United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2023 *No. 108*

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 21, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

CONGRATULATING LINDA RUSHING ON HER RETIREMENT

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate Linda Rushing on her retirement from her leadership role as vice chancellor at the University of Arkansas at Monticello College of Technology-Crossett.

Linda has worked tirelessly for almost five decades to serve her community through dedication to teaching, student administration, and academic leadership.

Linda began her career at Forest Echoes Vocational Technical School in 1975 where she was hired as a business instructor. She continued to serve this institution through 1987 when she was named director of the school.

When Forest Echoes Vocational Technical School merged with UAM to become UAM-CTC, she was named vice chancellor, where she has served for 20 years. Linda's commitment to excellence and the success of her faculty, staff, and students at the UAM College of Technology-Crossett has immensely benefited the greater Arkansas community. Her passion for serving others in leadership has cultivated a campus environment in which students can thrive and one that has served the workforce needs of southeast Arkansas and its communities.

I congratulate Linda on a commendable career of leadership and public service and thank her for all she has done for the State of Arkansas.

CONGRATULATING JOE FOX ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to congratulate my good friend, Mr. Joe Fox, on his retirement.

Joe has had a successful career in forestry in my home State of Arkansas as State forester, directing the Forestry Division of the Arkansas Department of Agriculture.

In Arkansas, Joe Fox and forestry are synonymous. He brings to the table a depth of experience, having served as president of the Arkansas Forestry Association, chairman of the Arkansas Forestry Commission, and president of the National Association of State Foresters.

I express my sincere thanks to Joe for his service and dedication to the State of Arkansas, his knowledge of forestry, and his contributions to the industry. I am proud to say that Arkansas serves as a blueprint for forest management for the rest of the country, and that has been enhanced by the service and leadership of Joe Fox.

Without a doubt, through his work in forestry and conservation, Joe has left a legacy for future generations, not only in the example that he set but also a tangible one: Our forests are better off for our kids and grandkids because of Joe Fox.

Mr. Speaker, I will leave with you a famous Joe Fox quote: ''Trees are the answer. Now, what is your question?'' I couldn't agree more.

ARKANSAS IS A WONDERFUL STATE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Arkansas celebrated its statehood last week. Arkansas became the 25th State of the United States on June 15, 1836.

Arkansas is a wonderful State with a rich history, breathtaking natural beauty, and vibrant communities. From the gorgeous Ozark Mountains to the mighty Mississippi River, Arkansas is a State of limitless opportunities.

Arkansas has changed and flourished since its entry into the Union, leaving its imprint on the history of our country. Arkansas has experienced significant events, overcome barriers, and built a strong and resilient community to be proud of.

From the Delta blues to the world-renowned Hot Springs National Park, our State provides a diverse range of activities that reflect our distinct past. Let us continue to honor Arkansas' diverse culture, customs, and people.

PROTECTING OUR TERRITORIES AND FRIENDS IS PARAMOUNT

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States stands as a beacon of freedom with a mission to protect the inalienable rights for which many have given their lives. This mission rings from the mountains to the prairies, across our oceans, and across the globe.

This month, the Indo-Pacific Task Force was assembled to evaluate Chinese attempts to usurp our interests in the Pacific. China is a threat to our democracy, and they are attempting to

Printed on recycled paper.

gain a foothold not only in Cuba but also within our territories across the Pacific and Indo-Pacific regions.

To combat this hostility, our bipartisan team was assembled to support our territories and friends in the Freely Associated States to counter the communist influence.

Protecting our territories and our friends is paramount. I ask Congress to engage in this effort fully, heed the suggestions of the Indo-Pacific Task Force, and work together to strengthen our territories and deter Chinese influence in the Pacific and here at home.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER PARSONS

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a very heavy heart to pay tribute to St. Paul firefighter, my friend, Captain Christopher Parsons, who was just 48 years old when he sustained a major medical event shortly after completing his shift and passed away last week.

Christopher's untimely passing is a deep and profound loss for his loved ones, fellow firefighters, our entire city, and, in fact, the entire State.

