future of the world and the lives of our kids and grandchildren is literally at stake, we must have the courage to stand up to the fossil fuel industry and tell them and the politicians they sponsor that the future of this planet is more important than their short-term profits.

At a time when we spend more on the military than the next 10 nations combined, I cannot, in good conscience,

vote for a bill that increases funding for the bloated Pentagon and large defense contractors who continue to make huge profits by fleecing American taxpayers with impunity. Let me remind my colleagues that the Pentagon, which now gets over \$800 billion a year—a year—is the only Federal Agency that cannot pass an independent audit or account for trillions of dollars in spending.

At a time when the pharmaceutical industry is charging the American people, by far, the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for a bill that does nothing to take on the greed of the big drug companies that are bankrupting Medicare and cancer patients while spending tens of billions on stock buybacks and dividends. If the United States paid the same price for prescription drugs as paid in Europe, we could cut Medicare spending by approximately \$1 trillion over 10 years. But, apparently, we don't have quite the courage to take on the powerful pharmaceutical industry. It is easier to take on children and the elderly.

At a time when over 45 million Americans are drowning in student debt, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for a bill that eliminates the moratorium on student loan payments that has been a lifeline to millions of working-class families during the pandemic.

Deficit reduction cannot just be about cutting programs that working families, that children, the sick, the elderly, and the poor depend upon. They are the easy targets. You see, they don't have any lobbyists here. They don't make big campaign contributions. They don't wine and dine Members of the House and Senate. They are an easy target. We can cut programs that working-class and low-income people depend upon.

But when it comes to demanding that the billionaire class and profitable corporations start paying their fair share of taxes, when it comes to reining in out-of-control military spending and taking on the very powerful military industrial complex, when it comes to reducing the price of prescription drugs and taking on the pharmaceutical industry, and when it comes to ending billions of dollars in corporate welfare that goes to the fossil fuel industry and other corporate interests, well, that is another story. That is not something we are comfortable in doing. They are too powerful; make too many campaign contributions; have too many lobbyists. It is easy to go after the weak and the vulnerable.

The fact of the matter is that, in my judgment, this bill is totally unnecessary. The President of the United States has the authority and the ability to eliminate the debt ceiling today by invoking the 14th Amendment. I look forward to the day when he exercises that authority and puts an end, once and for all, to the outrageous actions of the extreme rightwing to hold our entire economy hostage in order to get what they want.

H.J. RES. 45

Madam President, I would like to say a few words on another subject, and that is the effort here on the part of some of my Republican colleagues to repeal President Biden's student debt plan.

I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 45 that we will be voting on tomorrow. This resolution would repeal President Biden's plan to provide up to \$20,000 in student debt relief to over 40 million Americans who desperately need that relief.

Almost 90 percent of this student debt relief would go to Americans who make less than \$75,000 a year. So anytime you hear Republicans say this is going to the wealthy, that ain't the case. Ninety percent of student debt relief goes to Americans who earn less than \$75,000 a year. These are working-class people who are struggling to pay the rent—rents which are, in many cases, skyrocketing. They are struggling to pay for groceries. They are struggling to pay for the basic necessities of life. And they desperately need this relief.

Despite what our Republican colleagues have told us, President Biden's student debt relief plan does not benefit the wealthy. In fact, the top 5 percent of American households would not see a nickel in benefits under Biden's student debt relief plan—not one nickel.

And let us be clear. Not only would this resolution that we vote upon tomorrow deny up to \$20,000 in student debt relief to over 40 million Americans, it would retroactively overturn the moratorium in student loan payments during the pandemic.

What does that mean? It means that tens of millions of Americans would be forced to pay back thousands of dollars in student loans and interest that were paused during the pandemic.

This is a program that started under President Trump and was continued under President Biden. Further, this resolution would retroactively claw back student debt that was previously canceled for more than 260,000 teachers, nurses, veterans, firefighters, librarians, and other public servants who successfully completed 10 years of public service. That would be absolutely unacceptable.

Over and over again, I have heard my Republican colleagues tell us that the time has come for younger Americans to pay for their college education just like they did 40 or 50 or 60 years ago. Well, I have got news for my Republican colleagues.

Back in the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, even 1980s, the cost of a college education, housing, healthcare, childcare, and the basic necessities of life were a heck of a lot cheaper than they are today.

When I was a young man, I attended Brooklyn College in 1959. Do you know how much I paid for tuition during that 1 year? Zero, at a very good college. And that was not unusual. The reality is that back then, tuition at

many of our Nation's public colleges and universities was either free or virtually free. Young people don't know that, but that is, in fact, the case.

The University of California system, the largest public college system in the country, considered to be the crown jewel of public higher education in America, did not begin charging tuition until the 1980s.

In 1970, the average tuition at a four-year public university in America was just \$814 a year. Today, it costs more than \$9,300 a year. And the total cost of attending a public college or university in America—including room and board—is over \$25,000.

In 1978, a student could get a minimum wage job in the summer and fully pay for a year of tuition at virtually any public college or university in America. Today, the only way that millions of working-class Americans can get a college education is to take out student loans with very high interest rates and graduate with tens and tens of thousands of dollars in debt. And if you go to graduate school, we are talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars in debt. Talk to medical students who will tell you they are going to graduate \$4- or \$500,000 in debt.

But it is not just the price of a college education that has soared. In 1970, the median cost of a home was \$188,000 in real inflation-adjusted dollars. Today, it costs \$497,000. And that is why many young people today are unable to afford to buy the kind of home that their parents were able to purchase.

In 1970, the average monthly rent was \$805 in real dollars. Today, it costs nearly \$2,000 a month. Over 40 years ago, a Federal Pell grant paid for over 80 percent of tuition, fees, room and board at a four-year public college. The Pell grant paid 80 percent. But today, because of massive cutbacks in education, Pell grants cover less than a third of those expenses.

Add all of that up and you understand why more than 45 million Americans are drowning in over \$1.7 trillion in student debt.

So when my Republican colleagues in their sixties, seventies, and eighties lecture young people about the need to pay off their student debt, to get out of their parents' basement and to buy a home, just the way it used to be, I am afraid that they are way out of touch with the economic reality that so many young people are forced to live in today.

Further, my Republican colleagues want you to believe that it is just too expensive and too unfair to provide up to \$20,000 in debt relief to a Pell grant recipient with an income of less than \$60,000 a year—just too much. Can't afford it. We have big national debt; how can we possibly pay for it?

Well, actually, that is a pretty funny argument, given where many of my Republican colleagues are coming from. I remember not so long ago that my Republican colleagues had no problem

voting to give away over a trillion dollars in tax breaks to the top 1 percent and large corporations when Donald Trump was President—without paying for it. No concern about the national debt back then when it comes to tax breaks for the very wealthiest people and largest corporations.

My Republican colleagues had no problem voting for a \$700 billion bailout for Wall Street when George W. Bush was President—without paying for it. Hey, we have to bail out the crooks on Wall Street. Not a problem; don't worry about the deficit; we have to do it.

My Republican colleagues had no problem with voting for an \$858 billion budget for the Pentagon this year, despite the fact that the Department of Defense is the only Federal Agency in America that cannot pass an independent audit and cannot account for trillions of dollars in spending. Don't worry about the deficit; don't worry about the national debt. Can't afford to help young people struggling with their student debt. Can't do that. But we can pump all kinds of money into the military, an institution which is wasting huge amounts of money and has not been able to do an independent audit.

But now, my Republican colleagues want you to believe—after giving huge tax breaks to the rich and large corporations and spending unbelievable amounts of money on the military, they want you to believe that we cannot afford to provide \$20,000 in student debt relief to a Pell grant recipient who is struggling to put a roof over his or her head, pay for childcare, or put food on the table.

Let me be as clear as I can be: If we can afford to provide trillions of dollars in tax breaks and corporate welfare to the wealthy and powerful, we can and we must cancel student debt. If we can afford to provide a \$1.4 billion tax break to the Koch family—Charles Koch family, one of the wealthiest families in America, worth \$120 billion—we can afford to cancel up to \$20,000 in student debt for a struggling, working-class college graduate.

And my understanding is that within a few weeks after all the discussion about the national debt and how we are going to deal with that, my Republican colleagues in the House are going to come up with another bill to give even more tax breaks to the people on top.

If Donald Trump could take Executive action to pause student debt payments when he was in office, please don't tell me that President Biden cannot take the same action to cancel student debt for working families who desperately need it.

Let's be clear: Canceling student debt is the right thing to do, not only from a moral and economic perspective, it is precisely what the American people want us to do.

According to a recent Fox News poll, 62 percent of the American people support canceling at least \$20,000 in student debt for individuals making

\$125,000 a year or less. The American people understand that we cannot continue to crush our young generation with a mountain of debt for doing the right thing—getting a college education. A vote for this resolution would deny relief to over 40 million Americans across every State and every Congressional district.

A vote for this resolution would reinstate tens of billions of dollars in interest charges and loans that have already been canceled for teachers, firefighters, and other public service workers throughout America. We cannot allow that to happen. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

U.S. HOSTAGE AND WRONGFUL DETAINEE DAY ACT OF 2023

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 769 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 769) to amend title 36, United States Code, to designate March 9 as U.S. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day and to designate the Hostage and Wrongful Detainee flag as an official symbol to recognize citizens of the United States held as hostages or wrongfully detained abroad.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 769) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 769

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 "U.S. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION.

(a) HOSTAGE AND WRONGFUL DETAINEE DAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating the second section 146 (relating to Choose Respect Day) as section 147; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“§ 148. U.S. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day

“(a) DESIGNATION.—March 9 is U.S. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day.

“(b) PROCLAMATION.—The President is requested to issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe U.S. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to the second section 146 and inserting the following new items:

“147. Choose Respect Day.

“148. U.S. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day.”.

(b) HOSTAGE AND WRONGFUL DETAINEE FLAG.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 9 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 904. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee flag

“(a) DESIGNATION.—The Hostage and Wrongful Detainee flag championed by the Bring Our Families Home Campaign is designated as the symbol of the commitment of the United States to recognizing, and prioritizing the freedom of, citizens and lawful permanent residents of the United States held as hostages or wrongfully detained abroad.

“(b) REQUIRED DISPLAY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Hostage and Wrongful Detainee flag shall be displayed at the locations specified in paragraph (3) on the days specified in paragraph (2).

“(2) DAYS SPECIFIED.—The days specified in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) U.S. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day, March 9.

“(B) Flag Day, June 14.

“(C) Independence Day, July 4.

“(D) Any day on which a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States—

“(i) returns to the United States from being held hostage or wrongfully detained abroad; or

“(ii) dies while being held hostage or wrongfully detained abroad.

“(3) LOCATIONS SPECIFIED.—The locations specified in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) The Capitol.

“(B) The White House.

“(C) The buildings containing the official office of—

“(i) the Secretary of State; and

“(ii) the Secretary of Defense.

“(c) DISPLAY TO BE IN A MANNER VISIBLE TO THE PUBLIC.—Display of the Hostage and Wrongful Detainee flag pursuant to this section shall be in a manner designed to ensure visibility to the public.

“(d) LIMITATION.—This section may not be construed or applied so as to require any employee to report to work solely for the purpose of providing for the display of the Hostage and Wrongful Detainee flag.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 9 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“904. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee flag.”.

VETERANS GET OUTSIDE DAY

NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK

KIDS TO PARKS DAY

NATIONAL BRAIN TUMOR AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration on S. Res. 206, 223, and 226; that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following

Senate resolutions: S. Res. 206, Veterans Get Outside Day; S. Res. 223, National Public Works Week; S. Res. 226, Kids to Parks Day; and S. Res. 229, National Brain Tumor Awareness Month.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged from the relevant resolutions, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolution (S. Res. 206), with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 10, 2023, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

(The resolution (S. Res. 223), with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 18, 2023, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

(The resolution (S. Res. 226), with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 18, 2023, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

(The resolution (S. Res. 229), with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise and join my colleague Senator WARREN to discuss the unprecedented political holds the Senator from Alabama has placed on 221 general and flag officers. This hold is now into its fourth month, and it is beginning to have serious impacts on military personnel and their families. Commanders who are supposed to retire or move on to a new assignment cannot do so because there is no one to replace them. Commanders who are set to take new assignments remain in limbo. Family members don't know when they are going to move. Children don't know what new school they will attend or when. Thousands of lives are being disrupted, all because the Senator from Alabama has chosen to block merit-based, non-political military promotions over a policy he does not like.

(Mr. OSSOFF assumed the Chair.)

I would like to address a few of the assertions raised by the Senator from Alabama that he has used to justify his unprecedented and damaging hold on military promotions.

First, on the matter of the Hyde Amendment and the prohibitions on Federal funding for abortions, the Senator says the Department of Defense does not have the authority to provide travel benefits and grant leave for reproductive health care not covered by TRICARE. He is in error.

Let's provide some clarity on terms. The so-called Hyde Amendment does not apply to the Department of De-

fense. Instead, the Department has its own statute that restricts the use of Department of Defense funding "to perform abortions" and restricts the use of Department of Defense medical facilities "to perform an abortion," except when the life of the mother is endangered or in cases of rape or incest.

No reasonable interpretation of the policy can conclude that it authorizes the Department of Defense to pay for the performance of abortions unless under those conditions I mentioned—the life of the mother is in danger or in cases of rape or incest. Those costs for such abortions that are not covered under DOD will continue to be borne, as they are today, by servicemembers and dependents out of pocket. That does not change.

The Department's policy is legal and rooted in longstanding Department of Justice interpretation of the Hyde Amendment and similar restrictions. In fact, the Department of Defense General Counsel requested the Justice Department's views on its policy last fall. The Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel issued a lengthy and informative slip opinion concluding that "10 United States Code Section 1093 does not bar the Department from using appropriated funds to pay for servicemembers and their dependents to travel to obtain abortions that the Department cannot fund directly."

The opinion, which I encourage all my colleagues to read, traces the legislative history of the Hyde Amendment, similar Hyde-like restrictions, and the specific restriction applicable to the Department codified in section 1093.

Mr. President, I ask that an excerpt of the October 2022 Justice Department slip opinion considering the Department of Defense policy be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

(Slip Opinion)

AUTHORITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO USE APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL BY SERVICE MEMBERS AND DEPENDENTS TO OBTAIN ABORTIONS

The Department of Defense may lawfully expend funds to pay for service members and their dependents to travel to obtain abortions that DoD cannot itself perform due to statutory restrictions. DoD may lawfully expend funds to pay for such travel pursuant to both its express statutory authorities and, independently, the necessary expense doctrine.

(October 3, 2022)

MEMORANDUM OPINIONS FOR GENERAL COUNSEL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

You have asked whether the Department of Defense ("DoD") may lawfully expend funds to pay for service members and their dependents to travel to obtain abortions that DoD itself cannot perform due to statutory restrictions. We conclude that DoD may lawfully expend funds for this purpose under its express statutory authorities and, independently, under the necessary expense doctrine.

I.

By statute, "[f]unds available to the Department of Defense may not be used to per-

form abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in a case in which the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest," 10 U.S.C. 1093(a), and "[n]o medical treatment facility or other facility of the Department of Defense may be used to perform an abortion except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in a case in which the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest," id. 1093(b). By its express terms, 10 U.S.C. 1093(a) applies only to funds used to "perform abortions." As we have previously concluded in assessing identical language restricting the Peace Corps' use of its appropriations, the plain text is dispositive here. See Peace Corps Employment Policies for Pregnant Volunteers, 5 Op. O.L.C. 350, 357 (1981). This language "does not prohibit the use of funds to pay expenses, such as a per diem or travel expenses, that are incidental to the abortion." Id.

This conclusion is confirmed by section 1093's legislative history. When Congress originally enacted the provision in 1984, it prohibited DoD only from using funds "to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term." Pub. L. No. 98-525, 1401(e)(5), 98 Stat. 2492, 2617-18 (1984). DoD subsequently adopted a policy of prohibiting non-covered abortions from being performed at any DoD facility even when privately funded—a policy that President Clinton then directed DoD to reverse, stating that it went "beyond . . . the requirements of the statute." Memorandum on Abortions in Military Hospitals, 1 Pub. Papers of Pres. William J. Clinton 11, 11 (Jan. 22, 1993). In 1996, Congress responded to President Clinton's directive by amending 10 U.S.C. 1093 to make clear that, in addition to the prohibition on using funds to "perform abortions," "[n]o medical treatment facility or other facility of the Department of Defense may be used to perform an abortion except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in a case in which the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest." 10 U.S.C. 1093(b). It is notable that the amendment was targeted narrowly to address the specific issue of DoD's use of its medical treatment facilities, rather than reaching the same result via a broader prohibition on expenditures indirectly related to the provision of abortions.

The limited scope of the 1996 amendment is especially significant because when Congress has wanted to restrict abortion-related expenditures beyond those for the procedure itself, Congress has done so. For example, in 1988—prior to amending 10 U.S.C. 1093—Congress had attached a restriction to Department of Justice ("DOJ") funds prohibiting the use of those funds "to require any person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion." Pub. L. No. 100-459, tit. II, 206, 102 Stat. 2186, 2201 (1988) (emphasis added); see also, e.g., Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022, Pub. L. No. 117-103, div. E, 726(d), 136 Stat. 49, 131 ("CAA 2022") (referring to funding for "abortion or abortion related services" (emphasis added)). This DOJ restriction is also in the current appropriation. See CAA 2022, div. B, 203. That Congress chose not to include such capacious language in the 1996 amendment confirms that it did not intend for the prohibition to sweep so widely.

Other DOJ appropriation restrictions provide further evidence that Congress did not intend DoD's prohibition on the use of funds to perform abortions to reach ancillary expenses, such as travel costs. In addition to the provision noted above, section 202 of the current appropriation contains a general prohibition against using the appropriated

funds “to pay for an abortion.” *Id.*, div. B, 202. Section 204 then contains a clarification that the prohibition on requiring any person to perform or facilitate an abortion does not “remove the obligation of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to provide escort services necessary for a female inmate” to obtain an abortion “outside the Federal facility.” *Id.*, div. B, 204. Importantly, this language in section 204 does not also create an exception to the general funding restriction in section 202, but rather only clarifies that nothing in section 203 “remove[s] the obligation” of the agency to provide transportation services. *Id.* Section 204 therefore is premised on an understanding that section 202’s general prohibition on “pay[ing] for an abortion” does not affect the agency’s ability to provide such escort services, showing that when Congress prohibits funds from being used “to pay for an abortion,” it does not intend that prohibition to reach transportation expenses.

Comparing 10 U.S.C. 1093 to the text and history of the longstanding funding restriction known as the Hyde Amendment is similarly instructive. The Hyde Amendment restricts expenditures by the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education by providing that no covered funds “shall be expended for any abortion” or “for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion,” except “if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or . . . in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed.” CAA 2022, div. H, 506-507. In previous advice, we concluded that the Hyde Amendment would not bar the use of appropriated funds to provide transportation for women seeking abortions. See Memorandum for Samuel Bagenstos, General Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, from Christopher H. Schroeder, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Re: Application of the Hyde Amendment to the Provision of Transportation for Women Seeking Abortions (Sept. 27, 2022). In reaching that conclusion, we noted, among other considerations, that earlier versions of the Hyde Amendment only applied to funds “for any abortion,” and that in 1997 Congress added language to reach funds “for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.” Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, Pub. L. No. 105-78, 509(a)-(b), 111 Stat. 1467, 1516 (1997); see Application of the Hyde Amendment to Federal Student-Aid Programs, 45 Op. O.L.C. ___, at *3 (Jan. 16, 2021); H.R. Rep. No. 105-390, at 119 (1997) (Conf. Rep.); see also 143 Cong. Rec. 17,448 (1997) (statement of Sen. Ashcroft). In the context of health insurance, the funds are paid to reimburse the provider or the insured for, and thus effectively pay for, the abortion procedure itself. As a result, payment for health insurance that covers abortions is more closely connected to the actual provision of abortion than transportation to and from the procedure. Thus, the fact that Congress revised the Hyde Amendment to specify that it applies to payments for health benefits coverage supports the view that the prohibition on expending funds “for any abortion” is limited to the direct provision of abortions and would not apply to transportation. More generally, the amendment suggests that when Congress has wanted to clearly encompass certain expenditures beyond the direct provision of the procedure, Congress has amended abortion-related funding restrictions to do so.

For these reasons, 10 U.S.C. 1093 does not prohibit the use of funds for expenses that are indirect or ancillary to the performance of abortion. We therefore conclude that 10 U.S.C. 1093 does not bar DoD from using appropriated funds to pay for service members and their dependents to travel to obtain abortions that DoD cannot fund directly.

Mr. REED. The Justice Department’s opinion on the Defense Department’s policy is not new and is not partisan. In fact, it relies on decades of executive branch interpretation of the Hyde Amendment through administrations of both parties.

In 1981, for example, the Justice Department considered what it described as identical language restricting the Peace Corps’ use of Federal funds to “perform abortions.” In that opinion, President Reagan’s Justice Department concluded that the language “does not prohibit the use of funds to pay expenses, such as a per diem or travel expenses, that are incidental to the abortion.” That opinion was authored by Ted Olson, then the Assistant Attorney General and the future Solicitor General of the United States under President George W. Bush.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt of the 1981 Justice Department opinion on the Peace Corps’ policy be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS EMPLOYMENT POLICIES FOR
PREGNANT VOLUNTEERS

The Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) would prohibit the Peace Corps from implementing an across-the-board policy of terminating or reassigning volunteers solely because they become pregnant while assigned overseas, or because they have an abortion. A decision to terminate a pregnant volunteer must be based on a case-by-case assessment of the volunteer’s ability to function effectively in her assignment while pregnant or after delivery of the child.

Under the PDA, the fact that a volunteer who has been terminated because of pregnancy chooses to have an abortion cannot be considered in a decision on her reapplication for service.

Even though a specific restriction in the Peace Corps’ appropriation prohibits the use of its funds to perform abortions, so that the Peace Corps may not pay for the cost of an abortion for one of its volunteers, the PDA would require the Peace Corps to continue to pay travel and per diem expenses to volunteers evacuated to have an abortion, as long as it provides such compensation to other volunteers evacuated for comparable medical conditions. The Peace Corps must also allow volunteers to draw upon their accumulated readjustment allowance to pay for an abortion, if similar access is allowed for other medical expenses.

(November 20, 1981)

MEMORANDUM OPINION FOR THE GENERAL
COUNSEL, PEACE CORPS

This responds to your request for this Office’s views on several questions about the Peace Corps’ policies on hiring and reinstatement of volunteers who become pregnant while overseas and of pregnant volunteers who elect to have an abortion, and on reimbursement of travel and per diem expenses to volunteers evacuated to the United States for the purpose of obtaining an abortion. We conclude that the Pregnancy Discrimination

Act would prohibit the Peace Corps from implementing any across-the-board policy of terminating volunteers who become pregnant while overseas or pregnant volunteers who elect to have abortions, but that in some limited circumstances termination or reassignment may be appropriate, on an ad hoc basis, because of the unique demands and constraints of Peace Corps service. We do not believe, however, that the Peace Corps may consider the fact that a volunteer who had been terminated because of pregnancy subsequently elected to have an abortion in reviewing that individual’s application for reinstatement. With respect to the funding of abortion-related expenses, we conclude that the Peace Corps is not barred from using appropriated funds to pay travel costs and a per diem to volunteers who are evacuated for the purpose of obtaining an abortion, and, in fact, that the Pregnancy Discrimination Act requires the Peace Corps to continue paying those costs, so long as travel and per diem expenses are paid to volunteers evacuated for other comparable medical disabilities.

I. BACKGROUND

Current Peace Corps policy provides for an ad hoc determination whether volunteers who become pregnant or pregnant volunteers who elect to have an abortion will be allowed to remain in their assigned countries. In determining whether a pregnant volunteer (including her spouse) should be allowed to remain in service, the Country Director looks at a variety of factors, including health hazards to the mother and child, the ability of the parents to support the child, and the prospects for continued effectiveness by the parents. A pregnant volunteer who elects to have an abortion may be separated, or returned to duty if the Country Director determines she will be able to serve effectively under the circumstances. Pregnant volunteers, volunteers with dependent children, and volunteers who have had abortions while in service do serve in the Peace Corps, although individuals who are pregnant or who have dependent children are not encouraged to become volunteers. Volunteers who choose to have an abortion are generally evacuated to the United States for the procedure. The Peace Corps pays travel expenses and a per diem to those volunteers who have an abortion, as it does for volunteers evacuated for other medical or surgical treatment. Because of a prohibition in the Peace Corps’ current appropriations authority against the use of appropriated funds to pay for abortions except where the life of the woman would be endangered or in cases of reported rape or incest, the Peace Corps does not now pay the costs of the abortion procedure itself. Volunteers may, however, draw upon accumulated readjustment allowance funds to pay for abortion procedures.

You have asked us to address the following questions:

1. Can the Peace Corps terminate any volunteer who becomes pregnant while a volunteer because of pregnancy? If so, could such a policy be limited to single volunteers?

III. REIMBURSEMENT OR EXPENSES

You have also asked whether the Peace Corps must, or indeed can, consistent with the PDA and current restrictions on the use of appropriated funds, continue to pay travel costs and a per diem for volunteers who obtain an abortion while in service. The Peace Corps now pays those costs under a general policy providing for evacuation to the United States of volunteers who require “elective (necessary but not emergency) surgery of any consequence.” Until the beginning of FY 1979, the Peace Corps also paid for the costs of the abortion procedure itself. In 1978, Congress included language in the Peace Corps’ appropriations legislation limiting the use of

appropriated funds for abortions. We understand that the currently effective language is contained in Pub. L. No. 96-536, §109, 94 Stat. 3166, 3170 (1980), and prohibits the use of funds "to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term; or except for such medical procedures necessary for victims of [reported] rape or incest . . . or for medical procedures necessary for the termination of an ectopic pregnancy."

On its face, this restriction covers only payments made "to perform abortions"; it does not prohibit the use of funds to pay expenses, such as a per diem or travel expenses, that are incidental to the abortion. We believe that the plain language of the appropriations restriction is dispositive, and does not require the Peace Corps to cease payment of incidental expenses other than the costs of the abortion itself.

This does not, however, dispose of the question whether the Peace Corps, in its discretion, may cease payment of travel and per diem expenses for volunteers who elect to have abortions. The statutory authority for payment of those expenses vests broad discretion in the President or his delegated representative to authorize "such health care

Mr. REED. The Justice Department has likewise considered and concluded that the Hyde Amendment does not prevent the Bureau of Prisons from providing transportation services for inmates to seek abortion care outside the prison system, noting that the Bureau has "long provided" such benefits. This authority to provide transportation benefits dates at least to the 1996 version of Bureau regulations and continues uninterrupted to the present day.

So, again, this assertion that the Department's policy contravenes some long-held principle is wrong and contrary to fact.

Second, on the matter of travel authorities, the Defense Department has broad statutory authority to provide travel and transportation benefits to servicemembers and dependents and empowers the Secretary of Defense to define those parameters by regulation. As the Justice Department noted, 37 United States Code, section 452, authorizes the Secretary to provide "actual and necessary expenses of travel and transportation, for, or in connection with . . . any travel as authorized or ordered by the administering Secretary."

Further, the Justice Department aptly noted that 37 United States Code, sections 452 and 453, authorize travel benefits for servicemembers and dependents in connection with "unusual, hardship, or emergency circumstances" and leaves the definition of those terms and other implementing guidance to the Secretary.

I remind my colleagues again that never before in our history has a fundamental healthcare right been denied to servicemembers by a single decision on a single day by the Supreme Court. No matter what side of the abortion debate you are on, you cannot deny that what many women considered to be a fundamental, constitutionally protected right for 50 years was eliminated by the stroke of a pen and that those

who depend on these rights now find themselves assigned to locations, through no choice of their own, where these services are no longer available in any meaningful way. In my view, this meets any definition of "unusual, hardship, or emergency circumstances."

The Defense Department's policy is a result, as I just suggested, of the Dobbs decision which places extraordinary hardships on servicewomen and dependents, resulting in military personnel no longer being treated equitably at every military base. The Department of Defense's policy seeks to provide a level playing field so that a woman's access to healthcare is not based on her assignment and such access is consistent throughout the force. It seeks further to ensure that these issues do not become determinant in a woman's decision to join the military or remain in the military.

The U.S. Government has provided transportation and other incidental benefits and support relative to healthcare not covered by government programs, including abortion, to certain populations for decades. Servicemembers and their dependents are, I believe, uniquely affected by the Dobbs decision and deserve at least that same level of support.

Lastly, the Senator from Alabama has stated that these officers whose promotions he is holding will receive backpay. That is simply not true. The Department of Defense confirmed for the Armed Services Committee this week that there is no backpay mechanism for these officers. Their date of rank is the date of their appointment, which for general and flag officers can only occur after Senate confirmation. There will be no backpay.

I want to state again what I stated before. It is deeply detrimental to our national security and harmful to the well-being of military families to delay the promotions of senior military leaders for political purposes or any purpose, really, unrelated to an officer's qualifications. It is contrary to the practice and traditions of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate. It does a great disservice to the men and women in uniform and their families.

I would ask that the Senator from Alabama release his holds immediately before more damage is done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his leadership. He has worked hard to make sure that the Senate Armed Services Committee works in a bipartisan manner to keep our country safe. His steadfast approach has rightfully earned him respect from our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I appreciate his being here tonight on this issue.

Mr. President, several weeks ago, I came down to the Senate floor to ask

the Senator from Alabama to reconsider his unprecedented action of blocking hundreds of promotions earned by our men and women in uniform. He refused, so I am here to ask again.

As I said the last time I spoke about this, most people are aware that the Senate votes on nominees appointed by the President to occupy top roles in government—Cabinet Secretaries, judges, Ambassadors. Less well known is the fact that the Senate must also vote to approve thousands of military promotions each year. If a colonel has done really well on the job and their services promotion board decides that they are ready to be a brigadier general, the Senate must vote to approve this promotion before it can go through.

Typically, this vote is a formality. These promotions are processed in big batches rather than one at a time, and they nearly always happen without taking a recorded vote. But right now, the Senator from Alabama all by himself is blocking every single senior military nomination and promotion from moving forward. This means that one Senator is personally standing in the way of the promotions for 221 of our top-level military leaders, holding up pay raises for 221 men and women in uniform, blocking 221 senior military leaders from taking their posts, and jeopardizing America's national security.

In April, I sent a letter to Defense Secretary Austin asking about the impact of holding up these military promotions. Secretary Austin didn't pull any punches. He said:

The longer that this hold persists, the greater the risk the U.S. military runs in every theater, every domain, and every service.

He went on to point out that these unprecedented and unnecessary holds are creating "rising disquiet from our allies and partners at a moment when our competitors and adversaries are watching."

There is bipartisan opposition to the Senator from Alabama's actions. Thanks to Chairman REED, seven former Defense Secretaries, including ones who served under President Trump and President George W. Bush, sent a letter stating that leaving senior positions "in doubt at a time of enormous geopolitical uncertainty sends the wrong message to our adversaries and could weaken our deterrence."

The Senator from Alabama hurts Active-Duty military. He also hurts their families. In this letter describing the consequences of the Senator from Alabama's hold, Secretary Austin noted that it places an "unconscionable burden on families that are already making significant sacrifices."

There are mounting worries that the negative impacts on military families is threatening our military's ability to retain leaders who have completed thorough, months-long reviews to earn those promotions.

At a recent Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, the Secretary of the Air Force said:

One of the things that motivates our people in terms of retention . . . is how they feel that their families are being treated.

He said that he also knows that these families do not want to be treated liked the Senator from Alabama's political football.

The Senator from Alabama is punishing 221 dedicated men and women who serve in our military because he disagrees with one of the Pentagon's policy decisions. He is opposed to a Department of Defense policy established to help members of the military and their families access healthcare—specifically, reproductive healthcare.

I strongly support this particular policy, but it is no secret that I disagree with a lot of other policy positions at the Pentagon. And, as I reminded the Senator from Alabama the last time we had this discussion on the Senate floor, as Senators, we have many tools we can use to shape and influence government policy without putting our national defense at risk.

We can pass laws; we can conduct oversight; we can meet with administration officials; we can hold hearings. From time to time, Senators object to an individual nomination, usually to express opposition either to the nominee or to ensure that the Senator gets answers from a Federal Agency. I have done this in the past as have many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

That is not the approach the Senator from Alabama has taken. Instead, he is blocking every single top military leader from advancing indefinitely. The last time I came to the floor, he was holding up 184 nominees. Now he has snared 221 top-level servicemembers who are currently slated for advancement. He has stopped every one of them dead in their tracks.

The Senator from Alabama is single-handedly holding up three 4-star commanders, 35 3-star commanders, multiple Silver Star and Purple Heart recipients, the next commander of our Fifth Fleet in the Middle East, the next commander of the Seventh Fleet in the Pacific, the Navy's air and surface warfare commanders; and as a preview of coming events, the Senator from Alabama has already promised to block the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Senator from Alabama has already held some of these nominees for as long as 3 months. That is 3 months that they won't have time in their next roles. That is 3 months that they won't get a pay bump, and there is no retroactive pay here. That is 3 months that they don't get the experience and the responsibilities of their new duty stations. That is 3 months, and there is no end in sight.

How many blows to their military careers and to their families do these men and women have to suffer before some of them simply walk away?

This isn't right.

The Senator from Alabama has not raised any objections to the process by which these men and women were vetted and nominated. Each of these nominees has undergone a thorough review, first by their military service and then by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Months after those reviews, their nominations were sent to the White House for additional scrutiny and then to Congress to officially authorize the promotions.

These are our military's best leaders, and they have proven themselves to the highest degree. As a reward for their service and their exemplary dedication, the Senator from Alabama holds them hostage, with no concern for what it means to their careers, to the servicemembers depending on them for leadership, or to their families.

The Senator from Alabama's actions are not just the usual back-and-forth in Washington. His holds pose a grave threat to our national security and our military readiness. They actively hurt our ability to respond quickly to threats around the world. That is not my conclusion; that is the conclusion of the Secretary of Defense.

When I tried to move these nominations forward the last time, I said I was concerned about how the actions of the Senator from Alabama were undermining military readiness. The Senator responded that he knew that I had sent a letter to Secretary Austin to ask him about the impact of the holds on military readiness but that the Secretary had not yet responded. The Senator said the last time we were on the floor here together that he would consider Secretary Austin's concerns. In fact, he said that he "can't wait to read it," but he would not budge in the meantime.

So I am here this evening to place into the RECORD Secretary Austin's reply. In his letter, the Secretary makes his concerns clear. He explains how the actions of the Senator from Alabama pose a grave threat to national security by harming military readiness. The Secretary also explains how the Senator from Alabama harms military families.

I sincerely hope that the unvarnished assessment of our Secretary of Defense will be enough to move the Senator from Alabama to lift his holds and let these nominations go forward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Austin's letter be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. ELIZABETH WARREN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARREN: Thank you for your letter requesting a full accounting of the impact on our national security and the risks to our military readiness resulting from Senator Tuberville's indefinite hold on the confirmation of our general and flag officers.

I appreciate and share your deep concern over this hold, which is unprecedented in its scale and scope. Delays in confirming our general and flag officers pose a clear risk to U.S. military readiness, especially at this critical time.

The Department of Defense has 64 three- and four-star nominations pending for positions due to rotate within the next 120 days. These include the Chief of Staff of the Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; the Commandant and Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps; the Director of the National Security Agency and Commander of United States Cyber Command; and the Commander of United States Northern Command.

Additionally, several one- and two-star nominations are now on indefinite hold for general officers and flag officers slated to take command or support critical positions across the Joint Force. Within the next nine months, approximately 80 three- and four-star rotations are projected across the Department. Those positions include the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force. In total, between now and the end of the year, the Department projects that approximately 650 general and flag officers will require Senate confirmation.

This indefinite hold harms America's national security and hinders the Pentagon's normal operations. The United States military relies on the deep experience and strategic expertise of our senior military leaders. The longer that this hold persists, the greater the risk the U.S. military runs in every theater, every domain, and every Service.

MISSION VACANCIES

The tenure of Service Chiefs is limited by law, and thus, incumbents must vacate their positions at the appointed time and may only be extended under extraordinary circumstances. Collectively, these positions oversee more than 1.2 million active and reserve component Service members and provide Service personnel and resources to the commanders of the unified combatant commands. By law, Service Chiefs preside over the capabilities, requirements, policies, and plans of their Services and serve as the principal military advisors to the Secretaries of the Military Departments. Put simply, our Service Chiefs train and equip the Joint Force. Without these leaders in place, the U.S. military will incur an unnecessary and unprecedented degree of risk at a moment when our adversaries may seek to test our resolve.

The hold causes especially acute, self-inflicted problems in new domains of potential conflict. The Director of the National Security Agency and Commander of United States Cyber Command, is responsible for supporting every combatant commander and Service member around the globe—including troops in hostile or hazardous areas—with actionable signals intelligence and cybersecurity support. The Director also ensures that military communications and data remain secure and out of the hands of our adversaries, safeguarding our advanced command, control, communications, computer intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities against the People's Republic of China, Russia, Iran, North Korea, ISIS, and more. Failing to fill this position weakens the cybersecurity of the United States.

Furthermore, delays in confirming a large number of one- and two-star general and flag officers jeopardizes our current and future readiness. The Department relies on these experienced leaders to execute tactical actions every day and extend our strategic advantages for the long term. General and flag

officers at this level are responsible for executing strategy, acquiring new technologies, enhancing tactical effectiveness, conducting joint training, and strengthening global alliances. These general and flag officers also provide direct leadership and mentorship to thousands of enlisted Service members and junior and field grade officers across the Department. Their importance cannot be overstated.

POWER PROJECTION ABROAD

General and flag officers provide oversight of the Department's military and civilian staffs, help decide how we employ our forces, and take care of the Service members, civilians, and families in their organizations. Delays in confirmation will soon foist vacancies on the most senior military positions across each of the Services, imposing new and unnecessary risks on U.S. warfighters across multiple theaters of operations.

The hold also makes it harder for the United States to fulfil its global leadership responsibilities, including to our treaty allies and our valued partners around the world. Our smoothly running normal processes and predictable military transitions have long set helpful expectations among allies and partners. Now, however, this hold has created unnecessary uncertainty. That diminishes our global standing as the strongest military in the world, which is in large part based on our stable processes and orderly transitions.

General and flag officers have the authority to make decisions and commit resources, develop key policies, work with our allies and partners, and confront our rivals and foes. The full impact of this hold may not be immediately noticeable because of the resilience built into our military organizations, but over time, the hold will cause cascading impacts to our readiness and needlessly hinder our ability to meet our strategic objectives in the Indo-Pacific, Europe, the Middle East, and beyond.

The absence of experienced and Senate-confirmed senior leadership limits our ability to deepen our cooperation with our allies and partners through multilateral training and cooperative engagements. Recent exercises, such as Balikatan 2023 with the Armed Forces of the Philippines or joint U.S.-Israeli naval activity in the Bab el-Mandeb Strait, may become even more difficult if delays in confirmation force other leaders to take on the responsibilities of officers held up by the Senate. This hold could force senior leaders to become dual-hatted, which would force them to juggle competing priorities and sap their ability to excel.

KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERTISE

Our general and flag officers cultivate their expertise and experience over decades of service. Military units need leaders, and our Service members deserve to be led by fully confirmed general and flag officers. The failure to confirm leaders in key roles transfers strategic risk down the chain of command and forces our units to operate with less experienced decision makers in charge. By destabilizing the senior military promotion and rotation process, we put our short- and long-term readiness at significant risk.

Failure to fill these positions in a timely manner is simply irresponsible. We owe it to our Service members to provide them with the best leadership possible, and the current hold jeopardizes the continuity and effective transition of leadership.

SERVICE MEMBERS AND FAMILIES

This hold disrupts not only our most senior military leaders but their families as well. Service members and military families are resilient, but the current hold adds another layer of stress and unnecessary uncertainty.

The damage here includes not just the disruption to our most senior officers, but also profound confusion and disturbance to our rising one- and two-star general and flag officers and their families. Extended holds increase the time from selection to promotion, which could further delay promotion timelines by 12 to 24 months. This impedes not only the current cadre of officers but those in the groups behind them as well.

General officer and flag officer end strength is tightly controlled by statute. Promotion of one cadre of officers is possible only with the retirement of others. Long-term holds have a corrosive and cascading effect: they prevent our rising officers and their families from being able to predict promotion and rotation windows, which can increase the pressure to leave the military in favor of greater stability. The more our normal promotion processes are jolted, the more we risk the loss of the diverse warfighting and technical expertise that America needs to confront its 21st-century security challenges.

The current hold also means delaying or canceling permanent change of station moves—not only for those now nominated and on hold but also for numerous officers and their families who must be extended on station to prevent critical gaps. Military children will be unable to move to new schools when the next school year begins, which imposes needless additional stress on those students and their families. Military families enrolled in the Exceptional Family Member Program may endure serious delays or be unable to access the services and support that they need and deserve when they transition to their new duty stations. And outstanding military spouses may not be able to accept or start new jobs because they cannot predict when they could start. The families of our general and flag officers serve right alongside their Service members. The current hold imposes additional burdens upon our military families that are both unnecessary and unconscionable.

A PERILOUS PRECEDENT

As such, the Department urges the Senate to resolve the current situation as swiftly as possible to limit these serious consequences. Never before has one Senator prevented the Department of Defense from managing its officer corps in this manner, and letting this hold continue would set a perilous precedent for our military, our security, and our country.

The ripple effects of this unprecedented and unnecessary hold are increasingly troubling. Ultimately, the breakdown of the normal flow of leadership across the Department's carefully cultivated promotion and transition system will breed uncertainty and confusion across the U.S. military. This protracted hold means uncertainty for our Service members and their families and rising disquiet from our allies and partners, at a moment when our competitors and adversaries are watching.

As public servants and officials sworn to protect and defend our Constitution, I hope that we can all acknowledge the national security risks posed by these needless delays and come together to safeguard the lethality and readiness of the most powerful fighting force in human history.

Thank you for your continued strong support for our Service members and our national security. I again urge swift action to confirm all U.S. general and flag officers.

Sincerely,

LLOYD J. AUSTIN, III.

Ms. WARREN. I am here today to ask my colleague from Alabama to let these promotions move forward and to find other ways to continue advocating

for the policy changes that he wants to see. I am hopeful that he will do the right thing and allow these servicemembers to carry out their responsibilities to our country.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 204. This nominee is a native of Pittsfield, MA. If confirmed, he would be the Navy's next sub boss, making him the most senior operational submariner in the Navy. The Submarine Force is integral to deterring our enemies and keeping America safe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 204; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the Record; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I continue to reiterate my stance and my position over the last almost 4 months now about my opposition to this policy.

Now, the burden is not on me to pass legislation to stop this illegal policy. The burden is on the administration. The burden is on the administration to stop breaking the law.

So let me just say this one more time—because I keep getting asked the same question over and over again—I will keep my hold. I will keep it on until the Pentagon follows the law or changes the law. It is that simple. Those are the two conditions that would get me to drop the hold. So, until these conditions are met, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, let's be clear what is at issue here.

Servicemembers and their families don't get to decide where they serve. The policy that is at issue here allows servicemembers who need reproductive healthcare to request time to travel to receive the treatment that they need. The treatment could be an abortion, but it also could be IVF. It also could be helping a servicemember or a family member receive treatment after a miscarriage. Commanders respect a servicemember's privacy, and they don't want to be required to ask why the servicemember is taking leave. Now, I understand that the Senator from Alabama doesn't like that. He doesn't think that the Department should be facilitating certain types of reproductive healthcare in any way.

The administration—let us be clear—is not breaking the law. Chairman REED has already gone through all of

the legal precedent and the legal opinion that states that what the Department of Defense is doing is absolutely within its purview. The Department of Defense is following the law. I understand that the law could be changed, and the Senator from Alabama can advocate for the bill that he cosponsors that would ban the Department from providing paid leave or transportation to access legal reproductive care.

I think that such a policy would have a terrible impact on the privacy of our servicemembers and their families who would have to tell their commanding officers intimate details of their medical situations in order to get the time they need to seek care for things like IVF or a miscarriage. It could prevent servicemembers or their families from accessing important, legal care that would require them to travel or to take time away from work.

It would also have negative impacts on our commanders officers, who would spend less time training against our national security threats and more time asking invasive questions about their employees' health conditions or those of the employees' families.

Even so, the Senator from Alabama is free to advocate for this policy. As I have said before, the Senator does not have the votes in Congress for a bill like that. I think the Senator from Alabama knows that, which is why he has taken this radical step of opposing the swift passage of every high-level military nomination pending before the Senate.

This approach is dangerous. Many of us are frustrated by executive branch policies and actions, but that frustration is not an excuse to endanger our national security and to deprive servicemembers of the leaders they need.

The Senator from Alabama and I fundamentally disagree on the issue of abortion and on the DOD's policies, but we should all be able to agree that a blockade of the promotion of every senior member of our Nation's military creates unacceptable risks to our national security.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 192. If confirmed, this nominee would be the first female Superintendent for the Naval Academy. Of course, she is no stranger to breaking down barriers. She was also the first Hispanic woman to command a Navy warship. We are in the middle of a recruiting crisis. She is precisely the kind of leader we need to inspire our next generation to serve.

I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island. Then I will make my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I just want to reiterate what Senator WARREN pointed out: This policy is not illegal. It has been fully justified by the Department of Justice and by interpretations of many different agencies.

In fact, one of the excruciating ironies here is that Senator TUBERVILLE is denying promotions to general officers

because he will not allow female members of the military to have some of the same protections that Federal prisoners have. If that is not absurd, I don't know what is.

Also, I have had the opportunity—really, the privilege—to serve in and command a paratrooper company. I have a lot of friends who have made careers in the U.S. military. When you get to the level of a colonel who is about to be voted brigadier general, it is a great honor. You have worked your whole life for it, and you very much want to do that, but you have family responsibilities, and you have other responsibilities. I can pretty much assure you that most people who are qualified to be a brigadier general in the Army are being courted assiduously by companies to work for several hundred thousand dollars a year.

The longer this goes on, the more demands of the family, the more the uncertainty, the more the frustration, we will lose these talented people at a moment in our history when we need the leadership to assist our allies and also to confront a very serious threat across the Indo-Pacific region at a time when the practice of warfare is changing second by second with technology.

When you have the proponents of AI warning us this week that AI could be the catastrophic destruction of our species, well, guess where that is going to be first manifested—in the military domain, I believe. That requires leaders of character, intelligence, compassion, and dedication to democracy. Those leaders now are questioning whether they can continue because of an attempt to suggest that this is not legal, which is wrong, and, ironically, again, to take away healthcare support for women who serve in the military that we extend to Federal prisoners in this country.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I thank Senator REED for underscoring the point that the Department of Defense is not breaking the law. There is legal precedence for what the Department is doing, and it has been reviewed by the Department of Justice that the Department of Defense is fully in accord with current law.

With that, I would like to go back to the nominee who would be the first female Superintendent of the Naval Academy. Mr. President, I renew my request with respect to Calendar No. 192.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let's talk about a few things.

First of all, we have heard talk of clear legal authority, clear legal precedent.

I wasn't here when the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island was pro-

viding that, but my understanding of it is that he is making the claim that there are judicial precedents for this. At least one of the cases he cited was from 1981. Significantly, that is a full 3 years before 10 U.S.C. section 1093 was even enacted into law. Talk about excruciating ironies. That was enacted into law as part of the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1985, and it was voted on by, among others, then-Senator Joe Biden. He voted for it.

So whatever 1981 case you are citing I don't know, but I am certain that it couldn't have involved 10 U.S.C. section 1093, the very statute that we are dealing with here, because it did not yet exist.

I am equally certain that whatever personnel within the Department of Justice that blessed this, whatever lawyers within the Department of Defense that blessed this are also part of the Biden administration and are ultimately serving at the pleasure of the President. So I wouldn't expect that they would come back with an answer that he didn't want because he and his administration have made clear that this is an all-of-government approach to make sure that the more abortions, the better, in the wake of Dobbs.

So I find it impossible to believe that any court could have addressed this particular issue, setting aside whether that 1981 judicial precedent that he cited that I haven't seen is the only one. Let's assume there were others. If there were others—there couldn't have been others even if they were decided after this was enacted into law in 1984 as part of the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1985 because this policy didn't exist. No, this policy didn't exist until just a couple of months ago. So it couldn't have come up.

Courts don't answer these questions in the abstract. Under article III of the Constitution, the courts are empowered only to resolve cases in controversy. The case in controversy requirement of article III means that you have to have standing. To have standing, you have to have an injury, in fact, fairly traceable to the conduct of the defendant that is subject to being remedied by competent authority of a court. That would have been lacking here because until just a couple of months ago, this did not exist. They could not have addressed this. So I am not sure what authorities the Department of Justice officials to whom my colleagues are referring were relying on, but it is not a ripe controversy that could have been capably adjudicated.

But, yeah, this is truly full of excruciating ironies—the fact that the same President who voted to support 10 U.S.C. section 1093 which unmistakably makes clear that we don't want Department of Defense funding going to perform abortions. No, they rely on this argument that is reminiscent of Pinocchio in the movie *Shrek 3*. I think it was technically called “*Shrek the Third*.” Pinocchio, in that movie, gets

away with all kinds of things by speaking in a form of legalese that would make any lawyer blush. It wouldn't be entirely untrue if I didn't say that I weren't entirely not opposed to this nonpolicy. It confuses people. That is sort of what they are doing here.

Now, look, if you want to make the argument that this is legal, first of all, I don't agree with it. This violates at least the spirit, if not also the letter, of the law. And even to the extent that it is somehow compliant with the letter of the law on a point that I am not willing to concede because this is, in fact, funding the process of getting abortions; this is, in fact, funding the endeavor of an abortion—something that we go out of our way in American law to do. This is one of the things that unite Americans of different political backgrounds, of different party affiliations.