After joining the department in 2000, he was promoted to captain in 2007. He served in leadership roles for the IAFF Local 21, the Minnesota Professional Fire Fighters, and the Minnesota Fire Service Foundation, and he took his expertise and passion for public safety to our State capital, where he improved public safety for so many.

Chris was a guide for me. I learned so much from him about firefighting and the needs of those who fight fires.

Captain Parsons had an impact on so many lives. He fought to save lives during his time on Earth, and he continues to do so through the gift of organ donation.

I extend my deepest condolences to Chris' family, and I express my gratitude for all those who put their lives on the line day after day to keep our communities safe.

RECOGNIZING ALEX MEDINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Alex Medina, a man who demonstrates the spirit of giving that is a model for all of us.

Alex is a bone marrow donor, and thanks to his generosity, he was able to provide Egerton Burroughs, a man whom he had never met, with a second chance at life.

Mr. Speaker, donations like Alex's, whether they be bone marrow, blood, or other precious resources, help save the lives of countless Americans every day.

Mr. Medina and Mr. Burroughs were brought together by a wonderful program, Be The Match, which matches viable bone marrow donors to patients across the country.

We are blessed in North Carolina that both Duke University Hospital and Wake Forest Baptist play pivotal roles in bone marrow and stem cell transplants. Dedicated professionals there and at other institutions perform lifesaving work.

Mr. Speaker, across North Carolina and our entire Nation, the kindness and generosity of donors like Alex Medina should not only be celebrated but also encouraged.

We can all play a positive role in the lives of others, and donating blood and other critical resources is one way of doing so. The simple actions we take can go on to make a profound impact upon people we know as well as those we do not know.

Proverbs 11:25 reads: ''A generous person will prosper; whoever refreshes others will be refreshed.''

Let us never forget how we can serve as forces for good and give to others the gifts that God has bestowed upon us.

RECOGNIZING BILL FISHER

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Bill Fisher, a familiar voice to many within the High Country in North Carolina's Fifth District and someone I consider to be a dear friend.

After nearly 50 years of being on the radio and keeping the High Country informed on all the news of the day, Bill, or Fish, as many of his friends and colleagues refer to him, will be hanging up his headset one final time and retiring.

For years, I have been fortunate to join Bill on the radio to talk about issues ranging from the local to the national levels.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important duties that we have as Americans is to be an informed citizen, and I cannot overstate how much Bill embodies that role. No matter the topic or issue of the day, Bill always takes the time to inform people of the developments that matter most. He knows how to read the pulse of the community he proudly serves.

As Bill enters this new and exciting chapter of his life alongside his wonderful wife, Sheryl, family members, friends, and loved ones, I hope he knows that he has left an indelible mark upon his community that will be felt for many years to come.

Those who tune in to Bill's show on the commute to work, the grocery store, and everywhere in between are grateful for his work. In my eyes and in the eyes of many, Bill is the best that western North Carolina has to offer. May God continue to bless Bill and his family in his well-deserved retirement.

RESTORING AMERICANS' FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, Saturday marks 1 year since the U.S. Supreme Court announced its now infamous decision to overturn Roe v. Wade, and for the first time in our Nation's history, it took away one of America's most fundamental rights: the right to privacy.

In overturning Roe v. Wade and taking away Americans' right to abortion care, the U.S. Supreme Court has rolled back the clock on women's rights in this country and put the health and lives of millions of women at risk.

Everybody in this country deserves the freedom to make their own healthcare choices. Nobody should have to experience the pain and trauma that countless women in this country have now suffered as a result of the GOP's efforts to criminalize abortion care in this country.

While poll after poll shows that an overwhelming majority of the American public supports women's rights to abortion care, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle remain intent on outlawing it once and for all.

We may not have the majority in this Chamber just now, but there is no doubt that we have the majority of Americans on our side in this fight. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle aren't willing to stand up for the people they represent, then we must.

Today, Representatives LEE and CHU and I announce that we have filed a discharge petition to bring the Women's Health Protection Act up for a vote so that we can restore Americans' fundamental rights to abortion care.

This is legislation that was passed by the Chamber not once but twice last year. There is no reason why any Member who doesn't have their head in the sand shouldn't be ready to support it a third time.