Regardless of how you feel about abortion and under what circumstances it should or shouldn't be legal, Americans are overwhelmingly united behind the concept that we shouldn't use U.S. taxpayer dollars, thus forcing the American people at the point of a gun—because, ultimately, when you pay your taxes, you are paying at the point of a gun because, if you don't pay your taxes, people with guns are going to show up and make you pay. We don't force people, with the point of a gun, to fund abortions because we fundamentally recognize that is wrong regardless of how any individual feels about abortions themselves.

But this comparison is too cute by half. The very best I can say it is to analogize it this way: You really want to park in that handicap spot that is reserved for persons with disabilities and you are annoyed that it is there, so you park right up next to it, thus rendering it unusable space within the actual handicap spot. That is the best I can analogize this to.

To whatever extent you are complying with the letter of the law—and I don't concede that you are because I don't think you are—you are still really messing with the underlying purpose of the bill.

As to the point made moments ago by my colleague from Massachusetts—a distinguished lawyer, a Harvard law professor herself—that this somehow is lawful because Department of Justice lawyers said it is lawful, this is the same Department of Justice that has from time to time made mistakes, and I am understating that quite significantly here. This is, in any event, a clear affront to the men and women who elected each of us.

These laws are policy changes. Yes, they saw the need for a policy change in 1984 when they adopted the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1985. They understood that to put that in place, they couldn't just rely on Department of Defense policy; they needed to put it in statute. So they enacted a statute to do that. This flies in the face of that. You are actively pro-

moting, encouraging, and facilitating the performance of abortions.

Make no mistake, don't think of this as an evenhanded approach, one that aims broadly to facilitate reproductive care. No. The American people are not stupid. They cannot be fooled. We certainly must not be here. This is about Dobbs. This is about their disagreement, their fundamental rejection of Dobbs. This is about their fundamental disagreement and rejection of the notion that the U.S. Constitution doesn't give this authority over abortion to unelected judges who sit across the street in the Supreme Court of the United States. And it was never a constitutional principle to begin with. The Constitution doesn't address it. They disagree with that. I get it. But it is their disagreement about this that prompted this policy. They have been unmistakably clear about that.

Look, at the end of the day, this is a policy change. Policy changes need to be made by Congress—policy changes that involve a departure from the policy established in statute in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1985, which remains legally binding and in effect to this very moment. If they want to get that changed, it is not incumbent upon those who oppose this policy to get the statute changed; it is those who want this policy to go into effect.

So I return to my long-used refrain. If Secretary Austin wants to make policy, he should run for the Senate. He can't set this kind of policy from the E-ring of the Pentagon. It is wrong.

As to the points about military readiness, look, I don't think there is anyone more concerned about military readiness than my colleague from Alabama. He sits on the Armed Services Committee. He is a faithful member of that committee. He performs his oversight responsibilities very faithfully, very conscientiously. Nobody is more concerned about military readiness than Senator TOMMY TUBERVILLE—no one. But to whatever extent this impinges upon military readiness—the fact that he has concerns with this and is therefore raising objections—that door swings both ways. If anything, it cuts stronger in the opposite direction. To the extent this is interfering with military readiness, we should set down this policy right now and allow Congress to decide this in connection with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024, which we will be turning to in the coming weeks and months. Let's let Congress decide that. In the meantime, set aside this policy—this policy that is a departure, a clear violation of at least the spirit if not also the letter of the law—and let that be decided. If, in fact, this interferes with military readiness, let's put this down and not allow American national security to be impaired by that.

Now, I don't believe we are in that position. I believe that while it is ideal for us to be able to move these nominees forward and get them moved, it is

also very legitimate for a U.S. Senator to identify a problem, a simple problem arising out of the fact that the Department of Defense has a couple of things it wants to get done. It wants to get these people confirmed so that they can be promoted, and it also wants to put in place a policy. It wants to do both at the same time.

Senator TUBERVILLE won't—in fact, Senator TUBERVILLE can't physically—under the rules of the U.S. Senate, he cannot, he is physically unable to stop them from confirming these people. There are ways of going about it; it is just time-consuming to do it without his assent. So they want a shortcut, and they are asking for him to do them a favor—a favor that is unreciprocated—not just unreciprocated but a favor that he warned them he would not give them if they took this unfortunate step. He did that, I think, back in December. So knowing that as they did, they incurred this risk, to whatever degree.

They are right that this impacts military readiness at the expense of American national security. This is on him. He knew it would have this effect, and now he wants to force Senator TUBERVILLE, shame him—to shame him into doing him a favor by expediting this process so that the Senate won't have to go through the additional steps that the Senate will have to go through in order to get these people confirmed without Senator TUBERVILLE relinquishing it.

That is a shameful strategy on the Secretary of Defense, and he should be ashamed of the fact that he has become a policymaker. You can't legislate from the E-ring of the Pentagon. He has no business doing that here. He is thwarting, he is desecrating, he is disrespecting this institution and the sacred laws of our country—passed with really good reasons—in order for him to promote his own woke policy agenda. Shame on him for doing that.

I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first, anyone who suggests that the Secretary of Defense does not have a role—in fact, a responsibility—to shape policy in the Department of Defense—it is nonsense, and I would suspect that the person has never served in the military forces of the United States.

This is a policy that the Secretary of Defense is not only legally entitled to promulgate, but is, I think, compelled to clarify the position of the Department of Defense when it comes to this Dobbs decision and its effect on the military.

Now, the gentleman from Utah did not hear my opening remarks. I did not refer to judicial decisions; I was referring to opinions—very valid opinions—of the Department of Justice, dating back to 1981.

Section 1093, which he cites, is the most significant provision of the law.

What it does, it prevents funding to perform abortions and restricts the use of Department of Defense medical facilities to perform an abortion except when the life of the mother is in danger or in the case of rape or incest. I might suggest that I think my colleagues over there wouldn't even recognize that part of the law, but that is part of the law. There is no discussion of other aspects—i.e., providing transportation—and I pointed out Federal prisons provide transportation for female inmates requesting an abortion.

These are policy decisions that are reserved to the Secretary of Defense by statute, the same types of decisions he has to make every day. What are the physical standards for the troops in the U.S. military? Is that an act of Congress? No. I don't think anyone here would reasonably argue that we are the experts who should decide that and we know better than the Secretary of Defense.

There are a whole bevy of reasons, but section 1093 is the key statute, and it prevents Department funding being used for the performance of non-covered abortions. It makes no comment whatsoever in terms of any other aspects of incidental expenses.

The Department's policy is legal, as I pointed out. It is rooted in the longstanding Department of Justice interpretations of both the Hyde amendment and similar restrictions.

In fact, the Department of Defense General Counsel requested the Justice Department's views on the policy last fall because they wanted to be sure they were right before they went ahead, and they issued a lengthy and informative slip opinion, which is part of the record.

And they concluded that 10 United States Code section 1093, which my colleague from Utah continually refers to, does not prevent the Department from using appropriated funds to pay for servicemembers and their dependents to travel to obtain abortions that the Department cannot fund directly because of section 1093.

So this is not illegal. And what is contemptuous, I think, is not this debate over this policy. That is what we would do. It is ignoring years and years and years of respecting the promotion of military officers by the Department of Defense based on merit, based on their abilities, not their politics; and, for the first time, using military officers as tokens in a political game of trying to change things that they don't like, even though these policies are absolutely legal and have been confirmed by the Department of Justice and provide, I think, benefits that we provide to Federal prisoners. I would hate to see our soldiers—our female soldiers, particularly—treated any less appropriately than Federal prisoners.

So this argument is a lot of "sturm und drang." I think that is the German pronunciation for it.

The policy is legal. On one other point—a sort of simple-minded point—

if it is not legal, why hasn't it been challenged in court? Because it is legal.

Now, you can disagree with the policy, and many of my colleagues do. In fact, many of our colleagues have submitted legislation, and that legislation will be considered at some point. But no one has risen to the point of invoking this block of military promotions. It affects the military. It affects families. It affects our readiness. It affects our recruitment, if people look far enough down the road. And every day it continues, it does more and more damage. It is a cumulative effect. And I very, very strongly object to the continued decapitation of our military.

Let's carry this forward for 6 months or a year. We don't have a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I think we will because I think a majority of my colleagues will realize how important it is to have that. But it won't be done in an efficient, coordinated way. It will be objected to. It will be argued about.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps—no, we have to put this gentleman, General Smith, through the ringer. The Chief of Staff of the Army, the same thing.

We are in a situation with a tremendous pressure globally, assisting the Ukrainians in their battle; particularly, our new peer competition with China, trying to assimilate the technology that is changing the battlefield literally every second.

And now we are spending time arguing about what is within the legal authority of the Secretary of Defense and doing it by taking military officers and making them political tokens that you trade for something. I personally resent such treatment of professional officers in our military.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama earlier claimed that the Department of Defense's policy violates the law. The Senator from Utah then made a slight shift in how he described his complaint with the Department of Defense policy. He said it violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the law, and therein lies the difference.

The law that we are talking about here is the Hyde amendment, and that is a congressional prohibition on the Federal government paying for abortions.

Let's be clear about the Department of Defense policy. Servicemembers remain personally responsible for bearing the medical cost of abortion, just like they did before the Dobbs opinion, just like they did the year before that and the year before that and the year before that, and all the way back to when the Hyde amendment was passed.

Instead, what DOD policy does is it clarifies that servicemembers who need to travel out of State to access any kind of reproductive healthcare that is not available where they are stationed can request the time off to go get that care for themselves or a family member. That is it.

That is what people in the Peace Corps can do. That is what people in Federal prisons can do. And that is what our servicemembers can do. That is not a violation of the explicit language in the Hyde amendment.

And to stand up and claim that somehow what the Department of Defense has done is violate the law is simply not to read the law. The law is clear, and the Department of Defense continues to follow it.

But there are real consequences to this argument. I understand that there are Members of the Republican Party, Members of the Senate, who would like to change that policy. They would like the Department of Defense to follow a different policy. They can try to change the law. They can introduce an amendment. In fact, they already have introduced an amendment. But, in the meantime, they cannot hold hostage the promotions of our top military leaders. This jeopardizes our national defense.

Secretary Austin's letter that I earlier entered into the RECORD goes into great detail about how these holds that the Senator from Alabama has put on our top military leaders create mission vacancies that "incur an unnecessary and unprecedented degree of risk at a moment when our adversaries may seek to test our resolve."

He goes on to explain that the holds undermine power projection abroad, which, "diminishes our global standing as the strongest military in the world, which is in large part based on our stable processes and orderly transitions"—precisely what the Senator from Alabama is holding up.

The risks are even greater in new domains of potential conflict, and Secretary Austin does not mince words on who benefits.

Who benefits? Our Secretary of Defense identifies them: China, Russia, Iran, North Korea, and ISIS. The leaders whose nominations currently stand in purgatory are responsible, according to Secretary Austin, for "executing strategy, acquiring new technologies, enhancing tactical effectiveness, conducting joint training, and strengthening global alliances."

This isn't rhetoric. These are specific examples of U.S. national security interests that are endangered by these reckless holds.

I understand that the Senator from Alabama may not be persuaded by Secretary Austin's letter, but we have to face reality here. While we argue over the fact that the Republicans want to change current law under the Hyde amendment, we are endangering our national defense.

We need to move forward on the nominations that have already been approved by the servicemembers, by the White House, by our own committee. In the Senate Armed Services Committee, we need a vote so that these people can move to their next posts and do their jobs.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 199. If

confirmed, this nominee would be Deputy Commander for Air Force Materiel Command, which employs nearly 86,000 military and civilian airmen and manages a \$71.3 billion budget.

She is also a mama. She calls her kids the “Three Musketeers” and says they are the center of her universe.

These holds are the hardest on military families who are trying to figure out how to sign up for new schools, trying to establish their lives in their next deployment.

This nominee has already moved 17 times during her career, and she is now held by the Senator from Alabama, cannot move to her next deployment, cannot establish herself and her “Three Musketeers” and get them settled in school, and get her family in the place where they will be so that she can do her job for the American people.

We need people with decades of logistics management experience, and we need to treat them with some respect.

I renew my request with respect to Calendar No. 199.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to support my friend, my colleague Senator TOMMY TUBERVILLE as he continues to do the right thing, to do justice, as he continues this fight against the radical pro-abortion policies put in place by the Defense Department earlier this year.

And I remind everybody that this is a fight the Department of Defense picked. We didn’t pick this fight. They picked this fight. They are the ones who decided to change their policies to break the law.

This February 16 policy provides military personnel 3 weeks of paid leave and uses taxpayer dollars for travel expenses incurred while seeking an abortion—a clear violation of the Hyde amendment.

The policy is illegal. It violates Federal law, prohibiting funds to the DOD from being used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother is endangered, rape, or incest.

This policy takes the number of the Department of Defense abortions from less than 20 per year to an estimated 4,500 abortions.

The policy also describes abortion as reproductive healthcare. And I think that is the true issue here. You know, as an obstetrician, I am often asked two questions: When does life begin? What was the favorite part of a pregnancy for me?

I want to talk about the pregnancy for a second. I took care of hundreds, maybe thousands, of infertile couples, and, certainly, that first time when they had a pregnancy test that was positive was a great moment for me to share with them.

Four weeks after conception, we can see a baby’s heartbeat on the

ultrasound. That is another spectacular moment, for every couple to see that little baby’s heartbeat at 4 weeks after conception.

At 12 weeks, we could hear the baby’s heartbeat on a doppler. And it was one of the favorite moments for that mom and dad to hear that baby’s heartbeat, as well, especially those women who had recurrent miscarriages, those who had lost life early repeatedly and, through miracles and medicines, they were able to conceive and carry that pregnancy. They get through the first trimester. They hear their baby’s heartbeat. They know they are pretty much out of the woods.

One of my favorite visits came at about 15 to 16 weeks after conception. And the mom would come into my office, and I would ask her: How are you feeling?

And the nausea and vomiting are now over with, and I would ask her: Are you feeling the baby move yet?

And her eyes would light up. And she would say: Yes, Doctor. I can feel the baby move now. Isn’t that incredible?

So I always loved that.

And maybe the next visit—maybe, you know, at 18, 20 weeks along—they would come into the room, and I would examine the mom and put my hands on her abdomen. I could feel the baby’s head and the baby’s buttocks and maybe the limbs. And I would see the baby kind of start to move as I would kind of push on one spot. And maybe there was a little brother or sister in the room as well. And I would listen to the heartbeat. And almost every time that brother or sister would screech out: Mommy, is that my baby brother or sister?

This is at 18 weeks.

And, then, what was miraculous of all of this is that little baby, that fetus—the baby inside of the mom, the unborn baby—you could hear the heartbeat increase. You could hear it increase in intensity and the rate, recognizing this baby brother or sister’s voice.

The rest of the pregnancy, you know, maybe there was another 6 or 8 visits, and they were all fun, and they were all special.

I delivered a baby almost every day of my life for 25 years, and every labor was different. It was touchy; it was hard; it was easy—all those things. We had prolapsed cords, placentas separate, women with blood pressure problems seizing. I was blessed. I never lost a mom—never lost a mom. God blessed us and gave me the skill to get them through that.

Some labors were short, and some were long. Some lasted 30 minutes, and some lasted 2 days. Sometimes they would push for 2 minutes, and sometimes a woman would push for 3 hours. But my favorite moment of every pregnancy was delivering the baby and rubbing it down, and I would be checking its pulse and its heart rate and see if it was breathing and making sure it was dry and quietly praying to myself for

this newborn baby until I heard it start crying.

The favorite moment was giving that newborn baby to that mom and just watching her and observe her and just being able to watch that total nonjudgmental love of a mom for a newborn baby.

I take it backward from there and talk about when life begins. There are those people in this Congress that, even after a baby would survive abortion, they think that baby should not be treated and cared for. Certainly, I believe life certainly begins when the baby survives an abortion, and it is past the point of viability. We should do everything we can to help that baby out.

You know, you go backward. Viability is probably 20, 21 weeks—21 weeks probably today. Does life begin at 21 weeks? If that baby was born outside the womb, would it survive? At 21 weeks, it has a chance. I think most of us certainly agree life begins then. What about 18 weeks when that baby recognizes its brother’s or sister’s voice or at 16 weeks when mom can feel the baby move or at 12 weeks when we can hear the heartbeat or 6 weeks when we can see the heartbeat? Well, after years of study and doing this, I just—my heart tells me life begins at conception, and no one has been able to prove me wrong. I think we have to assume life begins at conception.

That is why it is so struggling for me to hear people calling abortionists reproductive healthcare. Reproductive healthcare, to me, means helping patients who can’t conceive, helping moms to have a healthy pregnancy, getting them—taking folic acid a year before they are trying to conceive, making sure they are doing everything they can to prevent spina bifida or encephalic babies, getting their sugars under control—all those things. That is what reproductive healthcare means to me, not taking the life of a baby.

Labeling abortion as “healthcare” is a tactic that is used to avert the radical abortion agenda. This irresponsible and unethical scheme politicizes our doctors’ offices and, in almost all cases, does not improve women’s health.

I am sorely disappointed in the military that I once served in, that my dad served, my uncle served, my great uncles, my mom’s dad, my mom’s uncle who died in World War II, my son who is now serving. I am disappointed in the military. It turned its attention and resources to terminating life.

I want to remind the Department of Defense they exist to protect the citizens of this great Nation, not to push a radical abortion agenda; that they took an oath to the Constitution to defend this country. Why are they picking this fight to end the lives of unborn babies? It is morally wrong; it is illegal; and the Pentagon needs to be held accountable.

The Biden administration has created the most politicalized Pentagon in

history, destroying their own morality, destroying recruiting, destroying the readiness of our military. Unelected bureaucrats cannot ignore Congress and change the law with a memo. This policy is outside the Department of Defense's mission to uphold and fight for life, not destroy it.

I am honored to stand up here and support my colleague Senator TUBERVILLE to fight back against this outrageous abortion policy, both in the name of protecting life and ensuring that our military uses resources to protect our homeland and our interests abroad. The policy is wrong. The DOD's policy is wrong, and until the military gets back to providing for our common defense and out of the business of providing abortions, I am proud to stand with Senator TUBERVILLE.

Madam President, I object and yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, the Department of Defense has adopted a healthcare policy that is both legal and necessary to protect the readiness of our forces. It also protects our national defense. These policies were also reviewed by the Department of Justice.

The prohibition to which my colleagues refer is the prohibition in the Hyde amendment of using Federal dollars to pay for abortions. Let me say this as clearly as I can. Under the Department of Defense's policy, servicemembers remain personally responsible for bearing the medical cost of abortion. That is true today; it was true last week; it was true the day after the Dobbs opinion; it was true the day before the Dobbs opinion; and for years, that has been the policy.

What has changed is that the DOD has clarified that servicemembers who need to travel out of State to access any kind of reproductive healthcare that is not available where they are stationed and what kind of healthcare might not be available—it might be abortion care; it might be IVF; it might be care for someone who has suffered a miscarriage—that any person who has suffered that personally or someone in their family can request time off to go get that care for themselves or for a family member. That is it. That is all we are talking about here.

Servicemembers do not get to decide where to serve. I am proud to support the DOD in saying that a change in station should not mean a change in your basic rights.

I appreciate that my colleagues have strong views on abortion. So do I. We are not going to agree on that. But all of us should be able to agree that we should not take steps that harm the people who volunteered to serve in our military; that if they need care that they cannot get in the State where they are, they should have an opportunity to go somewhere else. That is it.

There is no prohibition in law. There is no Hyde amendment violation here.

Instead, what we have is wholesale holding up the nominations of more than 200 of our top military leaders who cannot advance to the posts that they have been thoroughly vetted and are ready to be promoted into, cannot advance to their duty stations, cannot settle their families in their next assignments, cannot receive the increase in their pay that they are entitled to.

So, in a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 90. This is the person who would be America's military representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization but is currently being held up by the Senator from Alabama.

I will be asking for the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 94. Collectively, these are 37 nominees who have served in the Army for nearly 1,000 years.

I will be asking for the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 84. This nominee would command the Fifth Fleet, which operates in the Middle East.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 49. This is the man who is the Chief of Staff for Operation Warp Speed—one of the greatest achievements of the Trump administration—to rapidly develop tests and distribute lifesaving COVID vaccines.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 82. These 27 Air Force nominees have collectively served their country for more than 600 years. One of them, in fact, is a NASA astronaut who received his master's degree from MIT and commanded NASA's third longest duration commercial crew mission.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 47. This nominee would be Commanding General for the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command and U.S. Army Forces Strategic Command.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 97. Collectively, these 16 nominees have served in the Navy for more than 400 years.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 46. This nominee studied at the Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama and currently serves as Commander of the 10th Medical Group and Command Surgeon for the U.S. Air Force Academy.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 83. This nominee studied at the Squadron Officer School at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama and she is now capable and ready to serve as the Chief of Staff for Air Mobility Command at Scott Air Force Base in Illinois.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 48. She would serve as Deputy Chief of Staff for the Army's G-4, which is responsible for the Army's strategy policy plans and programming for logistics sustainment.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 50. Collectively, these two women have served in the Army for over 60 years. They deserve to be promoted.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 51. This man would

serve as Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Deterrence and Nuclear Integration for the Air Force.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 52. This nominee would be the Military Deputy and Director for the Army Acquisition Corps.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 86. Collectively, these 11 nominees have over 275 years of service in the Air Force.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 87. These two nominees have served the Air Force for over 55 years.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 88. These 10 nominees have served over 288 years. Together, they have nearly 20,000 flying hours of experience.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 89. This nominee is currently commanding the largest Army command in the Caribbean.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 91. This nominee is currently serving in Birmingham, AL, as Chief of Staff to the U.S. Army Reserve Deployment Support Command.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 92. This nominee is currently the Director for Joint Reserve Intelligence Support Element for Europe and Eurasia for the Defense Intelligence Agency, helping to make sure that Ukraine and our allies in Europe have the critical national security information they need so that they can compete on the battlefield.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 93. This nominee is currently the Deputy Commander for Support, providing security assistance to Ukraine.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 95. Collectively, these eight nominees have served in the Marine Corps for over 200 years. They deserve their promotions.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 96. These nominees have served in the Navy for over 55 years. Both are currently serving in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, making them responsible for the health and safety of our sailors, marines, and their families.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 98. Collectively, these two nominees have served in the Navy for 55 years. I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 99. These two have collectively served in the Navy for over 60 years, managing major weapons systems programs.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 100. This nominee is currently serving as the Director of Health and Training at the Defense Health Agency, and he is recognized as a Diplomate of the American Board of General Dentistry.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 101. This nominee will be the Commander of Naval Supply Systems Command, which makes sure the Navy has everything they need all around the world.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 102. These 13 nominees collectively served in the Navy for over 400 years.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 103. This nominee is currently serving as the Executive Assistant for the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency. We need people like this.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 104. These two nominees have collectively served the Navy for over 55 years, one currently serving as Information Warfare Commander.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 105. These four nominees have collectively served the Navy for over 100 years.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 106. These two nominees have served the Air Force for over 65 years. One of these nominees earned her nursing degree at Boston College and rose to become the chief nurse of the entire Air Force. She deserves her promotion.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 107, currently serving as the Commanding General for the Marine Corps forces in Japan.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 110. Collectively, these 23 nominees have over 620 years of service to the Air Force.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 111. This nominee would be the Deputy Commandant for Aviation for the Marine Corps, who advises the Marine Corps top officer of all aviation matters.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 205. This nominee would be the Commander of the 2nd Fleet and Joint Forces Command Norfolk—the only operational NATO command in North America, responsible for the North Atlantic and the Arctic. We need capable leaders like this.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 203. This pilot has flown more than 3,000 hours in the F-16 and the F-35. We need capable people like this.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 202. This nominee will be the Director of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 201. This nominee is an experienced information warfare officer. We need him in his post.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 200. This nominee is someone you can count on in a crisis. A native of San Juan, he was there to help his fellow Puerto Ricans after the earthquakes forced 7,500 people to leave their homes. He has stepped up and stepped up again for people who need him.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 198. This nominee will be the Commander of Air Combat Command, which is the primary provider of air combat forces to U.S. war-fighting commands all around the world.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 197. This nominee would be the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for War-Fighting Requirements and Capabilities.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 196. He will be the Deputy Commander for U.S. Central Command.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 195. He has logged more than 500 carrier-assisted landings and 2,800 flight hours in tactical aircraft. We need him.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 194. This nominee from Falmouth, MA, if confirmed, will be the Deputy Commander of the U.S. Fleet Forces Command, which is responsible for training and providing combat-ready Navy forces wherever combatant commanders need them, and we need him.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 193. This nominee will be the Commander of Naval Surface Forces and Commander of Naval Surface Forces, U.S. Pacific Fleet, where his mission will be to make sure the Navy has every capability we need for a force that is balanced, affordable, and resilient.

I will be asking the Senate to consider Calendar No. 191. This nominee will be the Commanding General for the Marine Expeditionary Force in U.S. Marine Corps Forces Japan.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 190. This nominee will be Deputy Commanding General for Futures and Concepts at Army Futures Command.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 188. This nominee will be Commander of Pacific Air Forces, which integrates airspace and cyber space capabilities to keep the Indo-Pacific open and free. He has flown more than 4,000 flight hours and previously served as the Commander for U.S. Forces in Japan.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 189. As a leader, she sees that our power as a nation comes from our moral strength and standing up for what we know as right. This nominee would be Pacific Air Forces Deputy Commander, making her the No. 2 for the nominee I just spoke about.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 187. If confirmed, this nominee would be Deputy Commander of U.S. Forces Korea and the Commander of the 7th Air Force.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 186. This nominee will be Deputy Chief of Staff for Air Force Futures, which is charged with representing the voice of tomorrow's airmen to be ready to defeat any future threats and capabilities our enemies wield. We need this person.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 185. If confirmed, this nominee would be Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Technology and

Logistics, making him the primary military adviser for everything the Air Force buys to keep us safe.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 184. This nominee took his first flight at 2 weeks old and became a command pilot with more than 2,500 flying hours.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar Nos. 182 and 183. This nominee will be the next Navy Surgeon General, making him the principal adviser to the Secretary of the Navy on medical matters.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 181. During his service, he has accumulated over 5,000 flight hours and over 1,100 carrier-assisted landings. He was a Top Gun instructor and later the Commander for the Naval Aviation Warfighting Development Center. He is entitled to his promotion.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 180. This nominee is also a Top Gun graduate, completing eight carrier deployments in the Western, Pacific, North Atlantic, Mediterranean, and North Arabian Seas.

I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 112. He would be the Director of the Defense Contract Management Agency, which manages 225,000 contracts valued at more than \$3½ trillion and 15,000 contractor locations worldwide.

I don't know what to say except that we have more than 200 people here who have dedicated their lives to the United States. They have volunteered for military service. They are all career. They are in it all the way. They are capable. They are talented. They serve our country. And right now, they have become the political football for the Senator from Alabama, and that is wrong.

These people deserve their promotions. They deserve to be treated with dignity and respect for the work they have put in for our Nation. It is the least we can do for them, for their families, and for the national security of the United States of America.

We need these people. We don't need to tell them we don't care about them. We need them. We need to retain them. We need to promote them. We need to use their talents.

Madam President, I renew my request with respect to each of the calendar numbers I have identified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Reserving the right to object, my position continues to be, follow the law or change the law. For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Ms. WARREN. I will yield to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I want to be very clear about a couple things. No.

1, this is the law. It is not called the Hyde amendment. There is a thing called the Hyde amendment that applies elsewhere outside the military. The military, the Pentagon, has its own statutory provision. It is not the Hyde amendment; it is 10 U.S.C. section 1093, adopted in 1984 as part of the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1985. It has been the law ever since then.

You can't use Pentagon money for this purpose, nor can you use Pentagon facilities for this purpose. Saying that you are not doing that even though you are paying people, you are giving them 3 weeks of paid leave time and paying all their travel expenses and their per diem in order to do this—that is openly flouting the spirit of the law, if not also the letter, in order to circumvent it.

I will go back to the analogy I used earlier. You go up to a parking space, thinking you want to park there, but it is a handicap space. It is reserved for people with disabilities. You don't have the disability symbol on your car, so you park next to it, but you deliberately park so close to the line that you render that spot unusable for anyone with disabilities who should need access to it. It still has the same effect because you are openly flouting the law. You are doing it in a deliberate attempt to cause the very same harms that particular law was designed to prevent.

Now, this is a policy choice, and it is a policy choice that Congress deliberately took away from the Department of Defense, deliberately took out of the hands of the Secretary of Defense. He seized that back.

Senator TUBERVILLE saw this coming. Back in December, he told Secretary Austin in no uncertain terms: You should not do this. This is in violation of the law, and if you do this, there will be problems. I will no longer cooperate with you if you try to seek unanimous consent to facilitate the confirmation of these flag officer promotions.

He made that really clear.

Secretary Austin made his choice the moment he decided to legislate from the E-ring of the Pentagon. He took on that risk, and now he has the audacity, through surrogates in the Senate, to come back to Senator TUBERVILLE and say: I got what I wanted. I did so in violation of the law. I am openly flouting the law—its spirit if not also the letter—and I also want you to cooperate with me, Senator TUBERVILLE. I want you to do what I say because that is more convenient for me.

That is not fair. That is not lawful. It is not legal. It is not kosher. It is not cool.

Look, the fact is, we could end this right now. I would love to end it right now. I can't speak for Senator TUBERVILLE, but I have a sneaking suspicion he would let these go right now. He would let you get every one of these men and women confirmed this very moment if you take this thing off the

table. But Secretary Austin took this hostage. He took all of these men and women hostage the moment he did this, having been forewarned by Senator TUBERVILLE. He can't now be heard to come back—having waived his right to do that—to come back and demand that Senator TUBERVILLE be somehow shamed into cooperating, into facilitating.

The other point here is, they can still get these people confirmed even without that compromise, which you could make tonight. If you put this thing off the table, you stop trying to achieve this through extortion, he will let them go right now. I am 99.99 percent sure of that, and that is pretty confident from me. He will do that right now. But even if you are not willing to do that, you could still get these people confirmed. You just don't want to do the hard work of doing it. It takes more time to do it without Senator TUBERVILLE's full cooperation.

So, look, if you really are serious about end-strength readiness, then that is what you would do. That is what someone would do if they were worried about end-strength readiness.

Let's talk about that for a moment. End-strength readiness shouldn't be confused with flag officer promotions. It is not where we see end-strength readiness, with flag officer promotions. It doesn't mean these men and women aren't deserving of their promotions or we wouldn't be willing and interested to see them confirmed so that they can have their promotions. But to say that it affects end-strength readiness disregards what flag officers are doing in the capacity they hold. I am not aware of any reason why that would affect our end-strength readiness, nor am I aware of any compelling reason why, without this policy—this policy that openly flouts the law—our military would suffer from an end-strength readiness problem. It is an absurd argument. In any event, it violates the law. They can't do this. It is the wrong branch of government. He doesn't have this power. He was forewarned, and he did the wrong thing anyway. We don't reward bad behavior that way. We certainly don't reward unlawful behavior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Alabama have repeatedly said that the Department of Defense is somehow violating the law.

Let's pull the statute out and just take a look at it. I want to read the words into the RECORD.

Under part (a) Restriction on Use of Funds:

Funds available to the Department of Defense may not be used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in a case in which the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

Period. That is it. It does not say that funds from the Department of Defense may not be used for travel. It

does not say that people may not have time off. It does not say that people may not be allowed to travel out of State. It has exactly one thing that it prohibits Federal funds from being used, and that is "may not be used to perform abortions."

Let me say again as clearly as I know how: The Department of Defense's rule clearly states that the servicemember will pay for her own medical services. It will not be the case that the Department of Defense will pay for abortion.

If the Senator from Utah wants to change that law, he certainly can introduce an amendment to do that. The same with the Senator from Alabama. But right now, the Department of Defense is following the law in the United States.

The Senator from Alabama's actions pose a grave threat to our national security and readiness. That is not just my view. It is the view of the Secretary of Defense and the former Secretaries of Defense serving in both Democratic and Republican administrations.

If the Senator from Alabama stays on this path, his actions will soon endanger the nomination of the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, an action we have never seen in the history of our Nation. We have 221 good people who have earned their promotions, who are ready to go to their next duty stations and serve their nation. They are being treated with disrespect; and this action is undermining our national defense.

I urge the Senator from Alabama to release his holds immediately and allow these senior military officers to receive the promotions that they have earned.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. With great respect for my friend and colleague from Massachusetts, the Pentagon itself acknowledged that while military abortions had been counted at maybe 20 or 30 per year in the past, this policy, which funds abortion—it just does—has increased to about 4,400 to maybe 4,500 a year. The causation and the number were estimated by the Pentagon itself based on this subsidy. This is a subsidy for abortion. They are, in fact, subsidizing abortion. The fact that they have engineered in a way that they think gets them around the technicalities of the law should mean very little to us as policymakers, as lawmakers, to the fact that they are openly flouting the law.

They are going through this trickery only because they don't like the law. They hate the fact that this became law, so they are trying to find a way to get around it.

They are, in fact, funding abortions. That is what you do when you pay somebody to travel, when you give them 3 weeks of paid leave to do something, when you fund their per diem—so you cover everything for them—you are funding abortion.

If the only argument you are left with is "we are not paying for the actual surgery itself; we are just paying for everything around it," when the value attached to the travel, to the per diem, to the paid leave time is a significant expense—an expense that I suspect in many, if not most, instances would well outpace the cost of the medical procedure itself—that's too cute by half. They are, in fact, funding abortion. That is what this does. It is done knowing, expecting, anticipating, and desiring that this would increase the number of abortions performed in the military every year to a significant degree. That is what they are doing, and it is wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BICENTENNIAL OF THE KENTUCKY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, as a polio survivor, I have a special appreciation for organizations that help those with conditions often overlooked in our society. The Kentucky School for the Deaf—KSD—in Danville, KY, is a remarkable example of such an organization, having dedicated itself to serving the deaf and hard of hearing for over two centuries. Today, I would like to recognize this institution for its outstanding work, as its students and faculty celebrate the school's bicentennial.

In a hearing world, it can be hard to imagine the life of the deaf. Nowhere was this misunderstanding more pronounced than throughout early human history. For centuries, the deaf were relegated to the outskirts of society, frequently sent to asylums for the insane, or otherwise forgotten. Many contended with Aristotle's opinion that the deaf were "incapable of education" due to their inability to hear. This was, unfortunately, the standing belief on deaf education for hundreds of years.

Gradual shifts in cultural attitudes and educational techniques led to slow but steady progress over time. The early days of deaf education were typi-

cally born from the philanthropic efforts of wealthy citizens, while schools were privately held and operated out of the country's east coast.

In the early 19th century, General Elias Barbee, then a member of the Kentucky State Senate, hoped to change that. Senator Barbee launched an effort to establish the first State-supported school for the deaf in the United States. In 1822, legislation was signed into law, bringing deaf schooling west of the Alleghenies for the first time in American history. Shortly thereafter, Barbee's daughter, who had been deaf since childhood, enrolled as the first of three students at the Kentucky school.

From the start, the institution intended to educate the whole person, preparing the deaf and hard of hearing for success in both academic and real-world settings. The school secured two Federal land grants, with the help of Kentucky's illustrious statesman Henry Clay, that were used to fund the construction of KSD's campus.

The board of trustees faced their first great hurdle early on: finding faculty to lead the fledgling school. They soon took up the training of John A. Jacobs, a young student at Centre College. Jacobs, often described as the "founding father" of the institution, would go on to serve as faculty for over 40 years and was integral to the school's success throughout its infancy. Under his leadership, the school prevailed through some of the most perilous periods of our Nation's history, even resisting three attempts from Confederate soldiers to occupy the school during the Civil War.

In recent history, the school has seen its campus and its student population flourish and expand. Meanwhile, opportunities for deaf children in public schools also became more widespread. In 1975, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act was signed into law by President Ford. This landmark legislation ensured equal access to education for every child, regardless of their disability, and marked a major turning point for deaf education in the United States.

Today, KSD remains a leading institution for deaf education throughout the country. It promises an academic experience uniquely suited to the needs of the deaf and hard of hearing and affords its students a rare opportunity to learn as the hearing do: directly communicating and connecting with their peers.

Through English and sign language, students freely exchange ideas in the classroom, participate in afterschool activities, and learn the skills needed to succeed on their own after graduation.

For over 200 years, KSD has empowered deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals to lead a life of dignity and self-sufficiency when many thought it impossible. This Kentucky institution has made an indelible impact on the history of deaf education and the thou-

sands of students who have called it home.

I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in recognizing the Kentucky School for the Deaf for their tireless dedication to educating and enriching the lives of America's deaf and hard of hearing. Thank you for 200 years of remarkable service to the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

58TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate and extend my heartfelt congratulations to Head Start on its 58th anniversary to celebrate the program's 58 years of providing early learning to more than 30 million children since 1965. As the only Head Start alumnus along with Senator RAPHAEL WARNOCK serving in the U.S. Senate, I am proud to honor this transformative program that has made a significant and positive difference in the lives of millions of children and families across our great Nation.

Head Start's legacy is one of hope, opportunity, and equity. Since its inception in 1965, this comprehensive early childhood education program has been a beacon of support for vulnerable children and families, helping break the cycle of poverty and providing a strong foundation for success. By prioritizing the educational, health, and developmental needs of low-income children, Head Start has been instrumental in leveling the playing field and ensuring that every child has an equal chance to thrive.

My personal experience as a Head Start alumnus fuels my unwavering commitment to championing policies that strengthen early childhood education and invest in the future of our Nation's youth. I understand firsthand the profound influence that Head Start can have on a child's life, setting them on a trajectory towards academic achievement, social-emotional growth, and lifelong success. By nurturing the whole child and fostering a love for learning, Head Start equips children with the tools they need to reach their full potential.

Head Start has demonstrated its ability to adapt and evolve with the changing needs of our society. Over the past 58 years, the program has expanded its reach, providing comprehensive services to millions of children and families. Head Start has embraced innovation, incorporating evidence-based practices and leveraging community partnerships to ensure that children receive the highest quality early education and support services available.

I applaud Head Start's ongoing commitment to inclusivity and diversity, recognizing that every child brings unique strengths and experiences to the classroom. By embracing cultural competency and promoting bilingual education, Head Start celebrates the rich tapestry of our nation and prepares children to thrive in an increasingly interconnected world.

As we celebrate this important milestone, we must also acknowledge the challenges that lie ahead. Access to high-quality early childhood education remains a critical issue for many families, especially those living in underserved communities. As Head Start continues to grow and evolve, we must redouble our efforts to ensure that all children, regardless of their ZIP Code or socioeconomic background, have access to this life-changing program.

Head Start's success is a testament to the power of investing in our children and communities. The return on investment in early childhood education is well documented, yielding significant long-term benefits for individuals, families, and society as a whole. We must seize this moment to strengthen and expand Head Start, recognizing that our Nation's future prosperity depends on the opportunities we afford our youngest citizens.

I would also like to express my gratitude and provide special recognition to my home Head Start program that helped to give me the best start in life—Nambe Head Start—and Senator WARNOCK's home Head Start program—Savannah Head Start. Without the dedicated educators and program directors at these programs, we would not be where we are today.

In conclusion, I proudly stand before my distinguished colleagues to commemorate the 58th anniversary of Head Start and extend my heartfelt congratulations to this remarkable program. Let Congress reaffirm its commitment to early childhood education and its Members work together to ensure that Head Start's profound effect reaches every child in need. By investing in our children today, we will build a brighter, more equitable future for all Americans.

58TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate and extend my heartfelt congratulations to Head Start on its 58th anniversary to celebrate the program's 58 years of providing early learning to more than 30 million children since 1965. As the only Head Start alumnus along with Senator BEN RAY LUJÁN serving in the U.S. Senate, I am proud to honor this transformative program that has made a significant and positive difference in the lives of millions of children and families across our great Nation.

Head Start's legacy is one of hope, opportunity, and equity. Since its inception in 1965, this comprehensive early childhood education program has been a beacon of support for vulnerable children and families, helping break the cycle of poverty and providing a strong foundation for success. By prioritizing the educational, health, and developmental needs of low-income children, Head Start has been instrumental in leveling the playing field and ensuring that every child has an equal chance to thrive.

My personal experience as a Head Start alumnus fuels my unwavering commitment to championing policies that strengthen early childhood education and invest in the future of our Nation's youth. I understand firsthand the profound influence that Head Start can have on a child's life, setting them on a trajectory towards academic achievement, social-emotional growth, and lifelong success. By nurturing the whole child and fostering a love for learning, Head Start equips children with the tools they need to reach their full potential.

Head Start has demonstrated its ability to adapt and evolve with the changing needs of our society. Over the past 58 years, the program has expanded its reach, providing comprehensive services to millions of children and families. Head Start has embraced innovation, incorporating evidence-based practices, and leveraging community partnerships to ensure that children receive the highest quality early education and support services available.

I applaud Head Start's ongoing commitment to inclusivity and diversity, recognizing that every child brings unique strengths and experiences to the classroom. By embracing cultural competency and promoting bilingual education, Head Start celebrates the rich tapestry of our Nation and prepares children to thrive in an increasingly interconnected world.

As we celebrate this important milestone, we must also acknowledge the challenges that lie ahead. Access to high-quality early childhood education remains a critical issue for many families, especially those living in underserved communities. As Head Start continues to grow and evolve, we must redouble our efforts to ensure that all children, regardless of their ZIP Code or socioeconomic background, have access to this life-changing program.

Head Start's success is a testament to the power of investing in our children and communities. The return on investment in early childhood education is well documented, yielding significant long-term benefits for individuals, families, and society as a whole. We must seize this moment to strengthen and expand Head Start, recognizing that our Nation's future prosperity depends on the opportunities we afford our youngest citizens.

I would also like to express my gratitude and provide special recognition to my home Head Start program that helped to give me the best start in life—Savannah Head Start—and Senator LUJÁN's home Head Start program—Nambe Head Start. Without the dedicated educators and program directors at these programs, we would not be where we are today.

In conclusion, I proudly stand before my distinguished colleagues to commemorate the 58th anniversary of Head Start and extend my heartfelt congratulations to this remarkable program. Let Congress reaffirm its commitment to early childhood education

and its Members work together to ensure that Head Start's profound effect reaches every child in need. By investing in our children today, we will build a brighter, more equitable future for all Americans.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO NATHAN SMALL

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, with my colleague Senator JIM RISCH and Representative MIKE SIMPSON, I congratulate Nathan Small, who is retiring from serving as chairman of the Fort Hall Business Council, the governing body of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes on the Fort Hall Reservation.

Chairman Small has been an unwavering voice for his people for roughly 40 years, leading in various roles for the Fort Hall Business Council since the late 1980s. He has dedicated his life to protecting the Tribes' rights under the 1868 Treaty of Fort Bridger and other Federal laws and tirelessly worked to preserve the traditional ways of life of the Shoshone-Bannock people. He is respected not only in Idaho for his efforts to protect the rights of all Idaho Tribes but also on the national level for his inspiring and effective advocacy in ensuring the United States upholds its treaty and trust responsibilities to Tribal governments.

We have been grateful for his steady leadership, especially while we partnered with him and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes on various efforts over the years. Chairman Small's wealth of knowledge and experience was pivotal to his advocacy on the Tribes' behalf. He is also a member of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribal Bar Association and has been both a prosecutor and public defender in Tribal court. He was instrumental in opening the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' first gaming operation and was gaming manager from 1990 to 1998. He also served in the Tribes' Water Resources Department in the Environmental Waste Program, advocating for the protection of the Reservation's water and land. He is a founding Board member and is Secretary of the Coalition of Large Tribes, which advocates for the sovereign rights of Tribes.

Thank you, Chairman Small, for working with us to properly recognize tribal sovereignty and the Federal Government's treaty and trust obligations to Tribes. We hope that retirement will provide you more time to spend enjoying the outdoors you love. We thank you for your leadership and wish you all the best.●

TRIBUTE TO LORELEY GODFREY

● Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, as we mark Mental Health Awareness Month, I am honored to recognize Loreley Godfrey of Portsmouth as May's Granite Stater of the Month. At age 18, Loreley has become a powerful force advocating for youth mental health education in New Hampshire.

Loreley was driving when her best friend had a panic attack next to her in the passenger's seat. Pulling to the side of the road, Loreley felt ill-equipped to handle the situation, and she did not know what to do besides hold her friend's hand and urgently search online for resources. The experience made Loreley wonder why many teens such as herself are not prepared to respond to a mental health crisis, where seconds can make a difference. Since she was a member of the Governor's Youth Advisory Council on Substance Misuse and Prevention, she interviewed the 17 other students on the panel and found that her experience was not unique—few had had any mental health education at school.

Loreley teamed up with a New Hampshire State senator to craft a bipartisan bill to provide schools with lesson plans on mental health. Although the bill did not pass the house in April, Loreley is committed to continuing her advocacy for mental health education in New Hampshire, even as she goes off to college this fall. Loreley's efforts are a testament to how young people can make a tremendous difference in New Hampshire. And her leadership extends beyond mental health advocacy, having led multiple rallies for sustainability in Portsmouth and being one of New Hampshire's first female Eagle Scouts. Loreley exemplifies the Granite State spirit of engaged, citizen-led public service, and I look forward to seeing all that she will do in the future to make New Hampshire and our country an even better place.●

TRIBUTE TO KARLA APONTE

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Karla Aponte, a spring 2023 intern in my Miami office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Karla recently graduated from the St. Thomas University College of Law. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Karla for her work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of her successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO VICTOR BETANCOURT

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Victor Betancourt, a spring 2023 intern in my Miami office, for the hard work he has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Victor attends Florida International University, with FIU Embrace Program. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Victor for his work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of his successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO GRACE LILI BOULOY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Grace Lili Bouloy, a recent intern

in my Tallahassee office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Grace is a student at Florida State University, where she is majoring in political science. She possesses many wonderful qualities that include an aptitude to evaluate complex issues, a strong work ethic, and a kindness that inspires.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Grace for her work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of her successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO LENA MARIA DUQUE

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Lena Maria Duque, a spring 2023 intern in my Tallahassee office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Lena is a student at Florida State University, where she is majoring in economics and management. She possesses many wonderful qualities that include an aptitude to evaluate complex issues, a strong work ethic, and a kindness that inspires.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Lena for her work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of her successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ISABELLA FURELOS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Isabella Furelos, a spring 2023 intern in my Miami office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Isabella is a student at Miami-Dade Honors College, where she majors in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Isabella for her work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of her successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ANA CAROLINA MERLO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Ana Carolina Merlo, a spring 2023 intern in my Tallahassee office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Ana is a student at Florida State University, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Ana for her work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of her successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ELIJAH MIDGLEY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Elijah Midgley, a spring 2023 intern in my Miami office, for the hard work he has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Elijah is a student at the University of Central Florida, where he is an anthropology major. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Elijah for his work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of his successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL ENRIQUE NIETO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Daniel Enrique Nieto, a spring 2023 intern in my Tallahassee office, for the hard work he has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Daniel is a student at Florida State University, where he is majoring in international affairs and political science. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Daniel for his work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of his successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CATHERINE ELIZABETH PATTILLO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Catherine Elizabeth Pattillo, a recent intern in my Tallahassee office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Catherine is a student at Florida State University, where she is majoring in history and pre-law. She possesses many wonderful qualities that include an aptitude to evaluate complex issues, a strong work ethic, and a kindness that inspires.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Catherine for her work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of her successes in the years to come as she pursues a career in law.●

TRIBUTE TO DEBORAH LYN PHILIPS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Deborah Lyn Philips, a spring 2023 intern in my Orlando office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Deborah is currently studying at Polk State College, where she is majoring in political science and government. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Deborah for her work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of her successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER RESTREPO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Christopher Restrepo, a spring 2023

intern in my Tallahassee office, for the hard work he has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Christopher is a student at Florida State University, where he is majoring in finance. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Christopher for his work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of his successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH RICHARDSON

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Elizabeth Richardson, a recent intern in my Tallahassee office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Liz recently graduated from Florida State University, where she majored in history. She possesses many wonderful qualities that include an aptitude to evaluate complex issues, a strong work ethic, and a kindness that inspires.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Liz for her work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of her successes in the years to come as she pursues a career in law.●

TRIBUTE TO REBECA RODRIGUEZ

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Rebeca Rodriguez, a recent intern in my Tallahassee office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Becky is a student at Florida State University, where she is majoring in human resource management. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

Becky believes that service and sacrifice are essential to achieving the American dream. She learned this lesson, along with many others, from her grandparents who fled Cuba to make a better life for their family in the United States. Becky strives to honor them by being the best version of herself in all that she does.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Becky for her work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of her successes in the years to come as she pursues a career in law.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHELLE ROSENBERG

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Michelle Rosenberg, a spring 2023 intern in my Miami office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Michelle recently graduated from Florida International University, where she majored global affairs. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Michelle for her work with my office,

and I look forward to hearing of his successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO IAN SEIBERT

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Ian Seibert, a spring 2023 intern in my Tallahassee office, for the hard work he has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Ian is a student at Florida State University, where he is majoring in finance. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Ian for his work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of his successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO LUIS ADRIAN SORIA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Luis Adrian Soria, a spring 2023 intern in my Orlando office, for the hard work he has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Luis recently graduated from the University of Central Florida, where he majored in legal studies. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Luis for his work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of his successes in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO LILLIETTE SOTOLONGO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Lilliette Sotolongo, a spring 2023 intern in my Miami office, for the hard work she has done for my office and the people of Florida.

Lilliette recently graduated from Florida International University, where she majored in political science and international relations. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who was devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Lilliette for her work with my office, and I look forward to hearing of her successes in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 7:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, 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. 2792. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study and rulemaking on the definition of the term "small entity" for purposes of the securities laws, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2795. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers with a multi-class stock structure to make certain disclosures in any proxy or consent solicitation material, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2796. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Advocate

for Small Business Capital Formation to provide educational resources and host events to promote capital raising options for traditionally underrepresented small businesses, and for other purposes.