Now is the time to end the devastation that too many Americans have already experienced. Now is the time to let the American public know exactly where every Member of this Chamber stands.

I urge my colleagues to sign this petition that is now at the desk. Madam Speaker, 218 of us is all it takes to bring this bill to the floor and take us one step closer to ending this nightmare.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, never before has this country marked the day that a fundamental freedom was taken from us. This Saturday, for the first time, we will.

Almost 1 year ago, the Supreme Court's shameful and unprecedented Dobbs decision stripped a constitutional right from all Americans, and the harm it triggered has only grown in the year since.

□ 1015

We are here to say enough is enough. Extremist Republicans around the country created this reproductive healthcare crisis against the will of the people with their out-of-touch, anti-choice agenda.

People should have the right to make decisions over their own bodies, especially healthcare decisions, not this body, nor politicians, nor Justices. That process has been now aided and enabled by Republicans in this Chamber, so it is time for some accountability right here and right now. Time to put our Speaker and the Members of his party on the record in front of their constituents. It is time, really, to restore the right to abortion.

One year after the fall of Roe, we refuse to back down from the fight for reproductive freedom.

Our bodies, our choices. That is what this, in essence, is about: freedom. We are here using every single tool at our disposal to force action on this issue.

I am proud to join with our fellow Pro-Choice Caucus leaders, our membership, Representative DIANA DEGETTE and Representative JUDY CHU, in leading this discharge petition on the Women's Health Protection Act and demanding that the Speaker let us vote.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to sign it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), the author of the Women's Health Protection Act.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, it has been a year since the Supreme Court ripped away the rights of millions of Americans in an instant by overturning the constitutional right to abortion care. It has been nearly 1 year since American women were forced to live in a country where they possessed fewer rights than their grandmothers.

House Republicans are out of step with the American people when it comes to abortion access, but instead of working to restore these fundamental freedoms, they have worked to further restrict abortion access in this country. That is why we are here today, to take action.

I am proud to present this discharge petition to force accountability for Republican inaction.

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

CONGRATULATING DICK JAMES

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dick James of St. Simon's Island on his induction into the Ranger Hall of Fame.

Mr. James served in the Army for 22 years, including two tours of duty in Vietnam and retiring as a Lieutenant Colonel.

In his first tour, he acted as an adviser for a Vietnamese battalion with 750 soldiers. This battalion suffered a high casualty rate, with two-thirds being lost in the 9½ months he served with them. He later returned to Vietnam as the commander of the 75th Ranger Regiment, 173rd Airborne Brigade, where he fearlessly led his Rangers in 450 missions, with 229 of them being fights with enemy troops.

Mr. James has been the rightful recipient of many awards, including four Bronze Star medals, a Vietnam Service Medal, Superior Service Medal, and a National Defense Service Medal, among many others.

I thank Mr. James for his service and congratulate him for his induction into the Ranger Hall of Fame. His extraordinary dedication to his country and his fellow Rangers makes him the perfect addition.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF STARLING SUTTON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and the legacy of Mr. Starling Sutton, a dedicated servant to his country and a community activist.

During the Vietnam war, Starling cross-trained in four different areas, airborne, special forces medic, combat engineer, and infantry officer.

His work in the Army's 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg led him to pursue a degree in criminal justice, which he then applied to professional and volunteer efforts devoted to helping homeless and marginalized people.

Mr. Sutton created two programs for the Atlanta Rotary Club to help inner-city youth learn about the camaraderie of the military, and his work with the Golden Isles Rotary helped homeless veterans find homes.

Professionally, he helped create affordable housing in Atlanta and converted two major warehouses into public art spaces.

Starling's service to our country and his impact on our State will continue to be felt for years to come, and we mourn his loss immensely.

CONGRATULATING GLYNN ACADEMY BOYS AND GIRLS GOLF TEAMS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Glynn Academy boys and girls golf teams on their recent 6A State Championship wins.

Both teams took a big lead on day one, and they never looked back. After day one, they had to fight through harsh weather conditions that plagued the rest of the tournament, but even that could not derail their efforts.

The Glynn Academy boys shot an impressive score of 591 overall to secure their first win since 2001. The Glynn Academy girls finished with a score of 480 to win their second championship in a row.

These impressive scores, and the fact that this is the second championship in a row for the girls, speaks volumes. These young adults are true athletes, and I am inspired by their amazing performance on the golf course.

I look forward to seeing what these great teams do in the coming season, and I know they will continue to make the First District of Georgia proud.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL GEORGE ALLEN TINDLE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of retired Lieutenant Colonel George Allen Tindle of the U.S. Army National Guard.

Mr. Tindle was born in Chicago, Illinois, on September 12, 1941. He was a proud member of the Chicago Police Department for 10 years, until he transferred to the Federal Protective Service in 1974, right here in Washington, D.C.

George began his career at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia, in 1986. He was the Director of Management Training for U.S. Customs until his retirement in 1999. After his retirement, George began his favorite career as an instructor in the Behavioral Sciences Division.

George was an avid fan of the Frederica Academy football team and a beloved member of the Community Church on St. Simons Island.

George was an animal lover with a quick wit and a compassionate heart.

George Tindle passed away on April 3, 2023, at the age of 81 in Brunswick, Georgia. He is survived by a son, a nephew, and nieces, along with the legacy he left behind in the Brunswick community.

GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, firearms are now the leading cause of death for our children in the United States. This is the reality that we are living with, and it is one that we should refuse to accept.

Every day, over 100 Americans are killed from gun violence and more than 200 people are shot and wounded. These are not just statistics, Mr. Speaker, they are human beings with lives and futures, with mothers, friends and loved ones.

It is sickening that the NRA and the gun lobby have bankrolled many of my colleagues in this Chamber into silence and inaction on this issue.

Many of these deaths involve the accidental discharge of a firearm, often by a child, including a number of recent tragic incidents in southeastern Michigan. Just this month, there was a horrific incident where a 2-year-old gained access to an unsecured gun and was tragically killed.

It is alarming that 4.6 million children in our country live in homes with loaded and unlocked firearms.

This is Gun Violence Awareness Month, and I am proud to introduce the Safe Storage Saves Lives Act with

colleagues like ROSA DELAURO, MAX FROST, and ROBIN KELLY to reduce firearm deaths among our children.

This legislation requires every firearms seller to provide a gun lock or a gun safety device every single time that a firearm is sold in the United States.

Far too often, Mr. Speaker, gun owners fail to properly secure their weapons with tragic consequences leading to accidental deaths, preventable suicides, and on several occasions, school shootings and other mass violence.

These deaths are preventable through proper gun storage and safety. When used correctly, a gun lock or secure gun storage or safety device makes it impossible for the gun to be fired.

Gun locks, Mr. Speaker, like this one, have already saved countless lives, and requiring their use is key to combating America's gun violence crisis.

This bill does work in tandem with Representative DELAURO's Ethan's Law, which mandates safe storage, requiring gun owners to secure their firearms in their home.

However, this crisis must be tackled with even more urgency because our children's lives depend on it.

Madam Speaker, this gun lock was $10 and $10 could save the life of a child.

These gun locks are a commonsense solution that every Member of this body should support. This should not be controversial. Keeping firearms out of the hands of our children should not be a partisan issue.

I will not stop fighting until Congress finally takes action to end the gun violence epidemic in our country. We must honor the lives of those killed with action.

Our communities deserve better, Mr. Speaker. Our families deserve better, and our kids deserve so much more than prayers.

HONORING SERGIO MARTINEZ

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise to uplift one of my LGBTQ+ neighbors. His name is Sergio Martinez.

During this Pride Month, I recognize Sergio's activism and leadership in the immigrant rights movement in Detroit.

Sergio is an inspiring DACA recipient. He came here at 5 years old, but that didn't stop him from giving back to the community.

He grew up proudly in southwest Detroit and serves on the board of Michigan United, leading the Detroit Immigrants Rights Organizing Committee. He is a passionate advocate for legal protection of our undocumented neighbors and a pathway to citizenship for Dreamers, TPS holders, farmworkers and essential workers.

Sergio also believes that housing is a human right and was recently appointed to the new statewide housing advisory board by Governor Whitmer.