At 9:50 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3746. An act to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2792. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study and rulemaking on the definition of the term "small entity" for purposes of the securities laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2795. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers with a multi-class stock structure to make certain disclosures in any proxy or consent solicitation material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2796. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation to provide educational resources and host events to promote capital raising options for traditionally underrepresented small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

(Legislative Day May 30, 2023)

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 3746. An act to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling.

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-1254. A communication from the Director of External Relations, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a corrected report entitled "Economic Impact of Section 232 and 301 Tariffs on U.S. Industries, Investigation No. 332-591, USITC Publication 5405, March 2023"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1255. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress: Planning Grant Implementation Initial Report"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1256. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Report"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1257. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting,

pursuant to law, a report entitled “Child Welfare Outcomes 2020: Report to Congress”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1258. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Procedures for Exempt Organizations determination letters for the electronically submitted Form 8940” (Rev. Proc. 2023-12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2023; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1259. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report to Congress on Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) Section 1332 State Innovation Waivers”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1260. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “FY 2021 Report to Congress: Review of Medicare’s Program for Oversight of Accrediting Organizations and the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Validation Program”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1261. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Data Mining Activities by Federal Agencies” received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1262. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification entitled “Certification of Countries That Are Not Fully Cooperating with U.S. Anti-Terrorism Efforts” received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1263. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2023-0029 - 2023-0033); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1264. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Determination Under section 7034(I) (5) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2023 (Div. K, P.L. 117-328)”; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1265. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of intent to provide assistance to Ukraine, including for self-defense and border security operations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1266. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Determination Under Section 506(a) (1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (FAA) to Provide Military Assistance to Ukraine”; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1267. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2023-0034 - 2023-0039); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1268. A communication from the Supervisory Regulations Coordinator, Centers for

Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Policy and Regulatory Changes to the Omnibus COVID-19 Health Care Staff Vaccination Requirements; Additional Policy and Regulatory Changes to the Requirements for Long-Term Care (LTC) Facilities and Intermediate Care Facilities for Individuals With Intellectual Disabilities (ICFs-IID) to Provide COVID-19 Vaccine Education and Offer Vaccinations to Residents, Clients, and Staff; Policy and Regulatory Changes to the Long Term Care Facility COVID-19 Testing Requirements” (RIN0938-AU75) (RIN0938-AU57) (RIN0938-AU33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2023; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1269. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2023; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1270. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2023; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1271. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2023; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1272. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Annual Reporting and Disclosure” (RIN1210-AB97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2023; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1273. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “2020-2021 Report to Congress on Organ Donation and the Recovery, Preservation, and Transportation of Organs”; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1274. A joint communication from the Chairman and the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2022 through March 31, 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1275. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the third transmittal of legislative proposals that support the President’s Fiscal Year 2024 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1276. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s fiscal year 2022 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1277. A communication from the Staff Director, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s fiscal year 2022 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1278. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Chief Human Capital Officers Council’s annual report to Congress for 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1279. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s fiscal year 2022 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1280. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled “To extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security and for other purposes”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1281. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Peace Corps’ fiscal year 2022 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1282. A communication from the Chair of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2022 through March 31, 2023 and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1283. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Agency for Global Media, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bureau’s fiscal year 2022 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1284. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled “Foreign Language Proficiency Awards for Immigration Officers”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1285. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2022 through March 31, 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1286. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2022 through March 31, 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1287. A communication from the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for

the period from October 1, 2022 through March 31, 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1288. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from October 1, 2022 through March 31, 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1289. A communication from the Director of Equal Employment Opportunity, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Service's fiscal year 2022 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002 received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1290. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-94, "Street Vendor Advancement Amendment Act of 2022"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1291. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2023-03, Introduction" (FAC 2023-03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-20. A resolution from the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico expressing its enthusiastic support for the agreement entered into by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Forum of Presidents of the Legislative Bodies of Central America and the Caribbean Basin (FOPREL), which provides for the establishment of a FOPREL branch office in Puerto Rico; establish the rules and objectives of said office; provide for the duties and operations of the branch office; for the purpose of strengthening the cooperation among the various parliaments that are members of this International Body and cementing ties among all Latin American peoples; among others; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 987

Laws are the vehicle that implements the will of the People and establish the foundation for a progressive, inclusive, and democratic society. The role of parliaments, which are the institutions that best represent the power of citizens within the government structure, is to create legal frameworks that are innovative, efficient, and consistent with the goal of creating the necessary conditions to meet the challenges faced in a modern society. Thus, a parliamentary system is not just an internal mechanism that each country can use to find answers, but one that can be used to exchange experiences and ideas with other legislative bodies in order to face the challenges of the 21st century in a comprehensively and thoroughly.

The Forum of Presidents of the Legislative Bodies of Central America, the Caribbean Basin and Mexico (FOPREL, Spanish acronym) is the highest inter-parliamentary organization in the Central American, Caribbean Basin, and Mexico region. Its mission is to be: (i) a space for political dialogue, (ii) an organization that promotes inter-parliamentary diplomacy, (iii) a Forum to reach agreements on regional legislative initiatives directed at strengthening national legislation, (iv) a facilitator for the generation of knowledge and to strengthen the parliamentary sphere, (v) a nexus between the legislative, executive, and judicial powers, civil society, and multilateral organizations, (vi) an inter-parliamentary network that promotes the sharing of experiences, good practices, and technical and financial cooperation; and (vi) an institution for the formation of alliances geared towards achieving common goals. Therefore, FOPREL has the authority to enter into agreements with parliaments within and without the region as well as to enter into cooperation agreements with other institutions in order to support its projects and programs.

FOPREL's Charter establishes that the institution "may open branch offices in all countries that are full members of the Forum in order to implement and create programs and projects that contribute to capacity building and strengthen the ties between the aforementioned parliaments and International Organizations." FOPREL's "2022-2027 Institutional Development Plan" states that "branch offices shall be established in the countries that are members of FOPREL and such offices shall be granted the institutional tools necessary for their administration and operation."

During FOPREL's 25th Special Meeting held on November 26, 2021, in the Dominican Republic, an agreement was reached to "create a FOPREL branch office within the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico that shall serve as a liaison between Puerto Rico and the countries of the Caribbean Basin that are members of FOPREL." The new office shall undertake, administer, and carry out projects to further FOPREL's institutional goals, and shall serve as a liaison between Puerto Rico, the countries of the Caribbean Basin and all other full and observer members of FOPREL.

This Legislative Assembly believes that the establishment of a FOPREL branch office on our Island shall enable Puerto Rico to join in progressive conversations on different topics and challenges and provide Puerto Rico with access to answers and solutions that shall, in turn, allow for the development and drafting of more effective, sensible, and appropriate legislation to address the needs of Puerto Rican society.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:

Section 1.—To express our enthusiastic support for the agreement entered into by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Forum of Presidents of the Legislative Bodies of Central America and the Caribbean Basin (FOPREL) at the 25th Extraordinary Meeting held on November 26, 2021, which provides for the establishment of a FOPREL branch office in Puerto Rico for the purpose of strengthening cooperation among the different parliaments that are members of this International Body and cementing ties among all Latin American peoples.

Section 2.—A branch office of the Forum of Presidents of the Legislative Bodies of Central America, the Caribbean Basin and Mexico (FOPREL) is hereby established within the House of Representatives, in the city of San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Section 3.—FOPREL branch office shall be subject to FOPREL's regulatory framework,

depending hierarchically and administratively on the Permanent Secretary, as provided in Articles 9, 10, and 11 of the Institutional Bylaws, adopted in the 24th Special Meeting of the International Body held on August 10, 2021.

Section 4.—FOPREL branch office, in coordination with the FOPREL's Permanent Secretary shall enact bylaws to provide for its operation and management. Furthermore, it shall take legal and administrative actions as appropriate for its efficient operation as an International Parliamentary Body in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Section 5.—FOPREL branch office may undertake, administer, and carry out projects to further FOPREL's institutional goals, as well as to collaborate as necessary in any and all processes at the request of the House of Representatives upon authorization of FOPREL's Permanent Secretary.

Section 6.—The FOPREL branch office's work agenda includes, but is not limited to:

(a) Facilitating and promoting actions within the framework of Collaboration Agreement No. 2021-003 which is the governing instrument of the Institutional Fellowship and Collaboration Alliance between the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Chamber of Deputies of the Dominican Republic, entered into under Resolution No. RE-VVV-01-28112021.

(b) Developing a Regional Program for Inter Parliamentary Action and the Attainment of Sustainable Development Goals, as provided in Resolution No. RE-XXXIX-04-25022021.

(c) Serving as a liaison between the countries of the Caribbean Basin and all other full and observer members of FOPREL.

(d) Addressing all other matters assigned by FOPREL.

Section 7.—Upon its approval, a copy of this Resolution shall be delivered to the Forum of Presidents of the Legislative Bodies of Central America, the Caribbean Basin and Mexico (FOPREL) as well as to each member thereof. Furthermore, this Resolution shall be translated into English and delivered to the President of the United States and the leadership of the United States Congress.

Section 8.—This Resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

POM-21. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee urging state agencies to expand comprehensive cardiovascular screening programs to allow for earlier identification of patients at risk of cardiovascular events; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 44

Whereas, cardiovascular disease is the leading cause of death in the United States; and,

Whereas, in the United States, approximately 21 million patients have been diagnosed with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) and are at risk of a cardiovascular event, according to the U.S. Census Bureau; and,

Whereas, the Mayo Clinic states that ASCVD is linked to the buildup of cholesterol in the arteries, and the risk of associated events can be modified by lowering low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C); and

Whereas, in 2016, nearly 70 million adults in the United States had higher than recommended LDL-C levels; and

Whereas, 43.1 million people in the United States are currently treated with lipid-lowering therapies to manage cardiovascular risk; and

Whereas, only 20 percent of people with ASCVD who are taking statins, one of the

leading lipid-lowering therapies, actually achieve healthy levels of LDL-C; and

Whereas, the total direct and indirect cost of ASCVD in the United States was \$555 billion in 2016 and is projected to climb to \$1.1 trillion by 2035, according to the American Heart Association; and

Whereas, in Tennessee, 579,200 adults have been told by a health professional that they had angina, a stroke, a heart attack, or coronary heart disease, which are some of the manifestations of ASCVD; and

Whereas, in Tennessee, 10,491 people had ASCVD as an underlying cause of death; and

Whereas, in Tennessee, 280,700 adults reported experiencing a heart attack in their lifetime, and 243,600 adults reported experiencing a stroke in their lifetime; and

Whereas, Tennessee spends an estimated \$3.41 billion on direct medical expenses for ASCVD care each year; now, therefore;

Be it resolved by the Senate of the One Hundred Thirteenth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the House of Representatives concurring, That we urge state agencies to expand comprehensive cardiovascular screening programs to allow for earlier identification of patients at risk of cardiovascular events; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge state agencies to explore ways to collaborate with federal and national agencies to establish or expand comprehensive cardiovascular screening programs; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge an update of the State's cardiovascular plan to accelerate quality improvements in the care rendered to these patients such that screening, treatment, monitoring, and improved health outcomes are achieved.

Resolved, That we support the creation of policies to decrease the rising number of deaths of Americans as a result of ASCVD; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the members of the Tennessee Congressional Delegation, and other federal and state government officials and agencies as appropriate.

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 Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 1763. A bill to include smoke in the definition of disaster in the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 1764. A bill to improve Federal activities relating to wildfires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1765. A bill to require the Federal Aviation Administration to establish evacuation standards for transport category airplanes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1766. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on overdoses among members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1767. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for emergency grants to safeguard essential health care workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 1768. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Taliban, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1769. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a demonstration project testing Whole Child Health Models, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1770. A bill to expand the imposition of sanctions under the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 with respect to human rights abuses in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China and to counter the genocidal policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 1771. A bill to authorize additional district judges for the district court for the eastern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1772. A bill to establish a national mercury monitoring program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1773. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national outreach and education strategy and research to improve behavioral health among the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander population, while addressing stigma against behavioral health treatment among such population; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CARPER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. FETTERMAN):

S. 1774. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for an increased Federal medical assistance percentage for State expenditures on certain behavioral health services furnished under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 1775. A bill to amend the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to require recipients of Federal awards to collect and report data relating to sub-awards granted to entities outside of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1776. A bill to provide for the protection of and investment in certain Federal land in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1777. A bill to engage in cybersecurity cooperation with Abraham Accords coun-

tries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 1778. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a study and research and demonstration on agrivoltaic systems; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1779. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the new clean vehicle credit to include clean vehicles with fewer than 4 wheels; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1780. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into self-determination contracts with Tribal organizations to carry out the authority of the Food Safety and Inspection Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1781. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to provide a uniform 8-digit subheading number for all whiskeys; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1782. A bill to provide for the entry of infant formula and infant formula base powder free of duty and free of quantitative limitation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MULLIN:

S. 1783. A bill to provide for the equitable settlement of certain Indian land disputes regarding land in Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 1784. A bill to increase language access to behavioral health services at eligible health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1785. A bill to establish programs to address addiction and overdoses caused by illicit fentanyl and other opioids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 227. A resolution calling on the President to support the creation of an international special tribunal to prosecute Russia's aggression against Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 228. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Indiana Pacers' 1972-1973 American Basketball Association Championship and their third American Basketball Association Championship in 5 seasons; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. Res. 229. A resolution designating May 2023 as "National Brain Tumor Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 230. A resolution recognizing the 102nd anniversary of the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. Con. Res. 11. A concurrent resolution expressing the need for the Senate to provide advice and consent to ratification of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 120

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 120, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students.

S. 173

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 173, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 179

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 179, a bill to require the designation of composting as a conservation practice and activity, to provide grants and loan guarantees for composting facilities and programs, and for other purposes.

S. 305

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) 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. 363

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 363, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the individuals and communities who volunteered or donated items to the North Platte Canteen in North Platte, Nebraska, during World War II from December 25, 1941, to April 1, 1946.

S. 364

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 364, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expand access to school-wide arts and music programs, and for other purposes.

S. 474

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen reporting to the CyberTipline related to online sexual exploitation of children, to modernize liabilities for such reports, to preserve the contents of such reports for 1 year, and for other purposes.

S. 613

At the request of Mr. TUBERVILLE, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 613, a bill to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in athletics, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth.

S. 626

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 626, a bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins to honor and memorialize the tragedy of the Sultana steamboat explosion of 1865.

S. 704

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for interest-free deferment on student loans for borrowers serving in a medical or dental internship or residency program.

S. 754

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 754, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to modify requirements for local school wellness policies.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE) were added as cosponsors of S. 759, a bill to authorize the National Detector Dog Training Center, and for other purposes.

S. 761

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr.

KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 761, a bill to combat forced organ harvesting and trafficking in persons for purposes of the removal of organs, and for other purposes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 815, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 831

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 831, a bill to address transnational repression by foreign governments against private individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 838

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 838, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program.

S. 886

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 886, a bill to authorize the location of a monument on the National Mall to commemorate and honor the women's suffrage movement and the passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, and for other purposes.

S. 889

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 889, a bill to provide consumer protections for students.

S. 928

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to prepare an annual report on suicide prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 954

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to eligible entities

to develop and implement a comprehensive program to promote student access to defibrillation in public elementary schools and secondary schools.

S. 1159

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1159, a bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to modify the requirements associated with small business loan data collection, and for other purposes.

S. 1161

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1161, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to reauthorize the voluntary public access and habitat incentive program.

S. 1176

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1176, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1191

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1191, a bill to direct the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to establish a K-12 Cybersecurity Technology Improvement Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1236

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1236, a bill to add suicide prevention resources to school identification cards.

S. 1256

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1256, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require certain air carriers to provide reports with respect to maintenance, preventative maintenance, or alterations, and for other purposes.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1271, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to trafficking of illicit fentanyl and its precursors by transnational criminal organizations, including cartels, and for other purposes.

S. 1280

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from West Vir-

ginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1280, 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.

S. 1288

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1288, a bill to ensure that contractors of the Department of Agriculture comply with certain labor laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1323

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1323, a bill to create protections for financial institutions that provide financial services to State-sanctioned marijuana businesses and service providers for such businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1334

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1334, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense to develop, in cooperation with allies and partners in the Middle East, an integrated maritime domain awareness and interdiction capability, and for other purposes.

S. 1354

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1354, a bill to increase the quality and supply of child care and lower child care costs for families.

S. 1375

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1375, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to apply additional payments, discounts, and other financial assistance towards the cost-sharing requirements of health insurance plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1408

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1408, a bill to amend title 9, United States Code, with respect to arbitration of disputes involving race discrimination.

S. 1456

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to provide for certain energy development, permitting reforms, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Ken-

tucky (Mr. PAUL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1512, a bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to allow for the interstate internet sales of certain State-inspected meat and poultry, and for other purposes.

S. 1529

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1529, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for greater protection of roosters, and for other purposes.

S. 1566

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1566, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense to identify certain aircraft shelters for aviation assets in the Indo-Pacific region and submit a plan to make improvements to such shelters, and for other purposes.

S. 1582

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1582, a bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to expand the national organic certification cost-share program into a comprehensive organic program, and for other purposes.

S. 1610

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1610, a bill to authorize administrative absences and travel and transportation allowances for members of the Armed Forces to travel and obtain reproductive health care.

S. 1624

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1624, a bill to require certain civil penalties to be transferred to a fund through which amounts are made available for the Gabriella Miller Kids First Pediatric Research Program at the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

S. 1641

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1641, a bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit reports to Congress on theft of mail and United States Postal Service property, and for other purposes.

S. 1666

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1666, a bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act to reauthorize animal disease prevention and management programs.

S. 1669

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1669, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring access to AM broadcast stations in motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 1673

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1673, a bill to amend title XVIII to protect patient access to ground ambulance services under the Medicare program.

S. 1684

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1684, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a vehicle summer meal delivery pilot program, and for other purposes.

S. 1698

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1698, a bill to require group health plans and group or individual health insurance coverage to provide coverage for over-the-counter contraceptives.

S. 1714

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1714, a bill to provide paid family leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1745

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1745, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand access to the Veterans Community Care Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to include certain veterans seeking mental health or substance-use services, and for other purposes.

S. 1753

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1753, a bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to allow individuals with drug offenses to receive benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 25

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 25, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Adverse Effect Wage Rate Methodology for the Temporary Employment of H-2A Nonimmigrants in

Non-Range Occupations in the United States".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 1771. A bill to authorize additional district judges for the district court for the eastern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to introduce the CASELOAD Act of 2023.

This legislation would address the critical need for additional judges in California's Eastern District, which faces disproportionately high workloads and significant litigation backlogs.

This legislation would add five new judges to the Eastern District of California over the next 4 years to increase that court's capacity to address the needs of its roughly 8.4 million citizens.

The bill adds the judges in three tranches. Two judges would be added in 2025, one judge would be added in 2027, and two would be added in 2029.

It also would authorize the funds necessary for the additional positions.

The Eastern District of California encompasses 34 counties and has roughly 8½ million residents. Despite this massive geographic size and population, the Eastern District has only six permanent judgeships and has not added a permanent seat since 1978.

The judges of the Eastern District face a staggering caseload. The total pending cases per judge as of June 2022 was 1,308, over 2½ the national average for districts.

The people of the Eastern District, as well as the hard-working judicial officers who serve them, would greatly benefit from the additional judgeships that this bill would add.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1772. A bill to establish a national mercury monitoring program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to introduce the Comprehensive National Mercury Monitoring Act. I want to thank Senator CARPER, the chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, for his partnership on this bill. Our bipartisan bill would help ensure that we have accurate information about the extent of mercury pollution in the United States.

Mercury is a potent neurotoxin. It poses significant ecological and public health concerns, especially for children and pregnant women. Mercury exposure has gone down as U.S. mercury emissions have declined; however, levels remain unacceptably high in some areas. It is estimated that nearly 100,000 to 200,000 children born in the United States have been exposed to levels of mercury in the womb that are

high enough to impair their neurological development. This exposure can impose a lifelong disability.

In Maine, some of our lands and bodies of water face higher mercury pollution compared to the national average. Maine has been called the "tailpipe of the nation," as the winds carry pollution, including mercury, from the west into Maine.

A system for collecting information, such as we have for acid rain and other pollution, does not exist currently for mercury, even though it is a more toxic pollutant. A comprehensive national mercury monitoring network is needed to help protect human health and track the effect of emissions reductions. This monitoring network would also help policymakers, scientists, and the public better understand the sources, consequences, and trends in U.S. mercury pollution.

Specifically, our legislation would do the following: First, it would direct the Environmental Protection Agency, in conjunction with the Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Geological Survey, National Park Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and other appropriate Federal Agencies, to establish a national mercury monitoring program. This program would be tasked to measure and monitor mercury levels in the air and watersheds, water and soil chemistry, and in marine, freshwater, and terrestrial organisms at multiple sites across the Nation.

Second, our bill would establish a scientific advisory committee to advise on the establishment, site selection, measurement, recording protocols, and operations of the monitoring program.

Third, our bill would establish a centralized database for existing and newly collected environmental mercury data that can be accessed on the internet and that is compatible with similar international efforts.

Fourth, our bill would require a report to Congress every 2 years on the program, including trend data, and an assessment every 4 years of the reduction in mercury deposition rates that would need to be achieved in order to prevent adverse human and ecological effects.

Fifth, the bill would authorize \$95 million over 3 years to carry out these activities.

We must establish a comprehensive, robust national mercury monitoring network to provide the data needed to help make decisions that can protect the people of Maine and the Nation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bipartisan legislation, the Comprehensive National Mercury Monitoring Act.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1776. A bill to provide for the protection of and investment in certain Federal land in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to reintroduce the Protecting Unique and Beautiful Landscapes by Investing in California, PUBLIC Lands Act. This measure would increase protections for over 1 million acres of Federal public lands throughout northwest California, the central coast, and Los Angeles, including nearly 600,000 acres of new wilderness, more than 583 miles of new wild and scenic rivers, and over 100,000 acres of an expanded national monument.

This legislation would preserve our public lands for the benefit of current and future generations and help protect California communities from the impacts of the climate crisis.

The PUBLIC Lands Act is grounded in the best conservation principles: It expands access to the outdoors for all, addresses disparities in access to nature, supports locally led efforts, and is based on science.

In northwest California, this bill would designate new wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, recreation and conservation areas, and forest and watershed restoration areas. Importantly, it would increase wildfire resiliency in northwest California, where the impacts of the climate crisis have resulted in more frequent and severe wildfires.

Along the central coast, the bill would designate nearly 250,000 acres of public land in the Los Padres National Forest and Carrizo Plain National Monument as wilderness and establish a 400-mile-long Condor National Recreation trail, stretching from Los Angeles to Monterey County. The designations in the bill would protect the Central Valley's abundant biodiversity, including threatened and endangered species.

In Southern California, the bill would expand the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument to include more of the San Gabriel Mountain range. Los Angeles County is one of the most park-poor, densely populated, and polluted regions in the Nation, and this legislation would begin to rectify that by providing increased outdoor opportunities for Angelenos and ensuring that disadvantaged communities can benefit more easily from our public lands.

I want to highlight that this legislation protects existing water rights, property rights, and land-use authorities. The bill also does not create any new public lands—rather, it protects existing public lands through the designation as wilderness in order to keep these lands as untouched and wild as possible.

The science is becoming increasingly clear that we must conserve 30 percent of our lands and waters by 2030 as part of our efforts to solve the climate crisis, protect nature, and save America's wildlife. This legislation would provide significant progress on that goal, helping California and the Biden administration meet our 30x30 goals and reverse the worst effects of climate change.

The bill would also provide outdoor recreation opportunities for park-poor communities. It is imperative that as we conserve our public lands, we do so in a way that also reverses racial and economic disparities in access to nature and parks.

This bill enjoys the support of hundreds of local municipalities and elected officials, community groups, and businesses and local outfitters. It is the product of significant public engagement in the legislative process over decades.

I would like to thank my colleagues and conservation champions, Representatives JARED HUFFMAN, SALUD CARBAJAL, and JUDY CHU, for championing these bills in the House.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the PUBLIC Lands Act as quickly as possible.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 227—CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT TO SUPPORT THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL SPECIAL TRIBUNAL TO PROSECUTE RUSSIA'S AGGRESSION AGAINST UKRAINE

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 227

Whereas on February 24, 2022, Russia unleashed a full-scale invasion of Ukraine in contravention of international law and the Charter of the United Nations;

Whereas the Russian armed forces committed mass atrocities in Bucha, Irpin, Kherson, Izyum, Mariupol, Dnipro, and Ukrainian towns occupied by the Russian Federation, including rape, summary execution, and unlawful violence and threats against civilians;

Whereas the Russian armed forces deliberately choose to target civilian infrastructure to terrorize Ukrainian citizens;

Whereas on September 21, 2022, Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky stated to the United Nations General Assembly that an aggression tribunal must be established as a "signal to all 'would-be' aggressors, that they must value peace or be brought to responsibility by the world";

Whereas on January 19, 2023, the European Parliament, by a vote of 472 to 19, called for the establishment of "a special international criminal tribunal for the crime of aggression against Ukraine" in order to "send a very clear signal to both Russian society and the international community that Putin and the Russian political and military leadership can be convicted for the crime of aggression in Ukraine";

Whereas on March 27, 2023, the United States Ambassador-at-Large for Global Criminal Justice, Dr. Beth Van Schaack, stated, "There is no question that Russia's aggression against Ukraine is a manifest violation of the UN Charter.";

Whereas Article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations states, "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.";

Whereas United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3314 (XXIX), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 14, 1974, defines aggression as "the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, as set out in this Definition";

Whereas Article 8 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, as amended by Resolution RC/Res. 6, adopted by the Review Conference at the 13th plenary meeting on June 11, 2010, states, in part: "For the purpose of this Statute, 'crime of aggression' means the planning, preparation, initiation or execution, by a person in a position effectively to exercise control over or to direct the political or military action of a State, of an act of aggression which, by its character, gravity and scale, constitutes a manifest violation of the Charter of the United Nations.";

Whereas on March 17, 2023, the Pre-Trial Chamber of the International Criminal Court issued arrest warrants for President Vladimir Putin and Russian Commissioner for Children's Rights Maria Lvova-Belova for their responsibility in the war crimes of unlawful deportation and transfer of children, and the International Criminal Court continues to investigate other international crimes within its jurisdiction that have been committed in Ukraine;

Whereas the International Criminal Court has jurisdiction over war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Ukraine, but it does not have jurisdiction over crimes of aggression in Ukraine because neither Ukraine nor the Russian Federation have ratified the Rome Statute and its amendments related to the crime of aggression;

Whereas the Russian Federation has committed manifest aggression against the Ukrainian state for which its leadership must be held accountable;

Whereas the international community must hold those responsible for these atrocities to account for their actions, including Russian President Putin and all of the Members of the Security Council of Russia; and

Whereas an international special tribunal must be based on the adoption of a United Nations General Assembly Resolution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns, in the strongest terms, the Russian Federation's full-scale war and aggression against Ukraine;

(2) regards the Russian Federation's aggression in Ukraine as an affront to humanity and in contravention of international law;

(3) calls on the United States to use its voice and vote in international institutions to support the creation of a special international criminal tribunal to hold accountable the leaders of the Russian Federation who led and sanctioned aggression in Ukraine;

(4) states its expectation that such a tribunal will be formed pursuant to a United Nations General Assembly resolution put forward by friends of Ukraine that would—

(A) direct the Secretary General of the United Nations to negotiate with Ukraine the terms of the tribunal's scope; and

(B) ensure that the role of the United Nations—

(i) would be complementary to the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court; and

(ii) would not limit or affect the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court, including its exercise of jurisdiction over war crimes, crimes against humanity, and possible genocide committed in the context of

Russia's ongoing aggression against Ukraine; and

(5) stands with people of Ukraine in support of their freedom and Ukraine's sovereignty against tyranny.

SENATE RESOLUTION 228—RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDIANA PACERS' 1972–1973 AMERICAN BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP AND THEIR THIRD AMERICAN BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP IN 5 SEASONS

Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 228

Whereas the Indiana Pacers were founded in 1967, as members of the American Basketball Association;

Whereas the Indiana Pacers won American Basketball Association Championships in the 1969–1970, 1971–1972, and 1972–1973 seasons and had 2 other championship appearances;

Whereas, during the seasons between 1970 and 1975, the Indiana Pacers averaged 51 wins per season;

Whereas Mel Daniels, Freddie Lewis, Roger Brown, and Billy Keller were members of all 3 Indiana Pacers championship teams;

Whereas the 1973 Indiana Pacers championship team had a strong native Hoosier presence on the team;

Whereas the 1973 Indiana Pacers championship team was built around George McGinnis, who attended George Washington Community High School in Indianapolis, Indiana, and later attended Indiana University;

Whereas Billy Keller attended George Washington Community High School in Indianapolis, Indiana, and later attended Purdue University;

Whereas Don Buse attended Holland High School in Holland, Indiana, and Evansville College in Evansville, Indiana;

Whereas, during the 1972–1973 season, Don Buse, a rookie, made several contributions, and Gus Johnson, a National Basketball Association veteran at the end of his career, was brought onto the team to bring bench strength and leadership;

Whereas the revived group finished with a 51 to 33 record after winning 11 consecutive games late in the 1972–1973 season, the fourth-best record in the league behind the Carolina Cougars and the Kentucky Colonels in the East and the Utah Stars in the West;

Whereas the Indiana Pacers took control of the 1972–1973 series by winning Game 4 on the home court of the Houston Rockets, as Billy Keller hit a game-winning 3-pointer from the left wing off a broken play with 14 seconds left for a 97 to 95 victory;

Whereas that shot gained historical value in passing years because William Robert "Slick" Leonard rose off the bench and shouted, "Boom, Baby!" as the ball dropped through the net;

Whereas "Boom, Baby!" would become William Robert "Slick" Leonard's signature call as a broadcaster on every 3-pointer by the Indiana Pacers in following decades;

Whereas, on May 12, 1973, the Indiana Pacers beat the Kentucky Colonels 88 to 81 in Game 7 of the American Basketball Association Championship; and

Whereas that win gave the Indiana Pacers their third and final American Basketball Association title, the most titles held by a team in the history of the American Basketball Association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) basketball has a rich history and passionate fan base in the Hoosier State and the Indiana Pacers have highlighted that rich history during the time in which they participated in the American Basketball Association; and

(2) the history of the Indiana Pacers and their storied legacy should be recognized, especially during 2023, which marks the 50th anniversary of the Indiana Pacers' third and last American Basketball Association title and championship.

SENATE RESOLUTION 229—DESIGNATING MAY 2023 AS "NATIONAL BRAIN TUMOR AWARENESS MONTH"

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. WARNOCK) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 229

Whereas more than an estimated 94,390 individuals will be diagnosed with a primary brain tumor in the United States in 2023, and an estimated 93,470 individuals in the United States were diagnosed with a primary brain tumor in 2022;

Whereas an estimated 1,000,000 Americans are living with a brain tumor in the United States;

Whereas, in the United States, brain tumors are—

(1) the leading cause of death from cancer in children who are under 14 years of age and teens who are under 19 years of age; and

(2) the second leading cause of death from cancer in young adults who are between 15 and 39 years of age;

Whereas the average 5-year survival rate for an individual in the United States following the diagnosis of a primary malignant brain tumor is only 35.7 percent;

Whereas it is estimated that 18,990 individuals in the United States will die as a result of a malignant brain tumor in 2023;

Whereas brain tumors may be malignant or benign but can be life-threatening in either case;

Whereas treatment of brain tumors is complicated by the fact that more than 100 types of brain tumors exist;

Whereas the treatment and removal of brain tumors present significant challenges due to the uniquely complex and fragile nature of the brain;

Whereas brain tumors affect the primary organ in the human body that controls not only cognitive ability, but the actions of every other organ and limb in the body, leading to brain tumors being described as a disease that affects the whole individual;

Whereas brain tumor research is supported by a number of private, nonprofit research foundations and by Federal medical research institutions;

Whereas basic research may fuel advancements and development of new treatments for brain tumors;

Whereas obstacles to the development of new treatments for brain tumors remain, and there are limited strategies for the screening or early detection of brain tumors;

Whereas, despite the high number of individuals diagnosed with a brain tumor every year and the devastating prognoses for those individuals, only a few treatments have been approved for malignant brain tumors since the 1980s and none of the treatments extend survival more than 2 years of life, on average, or are considered to be curative.

Whereas the mortality rates associated with brain tumors have changed little during

the 30-year period preceding the date of introduction of this resolution;

Whereas there is a need for greater public awareness of brain tumors, including the difficulties associated with research on brain tumors and the opportunities for advances in brain tumor research and treatment; and

Whereas May 2023, during which brain tumor advocates nationwide unite in awareness, outreach, and advocacy activities, is an appropriate month to recognize as "National Brain Tumor Awareness Month": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 2023 as "National Brain Tumor Awareness Month";

(2) encourages increased public awareness of brain tumors to honor the individuals who have lost their lives to a brain tumor or currently live with a brain tumor diagnosis;

(3) supports efforts to develop better treatments for brain tumors that will improve the quality of life and the long-term prognoses of individuals diagnosed with a brain tumor;

(4) expresses its support for individuals who are battling brain tumors, as well as the families, friends, and caregivers of those individuals; and

(5) urges a collaborative approach to brain tumor research, which is a promising means of advancing understanding of, and treatment for, brain tumors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 230—RECOGNIZING THE 102ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1921 TULSA RACE MASSACRE

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 230

Whereas, in the early 20th century, de jure segregation confined the Black residents of Tulsa, Oklahoma, into the "Greenwood District", which they built into a thriving community with a nationally renowned entrepreneurial center known as the "Black Wall Street";

Whereas, at the time, White supremacy and racist violence were common throughout the United States and went largely unchecked by the justice system;

Whereas reports of an alleged and disputed incident on the morning of May 30, 1921, between two teenagers, a Black man and a White woman, caused the White community of Tulsa, including the Tulsa Tribune, to call for a lynching amidst a climate of White racial hostility and White resentment over Black economic success;

Whereas, on May 31, 1921, a mob of armed White men descended on the Greenwood District in Tulsa and launched what is now known as the "Tulsa Race Massacre";

Whereas Tulsa municipal and county authorities failed to take actions to calm or contain the violence, and civil and law enforcement officials deputized many White men who were participants in the violence as their agents, directly contributing to the violence through overt and often illegal acts;

Whereas, over a period of 24 hours, the violence of the White mob led to the death of an estimated 300 Black residents, and over 800 reports of injuries;

Whereas the White mob looted, damaged, burned, or otherwise destroyed approximately 40 square blocks of the Greenwood District, including an estimated 1,256 homes of Black residents, and virtually every other structure, including churches, schools, businesses, a hospital, and a library, leaving nearly 9,000 Black residents of Tulsa homeless and effectively wiping out tens of millions of dollars in Black prosperity and wealth in Tulsa;

Whereas, in the wake of the Tulsa Race Massacre, the Governor of Oklahoma declared martial law, and units of the Oklahoma National Guard participated in the mass arrests of all or nearly all of the surviving residents of Greenwood, removing them from Greenwood to other parts of Tulsa and unlawfully detaining them in holding centers;

Whereas Oklahoma local and State governments dismissed claims arising from the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre for decades, and the event was effectively erased from collective memory and history until, in 1997, the Oklahoma State Legislature finally created a commission to study the event;

Whereas, on February 28, 2001, the commission issued a report that detailed, for the first time, the extent of the Tulsa Race Massacre and decades-long efforts to suppress its recollection;

Whereas none of the law enforcement officials or any of the hundreds of other White mob members who participated in the violence were ever prosecuted or held accountable for the hundreds of lives lost and tens of millions of dollars of Black wealth destroyed, despite the Tulsa Race Massacre Commission confirming their roles in the Tulsa Race Massacre, nor was any compensation ever provided to the victims of the Tulsa Race Massacre or their descendants;

Whereas State government and city officials not only abdicated their responsibility to rebuild and repair the Greenwood community in the wake of the violence, but actively blocked efforts to do so, contributing to continued racial disparities in Tulsa akin to those that Black people face across the United States;

Whereas the pattern of violence against Black people in the United States, often at the hands of law enforcement, shows that the fight to end State-sanctioned violence against Black people continues; and

Whereas this year marks the 102nd anniversary of the Tulsa Race Massacre: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 102nd anniversary of the Tulsa Race Massacre;

(2) acknowledges the historical significance of this event as one of the largest single instances of State-sanctioned violence against Black people in the history of the United States;

(3) honors the lives and legacies of the estimated 300 Black individuals who were killed during the Tulsa Race Massacre and the nearly 9,000 Black individuals who were left homeless and penniless;

(4) condemns the participants of the Tulsa Race Massacre, including the White municipal officials and law enforcement who directly participated in or who aided and abetted the unlawful violence;

(5) condemns past and present efforts to cover up the truth and shield the White community, and especially State and local officials, from accountability for the Tulsa Race Massacre and other instances of violence at the hands of law enforcement;

(6) condemns the continued legacy of racism, including systemic racism, and White supremacy against Black people in the United States, particularly in the form of police brutality;

(7) encourages education about the Tulsa Race Massacre, including the horrors of the massacre itself, the history of White supremacy that fueled the massacre, and subsequent attempts to deny or cover up the Tulsa Race Massacre, in all elementary and secondary education settings and in institutions of higher education in the United States; and

(8) recognizes the commitment of Congress to acknowledge and learn from the history of racism and racial violence in the United States, including the Tulsa Race Massacre, to reverse the legacy of White supremacy and fight for racial justice.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11—EXPRESSING THE NEED FOR THE SENATE TO PROVIDE ADVICE AND CONSENT TO RATIFICATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Mr. PADILLA submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 11

Whereas human actions are contributing to an unprecedented and increasing loss of biodiversity worldwide;

Whereas nearly 1,000,000 species could be threatened with extinction;

Whereas every United Nations member state has ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity, done at Rio de Janeiro June 5, 1992, with the exception of the United States;

Whereas the United States signed the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1993 but has not ratified the treaty;

Whereas the United States, under current domestic law, is already legally compliant with the obligations of the Convention;

Whereas Federal agencies often design their plans to align with Convention on Biological Diversity initiatives;

Whereas the absence of the United States from the Convention on Biological Diversity limits the United States to holding the status of an “observer” to deliberations and decision making processes of the Convention on Biodiversity;

Whereas, not being party to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United States does not have a vote within the convention, which diminishes our voice and influence;

Whereas the decisions and rules made by the Convention on Biological Diversity affect both national security and economic interests of the United States in spite of the United States’ non-party status;

Whereas the United States is one of the world’s largest contributors in international conservation funding and biological diversity expertise; and

Whereas we are inextricably interconnected on this planet, and the work of the Convention on Biological Diversity has a direct impact on all Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is in the national interest for the Senate to provide its advice and consent for the ratification of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which was signed by the United States in New York on June 4, 1993.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 91. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill H.R. 3746, to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 92. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 93. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 94. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 95. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 96. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 97. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 91. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. RESCISSION OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING AND HONORING DEBTS DURING A DEBT CEILING CRISIS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CURRENT FISCAL YEAR.—The term “current fiscal year” means the fiscal year during which the applicable rescission of discretionary appropriations under subsection (b) occurs.

(2) DEBT CEILING CRISIS PERIOD.—The term “debt ceiling crisis period” means a period—

(A) beginning on the date on which, but for subsection (c), the Secretary of the Treasury would not be able to issue obligations under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, or other obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government, because of the limit on the face amount of such obligations that may be outstanding at one time under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code; and

(B) ending on date on which the first measure suspending or increasing the limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, is enacted into law after the date described in subparagraph (A).

(3) DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.—The term “discretionary appropriations” has the meaning given such term in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)).

(b) RESCISSION OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—For each discretionary appropriations account, effective on first day of a debt ceiling crisis period, and every 30 days thereafter until the end of the debt ceiling crisis period, 1 percent of the amount provided for the discretionary appropriations account under the appropriation Act for the current fiscal year is permanently rescinded.

(c) TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DEBT CEILING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply for the period—

(A) beginning on the first day of a debt ceiling crisis period; and

(B) ending on the last day of the debt ceiling crisis period.

(2) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED DURING EXTENSION PERIOD.—Effective on the last day of a debt ceiling crisis period, the limitation in effect under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall be increased to the extent that—

(A) the face amount of obligations issued under chapter 31 of such title and the face amount of obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government (except guaranteed obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on the first day of the debt ceiling crisis period; exceeds

(B) the face amount of such obligations outstanding on the last day of the debt ceiling crisis period.

(3) EXTENSION LIMITED TO NECESSARY OBLIGATIONS.—An obligation shall not be taken into account under paragraph (2)(A) unless the issuance of such obligation was necessary to fund a commitment incurred pursuant to law by the Federal Government that required payment on or before the last day of the applicable debt ceiling crisis period.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the first day of a debt ceiling crisis period, and every 30 days thereafter until the date that is 30 days after the end of the debt ceiling crisis period, the Director of the Office of Management shall submit to Congress a report detailing the rescission of discretionary appropriations under subsection (b) with respect to the debt ceiling crisis period.

(2) REVIEW BY GAO.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget submits each report under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report evaluating the description of the rescission of discretionary appropriations in the report by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SA 92. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In division C, in section 311, strike subsection (a) and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(o)(3) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(6)(o)(3)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A)(i) under 18 years of age; or

“(ii) in—

“(I) fiscal year 2023 over 51 years of age;

“(II) fiscal year 2024 over 53 years of age;

“(III) fiscal year 2025 and each fiscal year thereafter over 55 years of age;”.

SA 93. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ IMPOSITION OF DUTIES TO BALANCE TRADE WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) CALCULATION OF TRADE WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—Not later than January 31 of each year, the President shall calculate and publish in the Federal Register, for the preceding calendar year—

(1) the total value of articles imported into the United States from the People's Republic of China; and

(2) the total value of articles exported from the United States to the People's Republic of China.

(b) IMPOSITION OF DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the total value calculated under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) exceeds the total value calculated under paragraph (2) of that subsection for the preceding calendar year, the President shall impose an additional duty with respect to each article imported into the United States from the People's Republic of China of 25 percent ad valorem.

(2) ADDITIONAL DUTIES.—A duty imposed under paragraph (1) shall be in addition to any duty previously applicable with respect to an article.

(c) CONTINUED IMPOSITION OF DUTIES.—The duties imposed under subsection (b) with respect to articles imported into the United States from the People's Republic of China shall remain in effect until the total value calculated under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) is equal to or less than the total value calculated under paragraph (2) of that subsection for the preceding calendar year.

SA 94. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—INCOME TAX PROVISIONS
SEC. 01. AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Subtitle A—Repeal of Electric Vehicle Incentives

SEC. 11. CLEAN VEHICLE CREDIT.

(a) PER VEHICLE DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Section 30D(b) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) BASE AMOUNT.—The amount determined under this paragraph is \$2,500.

“(3) BATTERY CAPACITY.—In the case of a vehicle which draws propulsion energy from a battery with not less than 5 kilowatt hours of capacity, the amount determined under this paragraph is \$417, plus \$417 for each kilowatt hour of capacity in excess of 5 kilowatt hours. The amount determined under this paragraph shall not exceed \$5,000.”.

(b) FINAL ASSEMBLY.—Section 30D(d) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by adding “and” at the end,

(B) in subparagraph (F)(ii), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a period, and

(C) by striking subparagraph (G), and

(2) by striking paragraph (5).

(c) DEFINITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 30D(d), as amended by subsection (b), is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “CLEAN” and inserting “QUALIFIED PLUG-IN ELECTRIC DRIVE MOTOR”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “clean” and inserting “qualified plug-in electric drive motor”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “qualified” before “manufacturer”;

(iii) in subparagraph (F)(i), by striking “7” and inserting “4”; and

(iv) by striking subparagraph (H),

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “QUALIFIED MANUFACTURER” and inserting “MANUFACTURER”; and

(ii) by striking “The term ‘qualified manufacturer’ means” and all that follows

through the period and inserting “The term ‘manufacturer’ has the meaning given such term in regulations prescribed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for purposes of the administration of title II of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7521 et seq.)”, and

(D) by striking paragraph (6).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 30D is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “new clean vehicle” and inserting “new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicle”, and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “new clean vehicle” and inserting “new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicle”.

(d) CRITICAL MINERAL REQUIREMENTS REMOVED.—Section 30D is amended by striking subsection (e).

(e) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF VEHICLES ELIGIBLE FOR CREDIT RESTORED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 30D is amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF NEW QUALIFIED PLUG-IN ELECTRIC DRIVE MOTOR VEHICLES ELIGIBLE FOR CREDIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicle sold during the phaseout period, only the applicable percentage of the credit otherwise allowable under subsection (a) shall be allowed.

“(2) PHASEOUT PERIOD.—For purposes of this subsection, the phaseout period is the period beginning with the second calendar quarter following the calendar quarter which includes the first date on which the number of new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles manufactured by the manufacturer of the vehicle referred to in paragraph (1) sold for use in the United States after December 31, 2009, is at least 200,000.

“(3) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the applicable percentage is—

“(A) 50 percent for the first 2 calendar quarters of the phaseout period,

“(B) 25 percent for the 3rd and 4th calendar quarters of the phaseout period, and (C)

“(C) 0 percent for each calendar quarter thereafter.

“(4) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—Rules similar to the rules of section 30B(f)(4) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.”.

(2) EXCLUDED ENTITIES.—Section 30D(d), as amended by Public Law 117-169, is amended by striking paragraph (7).

(f) SPECIAL RULES REPEALED.—Section 30D(f) is amended by striking paragraphs (8), (9), (10), and (11).

(g) TRANSFER OF CREDIT REPEALED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 30D is amended by striking subsection (g).

(2) RESTORATION OF TEXT RELATING TO PLUG-IN ELECTRIC VEHICLES.—Section 30D is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) CREDIT ALLOWED FOR 2- AND 3-WHEELED PLUG-IN ELECTRIC VEHICLES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified 2- or 3-wheeled plug-in electric vehicle—

“(A) there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the sum of the applicable amount with respect to each such qualified 2- or 3-wheeled plug-in electric vehicle placed in service by the taxpayer during the taxable year, and

“(B) the amount of the credit allowed under subparagraph (A) shall be treated as a credit allowed under subsection (a).

“(2) APPLICABLE AMOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the applicable amount is an amount equal to the lesser of—

“(A) 10 percent of the cost of the qualified 2- or 3-wheeled plug-in electric vehicle, or

“(B) \$2,500.

“(3) QUALIFIED 2- OR 3-WHEELED PLUG-IN ELECTRIC VEHICLE.—The term ‘qualified 2- or 3-wheeled plug-in electric vehicle’ means any vehicle which—

“(A) has 2 or 3 wheels,

“(B) meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (E), and (F) of subsection (d)(1) (determined by substituting ‘2.5 kilowatt hours’ for ‘4 kilowatt hours’ in subparagraph (F)(i)),

“(C) is manufactured primarily for use on public streets, roads, and highways,

“(D) is capable of achieving a speed of 45 miles per hour or greater, and

“(E) is acquired—

“(i) after December 31, 2011, and before January 1, 2014, or

“(ii) in the case of a vehicle that has 2 wheels, after December 31, 2014, and before January 1, 2022.”

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS REVERSED.—Section 30D(f), as amended by Public Law 117-169, is amended—

(A) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) PROPERTY USED BY TAX-EXEMPT ENTITY.—In the case of a vehicle the use of which is described in paragraph (3) or (4) of section 50(b) and which is not subject to a lease, the person who sold such vehicle to the person or entity using such vehicle shall be treated as the taxpayer that placed such vehicle in service, but only if such person clearly discloses to such person or entity in a document the amount of any credit allowable under subsection (a) with respect to such vehicle (determined without regard to subsection (c)). For purposes of subsection (c), property to which this paragraph applies shall be treated as of a character subject to an allowance for depreciation.”, and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking “, including any vehicle with respect to which the taxpayer elects the application of subsection (g)”.

(h) TERMINATION REPEALED.—Section 30D is amended by striking subsection (h).

(i) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of section 30D is amended by striking “CLEAN VEHICLE CREDIT” and inserting “NEW QUALIFIED PLUG-IN ELECTRIC DRIVE MOTOR VEHICLES”.

(2) Section 30B is amended—

(A) in subsection (h)(8) by inserting “, except that no benefit shall be recaptured if such property ceases to be eligible for such credit by reason of conversion to a qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicle”, before the period at the end, and

(B) by inserting after subsection (h) the following subsection:

“(i) PLUG-IN CONVERSION CREDIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the plug-in conversion credit determined under this subsection with respect to any motor vehicle which is converted to a qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicle is 10 percent of so much of the cost of the converting such vehicle as does not exceed \$40,000.

“(2) QUALIFIED PLUG-IN ELECTRIC DRIVE MOTOR VEHICLE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicle’ means any new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicle (as defined in section 30D, determined without regard to whether such vehicle is made by a manufacturer or whether the original use of such vehicle commences with the taxpayer).

“(3) CREDIT ALLOWED IN ADDITION TO OTHER CREDITS.—The credit allowed under this subsection shall be allowed with respect to a motor vehicle notwithstanding whether a credit has been allowed with respect to such motor vehicle under this section (other than this subsection) in any preceding taxable year.

“(4) TERMINATION.—This subsection shall not apply to conversions made after December 31, 2011.”

(3) Section 38(b)(30) is amended by striking “clean” and inserting “qualified plug-in electric drive motor”.

(4) Section 6213(g)(2) is amended by striking subparagraph (T).

(5) Section 6501(m) is amended by striking “30D(f)(6)” and inserting “30D(e)(4)”.