This Pride Month, join me in honoring Sergio Martinez, a trailblazing LGBTQ+ leader in our community. We thank him for his commitment in advancing equality and justice in Detroit and across Michigan.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S STUDENT LOAN FORGIVENESS PLAN

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the administration's egregious student loan forgiveness plan.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this unauthorized handout will cost the taxpayers an estimated $400 billion over the next decade. That means that everyday, hardworking Americans who either choose not to attend college or who have paid their loans will be on the hook for the financial decisions of others.

Tell me: Does that sound like a fair shake for the American taxpayer? Of course not.

Additionally, it is not even clear if the President has the authority to do this because, you see, he hijacked a law meant to help veterans, veterans who had served their country following 9/11 just to justify this unprecedented bailout.

But I tell you what: House Republicans are standing up to this administration's unreasonable and irresponsible policies. That is why a few weeks ago, the House passed a bipartisan resolution to block the administration's student loan forgiveness plan from even taking effect.

Our colleagues in the Senate, well, they resoundingly agreed with us by sending this to the President's desk, where he then vetoed our resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in both the House and the Senate to defend the American taxpayer and override this veto.

HONORING THE MEMORIES OF THE VICTIMS OF THE PITTSBURGH SYNAGOGUE SHOOTING

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

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, with a heavy heart, to honor the memories of the 11 victims of the Pittsburgh synagogue shooting, an attack on three Jewish congregations during Shabbat service on the morning of October 27, 2018.

Back in Pittsburgh, the trial for the deadliest anti-Semitic attack in our Nation's history is proceeding. The jury convicted the gunman on all 63 counts. Though this is a step toward justice, this trial reopened unimaginably painful wounds that have barely begun to heal.

Congregation Dor Hadash, New Light Congregation, and the Tree of Life Congregation all had members taken from them. Their names were: Joyce Fienberg, Richard Gottfried, Rose Mallinger, Jerry Rabinowitz, Cecil Rosenthal, David Rosenthal, Bernice Simon, Sylvan Simon, Daniel Stein, Melvin Wax, and Irving Younger.

They were fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, friends, and colleagues. They were members of a vibrant community who sought solace, peace, and unity within the walls of their synagogue.

May their memories be forever a blessing. And may the strength and resilience shown by the survivors, the victims' family members, and the entire Jewish community throughout this heartbreaking trial forever be an inspiration to us all.

They inspire me to work even harder to confront the root causes of hatred, racism, and bigotry so that no community has to live in fear of such senseless gun violence ever again.

They were murdered by a white supremacist gunman who targeted them because of their faith and because their faith called them to welcome immigrants and refugees.

The shooter was motivated by the ''great replacement theory.'' This was the same white supremacist theory that motivated the shooter in Buffalo to take the lives of 10 community members; the shooter in El Paso to take the lives of 23 Hispanic community members; and the shooter in Christchurch to take the lives of 51 Muslim worshippers.

The best prediction of violence against our communities is violent language. That holds in each of the four mass shooting examples I just mentioned. We must uphold the right of free speech while also working to stem the proliferation of violent rhetoric.

□ 1030

When I visited the synagogue this past February, I met with the Tree of Life congregation leadership and several family members of those murdered. I was profoundly moved, both by the unimaginable pain of what I saw, but also the beautiful conversations we had.

Together, we discussed what can be done to help the community heal from the trauma, and we discussed their vision for transforming the site into a center to educate against anti-Semitism and hate, a vision I support.

The attack on the three Pittsburgh Jewish congregations is part of a larger pattern of hate-fueled violence that plagues our Nation. The Black community is all too familiar with the rising tide of white supremacy in our country.

The Federal Government has the responsibility to act. We all have the responsibility to use our platforms and condemn the rhetoric and dismantle the systems of white supremacy that enable this and other kinds of violence against our communities.

We must strengthen our gun laws to make sure weapons of war never enter the hands of someone capable of such violence. We must invest in resources to identify and dismantle extremist networks. We must work hand in hand

with communities, engaging in dialogue and support, to address the root causes of hatred and prevent future acts of violence.