(6) The table of sections for subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 30D and inserting after the item relating to section 30C the following item:

“Sec. 30D. New qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles.”.

(j) GROSS UP REPEALED.—Section 13401 of Public Law 117-169 is amended by striking subsection (j).

(k) TRANSITION RULE REPEALED.—Section 13401 of Public Law 117-169 is amended by striking subsection (l).

(1) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), the amendments made by this section shall apply to vehicles placed in service after December 31, 2022.

(2) FINAL ASSEMBLY.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to vehicles sold after August 16, 2022.

(3) MANUFACTURER LIMITATION.—The amendment made by subsections (d) and (e) shall apply to vehicles sold after December 31, 2022.

(4) TRANSFER OF CREDIT.—The amendments made by subsection (g) shall apply to vehicles placed in service after December 31, 2023.

(5) TRANSITION RULE.—The amendment made by subsection (k) shall take effect as if included in Public Law 117-169.

SEC. 12. REPEAL OF CREDIT FOR PREVIOUSLY-OWNED CLEAN VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking section 25E (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such subpart).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6213(g)(2) is amended by striking subparagraph (U).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to vehicles acquired after December 31, 2022.

SEC. 13. REPEAL OF CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED COMMERCIAL CLEAN VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking section 45W (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such subpart).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 38(b) is amended by striking paragraph (37).

(2) Section 6213(g)(2) is amended by striking subparagraph (V).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to vehicles acquired after December 31, 2022.

SEC. 14. ALTERNATIVE FUEL REFUELING PROPERTY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 30C(i) is amended by striking “December 31, 2032” and inserting “December 31, 2021”.

(b) PROPERTY OF A CHARACTER SUBJECT TO DEPRECIATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 30C(a) is amended by striking “(6 percent in the case of property of a character subject to depreciation)”.

(2) MODIFICATION OF CREDIT LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of section 30C is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “with respect to any single item of” and inserting “with respect to all”, and

(ii) by inserting “at a location” before “shall not exceed”, and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$100,000 in the case of any such item of property” and inserting “\$30,000 in the case of a property”.

(3) BIDIRECTIONAL CHARGING EQUIPMENT NOT INCLUDED; ELIGIBLE CENSUS TRACT REQUIREMENT REMOVED.—Section 30C(c) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) QUALIFIED ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE REFUELING PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified alternative fuel vehicle refueling property’ has the same meaning as the term ‘qualified clean-fuel vehicle refueling property’ would have under section 179A if—

“(1) paragraph (1) of section 179A(d) did not apply to property installed on property which is used as the principal residence (within the meaning of section 121) of the taxpayer, and

“(2) only the following were treated as clean-burning fuels for purposes of section 179A(d):

“(A) Any fuel at least 85 percent of the volume of which consists of one or more of the following: ethanol, natural gas, compressed natural gas, liquefied natural gas, liquefied petroleum gas, or hydrogen.

“(B) Any mixture—

“(i) which consists of two or more of the following: biodiesel (as defined in section 40A(d)(1)), diesel fuel (as defined in section 4083(a)(3)), or kerosene, and

“(ii) at least 20 percent of the volume of which consists of biodiesel (as so defined) determined without regard to any kerosene in such mixture.

“(C) Electricity.”.

(c) CERTAIN ELECTRIC CHARGING STATIONS NOT INCLUDED AS QUALIFIED ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE REFUELING PROPERTY; WAGE AND APPRENTICESHIP REQUIREMENTS REMOVED.—Section 30C is amended by striking subsections (f) and (g) and redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2021.

Subtitle B—Elimination of Marriage Penalty

SEC. 21. EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 32(b)(2)(B) is amended by striking “increased by \$5,000” and inserting “equal to 200 percent of the amount otherwise applicable under such subparagraph”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2022.

SA 95. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PRIORITIZE OBLIGATIONS ON THE DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC, SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS, MEDICARE, VETERANS, AND MILITARY PAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the debt of the United States Government reaches the statutory limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, the following obligations shall take equal priority over all other obligations incurred by the United States Government:

(1) The authority of the Department of the Treasury provided under section 3123 of title 31, United States Code, to pay with legal tender the principal and interest on debt held by the public.

(2) The authority of the Commissioner of Social Security to pay monthly old-age, survivors’, and disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.).

(3) The payment of pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces on active duty and members of the United States Coast Guard.

(4) The payment of compensation and pensions, and payments for medical services, provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(5) The Medicare programs under parts A, B, C, and D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c et seq.).

(b) LIMITED DEBT LIMIT AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of the Treasury determines, after consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, that incoming revenue will not be sufficient to pay the priority obligations specified under subsection (a) over an upcoming 2-week period during a period during which the debt of the United States Government has reached the statutory limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code—

(A) the Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall notify Congress of the amount of the expected revenue shortfall from the revenue required to pay in full the priority obligations specified under subsection (a) for such 2-week period; and

(B) the amount of the limit on debt held by the public under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, shall be increased by the amount of the expected revenue shortfall.

(2) EXCESS REVENUE.—If incoming revenue exceeds the amount projected under paragraph (1), any amount in excess shall be held in reserve and applied to the following 2-week period.

SA 96. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 251 and insert the following:

SEC. 251. RESCISSION OF CERTAIN BALANCES MADE AVAILABLE TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

The unobligated balances of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by paragraphs (1)(A)(ii), (1)(A)(iii), (1)(B), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 10301 of Public Law 117-169 (commonly known as the “Inflation Reduction Act of 2022”) as of the date of the enactment of this Act are rescinded.

SA 97. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3746, to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In division C, strike sections 311 and 312 and insert the following:

SEC. 311. SNAP WORK REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPEAL OF WAIVER.—Section 2301 of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (7 U.S.C. 2011 note; Public Law 116-127) is repealed.

(b) WORK REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, or, in the case of a parent or other member of a household with responsibility for a dependent child, 6 months (consecutive or otherwise),” before “during which”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “50” and inserting “60”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by adding “under 6 years of age” before the semicolon at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or” at the end after the semicolon;

(iv) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(F)(i) responsible for a dependent individual; and

“(ii) married to, and resides with, an individual who is in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (2).”; and

(C) in paragraph (6)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(H)” and inserting “(G)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “(F) and (H)” and inserting “(E) and (G)”;

(iii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “(F) through (H)” and inserting “(E) through (G)”;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (E);

(v) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) through (H) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively; and

(vi) in subparagraph (E) (as so redesignated), by striking “(C), (D), or (E)” and inserting “(C) or (D)”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 16(h)(1)(E)(ii)(I) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)(1)(E)(ii)(I)) is amended by striking “3-month period” and inserting “3-month or 6-month period, as applicable.”.

SEC. 312. WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING AND TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) PUBLIC HOUSING.—Section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR FAMILIES.—The requirements described in section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)) shall apply with respect to any individual who—

“(1) is a member of a family residing in a public housing dwelling; and

“(2) is not exempted from those requirements under paragraph (3) of such section.”.

(b) TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(22) WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR FAMILIES.—The requirements described in section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)) shall apply with respect to any individual who—

“(A) is a member of a family receiving tenant-based assistance; and

“(B) is not exempted from those requirements under paragraph (3) of such section.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I have 10 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 BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet

during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND SPENDING OVERSIGHT

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WATER, AND WILDLIFE

The Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EAST, SOUTH ASIA, CENTRAL ASIA, AND COUNTERTERRORISM

The Subcommittee on Near East, South Asia, Central Asia, and Counterterrorism of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3746

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3746) to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

May 31, 2023

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S1853

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objec-
tion is heard.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:11 P.M.
TONIGHT

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:10 p.m.,
adjourned until Wednesday, May 31,
2023, at 10:11 p.m.

The bill will be read for the second
time on the next legislative day.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I
move to adjourn until 10:11 p.m. to-
night.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING JAMES “JIM” TUTT, JR.

HON. MORGAN MCGARVEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Jim Tutt, who was cruelly taken from us too soon at the Old National Bank Shooting in Louisville on April 10th.

Jim was a loving and dedicated man who put his family and faith before all else. A Frankfort native and University of Kentucky alum, he spent the majority of his impressive career in the financial industry and worked for Old National Bank since 2015, always willing to lend a hand to his colleagues.

Jim's friends and loved ones described him as a deeply caring person, a great community leader, and someone who was so proud of his entire family.

Jim dedicated his time and resources to lending a hand wherever help was needed within his church and community. He will be remembered by his family, friends, and community as a faithful friend who found his own joy from spreading joy to others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for 3 Roll Call votes in the House on Tuesday, May 30, 2023. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: YEA on Roll Call No. 238, H.R. 2795, Enhancing Multi-Class Share Disclosures Act, YEA on Roll Call No. 239, H.R. 2792, Small Entity Update Act, and YEA on Roll Call No. 240, H.R. 2796, Promoting Opportunities for Non-Traditional Capital Formation Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I had to miss votes on May 30, 2023 due to official business in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 238—H.R. 2792; YEA on Roll Call No. 239—H.R. 2795; and YEA on Roll Call No. 240—H.R. 2796.

HONORING JOSH BARRICK

HON. MORGAN MCGARVEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Josh Barrick, who was cru-

elly taken from us too soon at the Old National Bank Shooting in Louisville on April 10th.

Josh was a devoted husband and father who loved his family and friends above all else. His family said, “To know Josh is to love Josh; he was a friend to all.” A Louisville native, he graduated from Trinity High School and attended college at Xavier University. Josh went on to become Senior Vice President of Commercial Real Estate at Old National Bank while devoting his free time to Holy Trinity Catholic Church and coaching first and second grade basketball teams.

Josh was just a few years younger than I am, and he leaves behind a wife and two young children. Josh's wife Jessica asked me to share that Josh was the center of their family; he was an amazing dad, and the family misses him so much.

His devastating and premature loss is deeply felt by our community. He will forever live on in our hearts, our prayers, and our memories.

SOUTH DAKOTAN AWARDED SPIRIT OF AMERICA AWARD

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of RF Buche, a fourth-generation South Dakota grocer. It was recently announced that Mr. Buche is receiving the National Grocers Association Spirit of America Award to recognize his unwavering dedication to the independent grocery industry and his outstanding contributions to South Dakota communities.

RF has dedicated himself to expanding food access in rural and remote communities throughout South Dakota, including the Pine Ridge Reservation, which sits 80 miles from the closest grocery store. Buche has identified innovative ways to serve surrounding communities fresh and healthy foods through community food lockers, online SNAP, and through his non-profit hunger foundation.

Not only does he make a difference through his actions, but he is a tireless advocate for his industry.

He welcomes policymakers like me into his stores to discuss the issues impacting America's grocery shoppers. Over the last few months, he testified before the House Rules Committee and represented the industry at the White House Conference on Hunger working to advance initiatives aimed at eradicating food deserts. Finally, he has been a staunch advocate for competition policy and antitrust reform.

I rise today to applaud and congratulate RF Buche and recognize his remarkable achievements and dedication to the independent grocery industry. His work has left a profound impact on many South Dakotan communities and his efforts remind us of the critical role

independent grocers play in ensuring food security and nourishing our Nation.

Congratulations to RF. This award is rightfully earned.

RECOGNIZING MS. CELIANA TUPUA-DENSER

HON. MARILYN STRICKLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Ms. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a standout member of the South Sound community. I would like to recognize Ms. Celiana Tupua-Denser and her remarkable work as a Registered Nurse for patients in our community, as well as her dedication to her nursing students as an instructor of Practical Nursing at Clover Park Technical College.

After graduating from the Practical Nursing Program at Clover Park Technical College and receiving her Registered Nurse license, Celiana continued her studies in nursing while working as a cardiac nurse.

After earning her Bachelor of Science in Nursing from the University of Washington Tacoma, Celiana decided to give back to the communities that supported her dream by joining the faculty at her alma mater, Clover Park Technical College. As a current Master of Nursing student at the University of Washington Tacoma and a tenure-track faculty member at Clover Park Technical College, Celiana continues to make education a priority not only for herself, but for the future nurses that she teaches.

In the classroom, Celiana focuses on delivering holistic patient care with an eye towards equity. By using simulators to create scenarios that students might face in the industry, Celiana takes advantage of available technology and resources to better prepare students for their nursing careers.

As National Nurses Month comes to a close, I am proud to shine a spotlight on Ms. Celiana Tupua-Denser, a service-oriented nurse and educator we can all learn from.

HONORING PETER L. GOVE

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Peter L. Gove. Peter will be recognized later this week by his colleagues, friends and family for more than 50 years of exceptional leadership to conserve Minnesota's environment, especially its rivers and national parks.

Thanks in no small part to Peter's efforts, Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District has two incredible national parks to enjoy in our front and back yards—the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area (MNRRA) and the

• 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.

St. Croix National Scenic Riverway. Peter gets results the old-fashioned way—by earning them—through tireless advocacy, vision and forging lasting relationships. When he sees a need for action, he doesn't just talk about it, he rolls up his sleeves and does something to protect cherished natural places for everyone.

Peter's success at advocacy draws on his experience as former Chief of the National Park Service Office of Legislation in the Carter/Mondale Administration and lead environmental staffer and later Commissioner for the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency under former Governor Wendell Anderson. He worked closely with the late Congressman Vento and late Senator Durenberger to secure passage of legislation designating MNRRA as a national park in Congress in 1988. He was appointed the first chairman of the Mississippi River Commission by the Secretary of the Interior to develop a comprehensive plan for MNRRA and founded Friends of the Mississippi River (FMR in 1993 and remains on its board.

Later, he worked with former Vice President Walter Mondale to expand the St. Croix River Association. He is an outspoken supporter of protecting Mid west national parks from ever present development pressures, particularly when they threaten the water resources and scenic beauty of our national parks.

After his effective service in the public sector, Peter had an equally distinguished career as an executive for two Minnesota tech companies, St. Jude Medical, Inc. and Control Data Corporation, before retiring in 2005. Throughout his various roles, he remains engaged in the community and in protecting our special natural places.

Peter served as past chair of the St. Croix River Association Board, Trust for Public Land Minnesota Advisory Board, and the National Park Conservation Association Upper Midwest Regional Council. He is also a Trustee of Northland College in Ashland, Wisconsin and chair of the Episcopal Homes of Minnesota Board.

His ongoing work for protection of resources and increased federal funding for parks, has earned him numerous and well-deserved honors, including NPCA's Marjory Stoneman Douglas Award, Wild Rivers Conservancy's Nelson-Mondale Legacy Award, and the Department of the Interior Public Service award in 1995 from then-Secretary of Interior Babbitt.

It has been a privilege to call Peter a trusted ally, advisor, and friend throughout my service in Congress. I have always found him to be a knowledgeable and passionate advocate for the issues he cares about, and I look forward to joining Peter and family later this week at an event to honor his decades of extraordinary public service.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in this well-deserved tribute to Peter. I wish him, his wife Mary, and his children and grandchildren all the best.

HONORING JULIANA FARMER

HON. MORGAN MCGARVEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Juliana Farmer, who was

cruelly taken from us too soon at the Old National Bank Shooting in Louisville on April 10th.

Juliana was known by her friends and family as a beautiful soul inside and out, who made people better just by talking to her. A Henderson County native, Juliana moved to Jefferson County three weeks prior to the shooting to work as a loan analyst while simultaneously pursuing a degree in business administration at Ivy Tech Community College.

When I spoke to Juliana's mother, she described her daughter as "a sensitive person who loved everyone and everything, she was a joy to have as a child, a very intelligent woman . . . she was a dedicated woman who had a pure heart and cared."

Juliana will be remembered by her friends, family, loved ones, and the people of Louisville as a hardworking and loving daughter, sister, mother, and grandmother.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BECCA BALINT

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, due to illness, I was unable to be present on May 30, 2023. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 238, YEA on Roll Call No. 239, and YEA on Roll Call No. 240.

HONORING SHUKRI JAMA

HON. ILHAN OMAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Shukri Jama, a dedicated member of my team for the last three years. Since December 2019, Shukri has loyally served the constituents of Minnesota's 5th Congressional District.

Shukri was born in a refugee camp that bordered Somalia and Kenya. After arriving in the United States, she moved to Minnesota, as part of the UNHCR Refugee Resettlement Program. Shukri later moved to Nebraska where she attended middle and high school. She later received her bachelor's degree in political science at South Dakota University. Her experience as a Somali refugee inspired her to pursue a career in public service.

During Shukri's time in my office, she has proven to be a talented, brilliant, and capable young woman. During her tenure, she has helped our constituents through answering our phone lines, responding to letters, managing our robust intern program, and helping the overall functioning of our office. It has been my pleasure to get to know Shukri and watch her develop her confidence and skills. I am incredibly grateful to her, along with my entire staff who work tirelessly to advance the interests of Minnesotans and the American people. Shukri has been an invaluable asset to my team, and I cannot wait to see the incredible things she will achieve.

On behalf of Minnesota's 5th Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in hon-

oring and thanking Shukri for her service. Her contributions to my office and the constituents of the 5th District will be forever cherished. It was an honor to get to work alongside her to advance a more just world. Shukri's quick wit and love for Taylor Swift will be missed in the office each day, and I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE HUMANITY
INSTITUTE

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize the Humanity Institute, in Locust Grove, Georgia, which is creating a space for all who seek natural healing, personal enlightenment, and to become better versions of themselves. Conceived by founder Harshad Patel, the institute will be a center for wellness and charity. Underpinning the Humanity Institute's approach is a commitment to peace and unity for individuals of all cultures, ethnicities, and religions.

The Humanity Institute plans to utilize Ayurveda. Originating in India over 3,000 years ago, Ayurveda is a system of healthcare which highlights the interconnectedness of the mind, body, and spirit as well as the importance of reducing stress. The institute will have a team of certified Ayurvedic medicine practitioners, specialists, and coaches working together to achieve positive health outcomes. Visitors will be able to meet a specialist and receive an individualized treatment plan. Therapies will include yoga, meditation, acupuncture, and herbal medicines. The campus, which is currently under development, will also offer an Addiction Recovery Center to aid those struggling with substance abuse. Together, these approaches are intended to address physical and mental health in conjunction.

The institute will provide visitors with a welcoming, educational environment where they can focus on eliminating stress and finding inner peace with the support of knowledgeable staff members. Overall, the Humanity Institute aims to create a community where visitors can both find support and help support others.

In addition to supporting the physical and mental health of visitors, the Humanity Institute is committed to assisting those in need. The proceeds from the institute will support charitable activities within the United States and throughout the world. These efforts include assisting victims of human trafficking, combating poverty, reducing hunger, conserving our natural environment, and promoting harmonious interpersonal and lifestyle management.

Mr. Speaker, founder Harshad Patel has an ambitious yet essential goal. The Humanity Institute is working diligently to develop its campus and to create a destination for wellness and peace. I want to commend the Humanity Institute for its efforts.

HONORING THOMAS “TOMMY”
ELLIOTT

HON. MORGAN MCGARVEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my friend, Tommy Elliott, who was cruelly taken from us too soon at the Old National Bank Shooting in Louisville on April 10th.

Tommy was a pillar of the Louisville community and a friend to all. Most importantly, he was a friend of ours.

I knew Tommy for a long time, and my wife, Chris, worked with his wife. Tommy loved life, and we loved sharing our life with him. He was the definition of a true friend.

An Elizabethtown High School and University of Kentucky alum, he devoted his life to helping others through serving on the board of numerous organizations and nonprofits throughout Kentucky, as well as mentoring some of the most prominent members of our community. Tommy will always be remembered as a true public servant, dedicated father and husband, and inspirational leader to all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 238—H.R. 2792; YEA on Roll Call No. 239—H.R. 2795; and YEA on Roll Call No. 240—H.R. 2796.

HONORING COLONEL THOMAS O.
PEMBERTON

HON. RUDY YAKYM III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. YAKYM. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize and celebrate Colonel Thomas O. Pemberton, Commander of the 434th Air Refueling Wing at Grissom Air Reserve Base, for his retirement from the U.S. Air Force Reserve this month.

Colonel Pemberton’s distinguished career in service to our nation has spanned nearly four decades. During that time, Colonel Pemberton’s professionalism and persistence has advanced the mission of the United States Military and inspired countless other men and women to be the very best they can be.

First entering active duty in 1985, Colonel Pemberton has flown numerous aircraft in his career, amassing more than 5,800 flight hours as a navigator and a pilot. Colonel Pemberton’s service has taken him bases across our country, including numerous roles at Grissom alone. It has also included mobilization and deployments in support of Operations Northern Watch, Enduring Freedom, Iraqi Freedom as well as other contingencies across the globe.

For the past two years, Colonel Pemberton has served as the 38th commander of the 434th Air Refueling Wing (ARW), a unit responsible for operating and maintaining all of Grissom Air Reserve Base. In this role, Colonel Pemberton has ably commanded the largest KC-135R Stratotanker unit in the Air Force Reserve Command, which runs refueling missions around the world. With nearly 1,900 military, civilian, and contractor personnel at Grissom, Pemberton’s steady leadership has proved instrumental in the success of the Hoosier Wing. In addition to his upstanding service in the Air Reserve, countless Hoosiers have testified to another important aspect of Colonel Pemberton’s life: his commitment and devotion to his family.

Indiana’s Second’s Congressional District, the Hoosier state, and our entire nation are all better off because of Colonel Pemberton’s service and leadership. I am proud to call Colonel Pemberton a friend and to congratulate him on a mission well accomplished. I and Hoosiers throughout the Second District and beyond, wish Colonel Pemberton and his entire family nothing but the best as he prepares to embark on the next exciting chapter of his life.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN MAYSAA
OUZA

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize Air Force Captain Maysaa Ouza, a native of Dearborn in Michigan’s 12th District Strong, a trailblazer for religious freedom and advocate on behalf of victims of crimes.

Captain Ouza is a graduate of University of Michigan-Dearborn and the University of Toledo College of Law in Toledo, Ohio. She first became interested in serving in the U.S. Air Force in 2018. An Arab American woman who wears the hijab, Captain Ouza blazed the trail for those who would follow in her footsteps by successfully petitioning the Air Force to reconsider its nationwide policy regarding religious accommodations. She is the first Air Force judge advocate (JAG) to wear a hijab in uniform. Captain Ouza currently serves as a JAG officer at the Wright-Patterson Air Force base in Dayton, Ohio, where she advocates on behalf of survivors of domestic abuse and sexual assault.

Please join me in recognizing Captain Maysaa Ouza, for her outstanding service, as we welcome her back to Dearborn, Michigan as the Grand Marshal of the City of Dearborn’s ninety-seventh Memorial Day festivities.

HONORING DEANA ECKERT

HON. MORGAN MCGARVEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Deana Eckert, who was cruelly taken from us too soon at the Old National Bank Shooting in Louisville on April 10th.

Deana was a selfless person above all and found the most joy in pouring love into her friends, family, and everyone she encountered. A Kentucky native and Western Kentucky University alum, Deana truly devoted her life to uplifting others. She had worked for Old National Bank since 2016 and was a beloved wife and mother to two children.

Deana’s father said he would always remember his daughter for her generosity and “how good and sweet she was.” Her husband and daughter said that “she never met someone she didn’t leave a lasting positive impact on,” and that she was the “kindest, most loving and compassionate” person.

Deana will be remembered by her family, friends, and neighbors in Louisville as “a rainbow of love.”

RECOGNIZING ELBIT SYSTEMS OF
AMERICA—30 YEARS OF SERVICE,
PERFORMANCE, AND INNOVATION

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 30th anniversary of one of America’s critically important defense technology companies—Elbit Systems of America, of Fort Worth, Texas. I congratulate the company and its 3,400 employees nationwide for their three decades of service and performance.

The men and women of Elbit Systems of America embody the spirit of innovation and have made invaluable contributions to our national defense and the welfare of our communities.

Founded in 1993, Elbit Systems of America has become a beacon of success within the defense industry. Over the past three decades, the company has continuously embraced innovation and leveraged cutting-edge technology to deliver superior defense capabilities to our aimed forces.

As a leading provider of innovative defense solutions, Elbit Systems of America has consistently demonstrated its commitment to excellence and has played a vital role in ensuring our national security. Through its unwavering dedication, Elbit Systems of America has established itself as a trusted partner in equipping our military with the tools they need to safeguard our nation.

Beyond its impressive track record in defense technology, Elbit Systems of America has also exemplified a deep sense of corporate social responsibility. The company’s commitment to giving back to the community is commendable, and its charitable contributions have had a profound impact on numerous organizations and causes.

I must also acknowledge the hard work and dedication of its employees, many of whom have worked there from the company’s modest beginnings, accumulating decades of expertise while simultaneously supporting key charitable organizations. As a Fort Worth native, I have known a number of Elbit Systems of America employees for many years. They are my neighbors, fellow parishioners, and friends. I can attest that they are joined together by a shared commitment to the company’s mission to create and deliver innovative

solutions that protect and save lives. It is because of their expertise, creativity, and tireless efforts that the company has achieved its remarkable success.

Through initiatives such as the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, Habitat for Humanity, and the Tarrant Area Food Bank, Elbit Systems of America employees have donated hundreds of thousands of dollars and tens of thousands of service-hours. By investing in these important areas, the company has helped improve the lives of countless individuals and strengthened our society as a whole.

Please join me in congratulating Elbit Systems of America on this significant occasion and wishing them continued prosperity in all their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DEBORAH K. ROSS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on May 30, 2023 due to 2 positive COVID-19 tests. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 238, YEA on Roll Call No. 239, and YEA on Roll Call No. 240.

HONORING PAUL HUBER, THE J. CARTER WALKER AWARDEE

HON. ABIGAIL DAVIS SPANBERGER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Paul Huber, the J. Carter Walker awardee, at Woodberry Forest School. For the past 55 years, Mr. Huber has served his students, the school, and his community, through his long-standing commitment to education and learning.

Mr. Huber's educational journey at Woodberry Forest started as a student at the school in the Fall of 1964. In 1968, he graduated from Woodberry as the class valedictorian. In his valedictorian speech, he asked the class not to leave Woodberry "without feeling not only has the school done something for you, but also that you have done something for the school." In accordance with this statement, the 1968 senior class announced at graduation that their class gift could not be used by the school until the board of trustees opened admission to all students, regardless of race or religion.

After graduation, Mr. Huber attended Yale University. He returned to Woodberry Forest School in 1972 to teach French, and throughout his 55-year career at Woodberry, he taught every language offered by the school. He also served as an academic dean and as associate headmaster from 1980 to 1996. In this role, he oversaw student scheduling and academic affairs. Since 2001 he has served as Woodberry's senior master. Finally, in 2018 he returned to the academic dean's role while continuing to teach French.

Mr. Huber is known for his ability to connect with his students. He remains in contact with hundreds of alumni—he is known for remembering birthdays, staying up to date on their

professional advancements, and offering advice when asked. His office is often the first stop for visiting alumni.

After 55 years of service to Woodberry Forest School, Mr. Huber is being honored with the J. Carter Walker Award, Woodberry's highest honor. J. Carter Walker, for whom the award is named, served Woodberry for more than 50 years and was the school's first headmaster. The award is given by the board of trustees to an alumnus or friend of the school who has exemplified the personal standards of Mr. Walker in devotion and long service to Woodberry Forest School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in honoring Paul Huber. His commitment and passion for education and for Woodberry Forest School are admirable—and may he keep inspiring Virginia students to learn.

CONGRATULATING HOLLY JOHNSON

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Holly Johnson for a remarkable 24 years with the Adams County Economic and Community Development, including the last 12 as Economic Development Director. Throughout her service to the county, Holly has worked with and met people from different backgrounds, led many community collaboration efforts, and built important partnerships throughout the county.

Holly is well known in Adams County, Ohio. Her selfless service has been a beacon of hope, integrity, and diligence.

Never touting her own accomplishments, Holly always acted in the best interests of all those she chose to serve. She leaves an incredible legacy in the community and leaves the job where the next Director will be in a position to thrive.

Holly Johnson served all around with dedication and honor throughout her career. I thank Holly for her service to the good people of our community. I wish her the best in her future endeavors.

HONORING AND RECOGNIZING IDA TIMMONS ON HER RETIREMENT AFTER 34 YEARS ON THE EASTERN SUFFOLK BOARD OF COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES (BOCES)

HON. ANDREW R. GARBARINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. GARBARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize Ida Timmons on her retirement after 34 years on the Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES).

Throughout her career, Ida has been a Student Assistance Service Counselor with Eastern Suffolk BOCES at the South Country Central School District as well as a Volunteer at numerous Not-for-Profits Agencies and Churches.

Ida has been an asset to Eastern Suffolk BOCES and to our community. I thank her for 34 years of incredible public service and wish her the best on her upcoming retirement.

FIRST NATIVE AMERICAN TO SUMMIT MOUNT EVEREST

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the first Native American to summit Mount Everest, Dr. Jacob Weasel from Rapid City, South Dakota.

Dr. Weasel is a surgeon at Monument Health and a member of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe. Five years ago, he became the first known Lakota surgeon and is now also known as the first Native American to summit the Earth's highest peak.

Dr. Jacob Weasel wants to set an example for Native American youth, showing them, they are capable of accomplishing whatever they set their mind to. This recent accomplishment is only a part of his goal to be the first Native American to summit the Seven Summits. Additionally, Dr. Weasel hopes to build a playground in Rapid City's Lakota Homes neighborhood and fund three women's health centers in rural Nepal.

I want to congratulate Dr. Jacob Weasel on his recent accomplishment and wish him the best of luck in completing the Seven Summits.

IN MEMORY OF PROFESSOR CHRISTOPHER SMITH: A TRAILBLAZER IN MEDIA, ECONOMICS, AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

HON. JONATHAN L. JACKSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable educator and dear friend, Professor Christopher Smith, who has recently passed away at the age of 55. Christopher was a clinical professor of communication at the University of Southern California Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism, where he passionately served for more than 20 years, inspiring colleagues and students with his innovation, leadership, and vision.

Throughout his tenure at USC Annenberg, Christopher proved himself to be an innovator and a leader. Christopher's passion for teaching was clearly demonstrated in the variety of comprehensive courses he developed. These included engaging and thought-provoking subjects like "Communication, Culture and Capitalism," and "Media, Money, and Society." These courses and seminars, unique in their focus and design, opened doors of opportunity for students to investigate the pressing issues of our time and devise innovative solutions.

Christopher's contributions extend far beyond the classroom. He was a trailblazer in creating links between academia and industry, leveraging his professional network to establish partnerships with prominent technology

companies in Silicon Valley and Los Angeles. His influence was instrumental in shaping the USC Annenberg experience, establishing economic literacy and entrepreneurial acumen as cornerstones of education there.

As the co-founder and director of the interdisciplinary Media, Economics & Entrepreneurship (M{2e}) program, Christopher led the way in exploring the evolving business models of communication and journalism. This program has been instrumental in cultivating the next wave of media leaders and entrepreneurs, providing them with practical, hands-on opportunities at leading companies.

His academic prowess also extended to research, with his work published in respected journals such as *Social Text* and the *International Journal of Communication*. He was frequently sought after by national and international media outlets, including NBC, ABC, NPR, the BBC, and Reuters, to share his insights.

In his capacity as a global intellectual voice, Christopher dedicated himself to cultivating global opportunities for USC. His research presentations at leading universities in Shenzhen, China; Johannesburg, South Africa; Copenhagen, Denmark; and Oxford, England, opened dialogues for further international collaboration.

Christopher's advocacy extended into the realm of diversity and inclusion. He founded the Women's Leadership Society, the first of its kind at USC Annenberg, which focused on promoting female professional advancement within the intersecting fields of technology, media, and entertainment.

His relentless dedication to closing opportunity gaps for women, people of color, and historically disadvantaged groups showcased his unwavering commitment to fostering an equitable and inclusive academic environment.

In his capacity as a faculty member, Christopher served the university and its students in many roles. He was selected to serve on the USC Board of Trustees Development Committee and most recently, served as the chair of USC Annenberg's Faculty Council. Moreover, his influence was felt within his innovative course "TV Strategy: From Broadcasting to YouTube," where he provided students with opportunities to work on real-world business cases and conduct original research projects, fostering an environment that truly combined theoretical knowledge with practical experiences.

Christopher Smith's life was a life dedicated to service, to mentorship, to innovation, and above all, to the pursuit of knowledge and justice. He will be deeply missed; yet his legacy will live on through the countless lives he touched and the profound impact he had on the field of media studies. On behalf of the United States Congress, I extend our deepest condolences to Christopher's wife, Salaam Coleman Smith, their children Asa and Nina, and their extended family and friends. We honor his significant contributions to education and communication, and his enduring legacy will continue to inspire and inform generations to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PRAMILA JAYAPAL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on May 30, 2023. Had I been present, I would have voted: Yea on Roll Call No. 238, Yea on Roll Call No. 239, and Yea on Roll Call No. 240.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. THOMAS H. KEAN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I missed this series of votes because of a delay in airline travel to DC. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 238, YEA on Roll Call No. 239, and YEA on Roll Call No. 240.

JUDGE GREG MATHIS: A PIONEERING FORCE IN JUSTICE AND MEDIA

HON. JONATHAN L. JACKSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this esteemed body to honor an individual who has left an indelible mark on our society through his unwavering commitment to justice, equality, and public service. I have the distinct privilege of acknowledging the contributions of a man who has shown a remarkable dedication to the ideals of equal justice and opportunity for all, Judge Greg Mathis.

Judge Mathis is not just a well-known figure in the media landscape; he is a pioneer. For over two decades, he has consistently been a source of inspiration and motivation as the longest-running African-American male host on television. His Emmy Award-winning television court show, *Judge Mathis*, has provided hope and guidance to millions who tune in to witness justice delivered with fairness, empathy, and firmness. A symbol of tenacity and resilience, Judge Mathis's transformation from a street youth to an acclaimed Judge is a testament to the power of redemption and the indomitable human spirit. In 2022, his remarkable contributions to the entertainment industry were rightly recognized with a star on Hollywood's "Walk of Fame," a fitting honor for a man of his stature and impact.

While his achievements in the television industry are commendable, Judge Mathis's work in public service is equally, if not more, impressive. He embarked on his journey in public service while in college, leading noteworthy campaigns such as Free South Africa and voter registration movements. After graduating in 1983, Judge Mathis continued his path of public service by joining the staff of Detroit City councilman Clyde Cleveland. His unwavering commitment to justice and equality found a fruitful platform with Reverend Jesse Jackson's PUSH Excel, where he now serves as

Chairman. He has also devoted his time and expertise to the NAACP and the Morehouse School of Medicine as a national board member, championing causes and policies that promote fairness, equality, and justice.

Judge Mathis's deep commitment to the community, particularly his hometown of Detroit, is further underscored by his numerous civic engagements and philanthropic endeavors. In 2001, he opened the Mathis Community Center, providing a platform for community engagement and outreach. In the same vein, he established his non-profit agency, Young Adults Asserting Themselves (Y.A.A.T.). These organizations have opened the doors of opportunity for thousands of Detroit youth, equipping them with the skills and resources they need to improve their lives and achieve their dreams.

His profound contributions to the city of Detroit have earned him well-deserved recognition. In honor of his relentless dedication, a street was named after him, 'Mathis Avenue,' as a constant reminder of his tireless efforts to uplift his community. Alongside his wife, Judge Mathis has further shown his dedication by opening five non-profit preschools in inner-city Detroit, working towards equalizing educational opportunities for the children of Detroit.

Beyond his judicial and civic commitments, Judge Mathis has made a significant impact in the realms of television production and literature. His production company, Mathis Productions, has been responsible for an array of successful television series, many of which underscore transformative and redemptive narratives. He is also the author of two insightful books, *Inner City Miracle* and *Street Judge*, in which he shares his journey and sheds light on the complexities of justice and morality in society.

Judge Mathis is not only a man of profound accomplishments; he is a man of immense character. He is a loving husband to his wife, Linda, and a proud father and grandfather. His life is a testament to the power of perseverance, dedication, and an unwavering belief in the pursuit of justice and equality.

It is with deep respect and admiration that I pay tribute to Judge Greg Mathis today. His tireless commitment to public service, his unwavering dedication to equal justice, and his relentless efforts in uplifting communities and empowering youth have already left an enduring legacy.

However, knowing Judge Mathis, I am confident that his future holds further accomplishments. He continues to be a driving force for change, and I eagerly anticipate the positive impact that his ongoing endeavors will undoubtedly have on our society.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed suspension votes on May 30, 2023.

Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll No. 238, Nay on Roll Call No. 239, and Nay on Roll Call No. 240.

ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HERITAGE MONTH SPOTLIGHT: DR. VIJAY G PRABHAKAR'S IMPACT IN CHICAGO AND BEYOND

HON. JONATHAN L. JACKSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 2023

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we close Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, I rise to celebrate the remarkable contributions of Dr. Vijay G Prabhakar, a Chicago-based Asian American leader whose dedication to public health, community service, and multi-ethnic unity has enriched our society. The story of his achievements, from the earliest days of his career to the present day, underscores his commitment to our community and the global stage.

As we find ourselves not even midway through the year 2023, I find myself standing in awe of the staggering breadth of achievements already accrued by Dr. Prabhakar. His illustrious record of accomplishments this year alone puts into sharp relief a lifetime's work of many, reinforcing the fact that his relentless dedication and commitment to service is truly unparalleled.

Starting the year with strength and vision, on January 4, Dr. Prabhakar led the successful launch of the GSA India @75 Expo USA Metro Cities Sequel in Washington, D.C. Together with esteemed colleagues including Congressman DANNY K. DAVIS, RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, DELIA RAMIREZ, Cook County Board President Toni Preckwinkle, and myself, we are aiming to strengthen U.S.—India relations across six major American cities in 2023.

Later that month, on January 28, I had the privilege to launch the Global Eye International Institute of Leadership in New York City. This institute, a brainchild of Dr. Prabhakar, offers short term leadership courses to ethnic minorities on a broad range of subjects, preparing and empowering future minority leaders in America. On the very same day, the World Malayalee Council, New York Province recognized Dr. Prabhakar's efforts with a Distinguished Leadership Award.

In a further testament to his tireless dedication to community service, Dr. Prabhakar launched the Gandhi King Center for Non-Violence in the Englewood neighborhood of Chicago on February 1. This initiative, aimed at reducing gun violence through grassroots community participation, is yet another example of his innovative approach to problem-solving.

March brought a memorable celebration as Dr. Prabhakar organized the India Unity Day to commemorate the historic defeat of the Anti-India resolution in the City of Chicago.

His relentless efforts were recognized by the United Punjabi Association, USA, which honored him with the Distinguished Community Leader Award on April 15.

In May, Dr. Prabhakar represented our nation as a Special Guest of Honor at the dedi-

cation of Asia's largest Christian Church in Warangal District, India. His dedication to public service extended to the sports domain as he met with Mr. Jay Shah, Secretary, Board of Cricket Control of India, to discuss the launch of the North American Cricket Promotion Council in the U.S.A.

Most recently, Dr. Prabhakar was chosen as National Chairman of the Asian American Restaurants Association. This is yet another testament to his remarkable leadership within our Asian American community.

Mr. Speaker, I remind you that these are just a handful of the numerous accomplishments Dr. Prabhakar has achieved in the first few months of 2023. I could stand before you for days, recounting the breadth and depth of Dr. Prabhakar's work. His unwavering dedication to service, community, and global unity is nothing short of inspiring.

His story, filled with resilience, perseverance, and an unwavering commitment to the service of others, stands as a testament to the power of hard work and the impact of purposeful leadership. His achievements reflect not only his exceptional dedication but also his ceaseless drive for the betterment of our communities, both here in the USA and abroad.

Dr. Prabhakar's contributions reach beyond his professional sphere, extending to significant social causes and initiatives. His dedication to public health, community service, and multi-ethnic unity has enriched our society, and his influence continues to inspire countless individuals and communities. Dr. Prabhakar's remarkable journey is a shining example of what can be achieved when passion meets purpose, and when a relentless spirit of service guides every action.

I would like to express my deepest admiration for Dr. Vijay G Prabhakar and his extraordinary contributions. His unwavering commitment to improving the lives of others, his tireless advocacy for unity and inclusivity, and his ability to lead with compassion and integrity make him a true role model for us all.

As we celebrate the Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, we celebrate trailblazers like Dr. Prabhakar who serve as pillars of our society. It is individuals like him who enrich our community and fortify the spirit of unity and diversity in our great Nation. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing and applauding the outstanding contributions of Dr. Prabhakar.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 1, 2023 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 7

- 10 a.m.
Committee on the Budget
To hold hearings to examine the changing agricultural landscape, focusing on cultivating stewardship. SD-608
- Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine perspectives on ecosystem restoration projects of the US Army Corps of Engineers. SD-406
- Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine Department of State services for the American people, focusing on an overview of consular affairs and programs. SD-419
- Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine pending nominations. SD-226
- 10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Defense
To receive a closed briefing on proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2024 for capacity of the defense industrial base and wartime stockpiles. SVC-217
- 2 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation
To hold hearings to examine aligning transatlantic approaches on China. SD-419
- 3 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Intellectual Property
To hold hearings to examine artificial intelligence and intellectual property, focusing on patents, innovation, and competition. SD-226
- Committee on Rules and Administration
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Election Assistance Commission. SR-301
- Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine veterans' access to long term care. SR-418
- ##### JUNE 8
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine FASTA implementation and optimizing the efficient use of Federal property. SD-562

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

(Legislative Days of Tuesday, May 30, 2023, and Wednesday, May 31, 2023)

Routine Proceedings, pages S1813–S1855

Measures Introduced: Twenty-three bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1763–1785, S. Res. 227–230, and S. Con. Res. 11. **Pages S1843–44**

Measures Passed:

U.S. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day Act: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. 769, to amend title 36, United States Code, to designate March 9 as U.S. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day and to designate the Hostage and Wrongful Detainee flag as an official symbol to recognize citizens of the United States held as hostages or wrongfully detained abroad, and the bill was then passed. **Page S1824**

Veterans Get Outside Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 206, designating June 10, 2023, as “Veterans Get Outside Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S1824–25**

National Public Works Week: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 223, designating the week of May 21 through May 27, 2023, as “National Public Works Week”, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S1824–25**

Kids to Parks Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 226, designating May 20, 2023, as “Kids to Parks Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S1824–25**

National Brain Tumor Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 229, designating May 2023 as “National Brain Tumor Awareness Month”. **Pages S1824–25**

Measures Considered:

Waivers and Modifications of Federal Student Loans—Agreement: Senate began consideration of H.J. Res. 45, providing for congressional disapproval

under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Waivers and Modifications of Federal Student Loans”. **Pages S1817–24**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 134), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution. **Page S1817**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the joint resolution at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, June 1, 2023; and that at 12:15 p.m., Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution. **Page S1855**

Messages from the House: **Page S1840**

Measures Referred: **Page S1840**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S1855**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S1840, S1852**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1840–42**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S1842–43**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1844–46**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1846–49**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1838–40**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1849–52**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1852**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—134) **Page S1817**

Motion to Adjourn: Senate agreed to the motion to adjourn until 10:11 p.m., on Wednesday, May 31, 2023. **Page S1853**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:10 p.m., and reconvened at 10:11 p.m., on the same day, and adjourned at 10:13 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 1, 2023. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1855.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COUNTERING CHINA

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine countering China, focusing on advancing U.S. national security, economic security, and foreign policy, including S. 1271, to impose sanctions with respect to trafficking of illicit fentanyl and its precursors by transnational criminal organizations, including cartels, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes, and Paul Rosen, Assistant Secretary for Investment Security, both of the Department of the Treasury; and Thea D. Rozman Kendler, Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, and Matthew S. Axelrod, Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement, both of the Department of Commerce.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 1111, to enhance United States civil nuclear leadership, support the licensing of advanced nuclear technologies, strengthen the domestic nuclear energy fuel cycle and supply chain, and improve the regulation of nuclear energy, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

WATER AFFORDABILITY

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife concluded a hearing to examine water affordability and small system assistance, after receiving testimony from Kyle Jones, Community Water Center, Sacramento, California; Rosemary Menard, City of Santa Cruz Water Department, Santa Cruz, California; and Mark Pepper, Wyoming Association of Rural Water Systems, Glenrock, on behalf of the National Rural Water Association.

MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA BUDGET

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Near East, South Asia, Central Asia, and Counterterrorism concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2024 for the Middle East and North Africa, after receiving testimony from Barbara A. Leaf, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs; and Jeanne Pryor, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for the Middle East, U.S. Agency for International Development.

RUSSIAN ATROCITIES IN UKRAINE

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine accountability for Russian atrocities in Ukraine, after receiving testimony from Beth Van Schaack, Ambassador-at-Large for Global Criminal Justice, Department of State.

LEGACY IT SYSTEMS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight concluded a hearing to examine securing the nation, focusing on modernizing the Department of Homeland Security's mission-critical legacy IT systems, after receiving testimony from Eric Hysen, Chief Information Officer, Charles Armstrong, Chief Information Officer, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and Opeyemi Oshinnaiye, Assistant Administrator for Information Technology, Transportation Security Administration, all of the Department of Homeland Security; and Kevin Walsh, Director, Information, Technology and Cybersecurity, Government Accountability Office.

CHILD CARE CRISIS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine solving the child care crisis, focusing on meeting the needs of working families and child care workers, after receiving testimony from Kathryn Larin, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, Government Accountability Office; Elizabeth Groginsky, New Mexico Early Childhood Education and Care Department Cabinet Secretary, Santa Fe; Lauren Hogan, National Association for the Education of Young Children, and Carrie Lukas, Independent Women's Forum, both of Washington, D.C.; and Cheryl Morman, Blessings From Above Child Development Center, Richmond, Virginia.

IMMIGRANT WORKERS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine immigrant workers, after receiving testimony from Daniel Costa, Economic Policy Institute, Washington, D.C.; Chalmers R. Carr III, Titan Farms LLC, Ridge Spring, South Carolina; Adam Lytch, L and M Farms, East Palatka, Florida; Diana Tellefson Torres, UFW Foundation, Bakersfield, California; and Leon R. Sequeira, Prospect, Kentucky.

NOMINATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Tanya J. Bradsher, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Duckworth, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 3757–3780; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 66; and H. Res. 458–460 were introduced.

Pages H2707–08

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H2709–10

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Con. Res. 43, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (H. Rept. 118–82).

Page H2707

Recess: The House recessed at 4:41 p.m. and reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

Page H2681

Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023: The House passed H.R. 3746, to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling, by a recorded vote of 314 ayes to 117 noes, Roll No. 243.

Pages H2671–80, H2681–H2706

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment printed in H. Rept. 118–81 shall be considered as adopted.

Pages H2681–92

H. Res. 456, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3746) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 241, after the previous question was ordered without objection.

Pages H2671–80

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, May 30th.

Recognizing the significance of Jewish American Heritage Month as a time to celebrate the contributions of Jewish Americans to the society and culture of the United States: H. Res. 382, amended, recognizing the significance of Jewish American Heritage Month as a time to celebrate the contributions of Jewish Americans to the society and culture of the United States, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 429 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 242; and

Pages H2680–81

Equal Opportunity for All Investors Act of 2023: H.R. 2797, amended, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to require certification examinations for accredited

investors, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 383 yeas to 18 nays, Roll No. 244.

Page H2706

Member Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Cicilline, wherein he resigned as Representative for the First Congressional District of Rhode Island, effective at the close of the legislative day today, May 31, 2023.

Page H2707

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2680, H2680–81, H2705–06, and H2706.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 2023

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2024 for the National Guard and Reserve, 9:30 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the reliability and resiliency of electric service in the United States in light of recent reliability assessments and alerts, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Chile for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed in Washington on February 4, 2010, with a Protocol signed the same day, as corrected by exchanges of notes effected February 25, 2011, and February 10 and 21, 2012, and a related agreement effected by exchange of notes (the “related Agreement”)

on February 4, 2010 (Treaty Doc.112–08), the nominations of Stephanie Syptak-Ramnath, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, Yael Lempert, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Arthur W. Brown, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ecuador, Roger F. Nyhus, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Barbados, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Federation of Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Antigua and Barbuda, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, William W. Popp, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Uganda, Julie Turner, of Maryland, to be Special Envoy on North Korean Human Rights Issues, with the rank of Ambassador, Ervin Jose Massinga, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ana A. Escrogima, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Sultanate of Oman, and Lisa A. Johnson, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Lebanese

Republic, all of the Department of State, and other pending calendar business, 10:30 a.m., S–116, Capitol.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1080, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require electronic communication service providers and remote computing services to report to the Attorney General certain controlled substances violations, S. 474, to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen reporting to the CyberTipline related to online sexual exploitation of children, to modernize liabilities for such reports, to preserve the contents of such reports for 1 year, and the nominations of Shannon R. Saylor, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Virginia, Department of Justice, Ana de Alba, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, and Irma Carrillo Ramirez, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, 10 a.m., SH–216.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, June 1

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 a.m., Thursday, June 1

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of H.J. Res. 45, Student Loans Congressional Review Act, and vote on passage thereon at 12:15 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 11 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Balint, Becca, Vt., E506
 Bucshon, Larry, Ind., E507
 Garbarino, Andrew R., N.Y. E508
 Jackson, Jonathan L., Ill., E508, E509, E510
 Jayapal, Pramila, Wash., E509
 Johnson, Dusty, S. Dak., E505, E508

Kean, Thomas M., N.J., E509
 Krishnamoorthi, Raja, Ill., E506
 LaHood, Darin, Ill., E505
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E505
 McGarvey, Morgan, Ky., E505, E505, E506, E507, E507
 Omar, Ihan, Minn., E506
 Pocan, Mark, Wisc., E505
 Ross, Deborah K., N.C., E508

Spanberger, Abigail Davis, Va., E508
 Strickland, Marilyn, Wash., E505
 Tlaib, Rashida, Mich., E507
 Veasey, Marc A., Tex., E507
 Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E508
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E509
 Yakym, Rudy III, Ind., E507



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.