If we don't, these things will only get worse. It is for this reason that I make a commitment—a commitment made by Reverend Eric Manning, senior pastor of Mother Emanuel Church AME, when he visited Pittsburgh. Mother Emanuel was the site of a 2015 shooting, where a self-avowed white supremacist entered the Charleston, South Carolina, church during a Bible study and killed nine Black congregants.

When Reverend Manning spoke at the funeral of Rose Mallinger, the last of the 11 victims to be laid to rest, he said: ''You are not alone. We mourn with you. We are here for you and that will never change.''

I commit myself to building bridges between marginalized communities and fighting back. I want our Jewish siblings to know that we are in this fight together every day for as long as it takes.

I end with an excerpt from the Jewish prayer for peace that Rose Mallinger led every Saturday service:

May it be Your will . . .
that You erase war and bloodshed from the world and
in its place draw down a great and glorious peace so
that nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
neither shall they learn war anymore. . . .
Let justice come in waves like water and
righteousness flow like river, for the Earth shall
be full of the knowledge of the Holy One as the
waters covered the sea.
So may it be.
And we say:
Amen.

STUDENT LOAN GIVEAWAY

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to President Biden's student loan scam and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote to override President Biden's veto of H.J. Res. 45, which would overturn this ridiculous misuse of taxpayer dollars and transfer of wealth from the working class to our country's most wealthy and educated citizens.

Mr. Speaker, middle Tennessee is home to many hardworking, blue-collar workers who do everything they can to provide for their families and live within their means. Many of them made tough decisions to forego attending college to pursue careers in skilled trades like becoming an electrician, a plumber, or carpenter, each valuable skill sets and careers that keep our communities running and provide services we could never live without.

In fact, 66 percent of the folks in Tennessee's Sixth Congressional District have no college degree. This, along with those who responsibly took out student loans and paid them back, means that an estimated 759,000 people whom I represent are ineligible for the Biden administration's proposed student loan giveaway.

To put this into perspective, the total population of Tennessee's Sixth Congressional District is 768,525. A whopping 98.7 percent of folks whom I represent will never see a penny of the billions being wasted on this ill-guided proposal. What is even worse is that it will cost the folks of my district an estimated $1.53 billion, or almost $2,000 per individual.

At a time when the U.S. national debt has surpassed $32 trillion for the first time in our country's history, meaning that each citizen owes almost $100,000 of the national debt, the last thing Americans need, and that Tennesseans need, is another 2,000 in debt to pay for other people's decisions to pursue college degrees.

Mr. Speaker, when we debated this legislation on the floor previously, I said that America is a country built on the idea of freedom. Freedom does not mean freedom from individual responsibility, but freedom from unreasonable constraints. By forcing Tennesseans to foot the bill for the college degrees of wealthy lawyers and doctors in New York and California, President Biden is chipping away at our freedom.

Back home in my district, where the median household income is $57,373, President Biden's student loan bailout will cost almost an entire paycheck for the hardworking folks of Tennessee's Sixth District.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I encourage the President and those who support this transfer of wealth from blue-collar folks of Tennessee to coastal elites to take a visit to my constituents and tell them this news that their hard-earned paychecks will be going to some of the most well-educated and wealthy Americans in our country.

I have a feeling that a lot of folks who support this policy would have a hard time going door-to-door taking paychecks away from people without college degrees so that those with college degrees can reap the rewards and benefits of the President's policy.

Mr. Speaker, let's call this proposal what it is: An election-year gimmick that has no chance of ever becoming law through the normal procedures of being passed by the House and the Senate. Even some Democrats understand this policy is just plain wrong and that is why they joined Republicans to pass this legislation, which would have stopped this proposal in its track.

Now is our chance to override the President's veto. Let's hope more commonsense and fiscally responsible Democrats will join us to send a message to the President to reverse course on this disastrous decision.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF JACQUES ''JAY'' ROUGEAU

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Jacques ''Jay'' Rougeau, a Pennsylvania State trooper who died in the line of duty just this past Saturday, June 17.

Trooper Rougeau was shot and fatally injured while responding to a call in Juniata, Pennsylvania. Trooper Rougeau was only 29 years old.

Now, Trooper Rougeau is a native of Corry, Pennsylvania, which is in my district where, today, he remains on the minds of so many family, friends, neighbors, and loved ones.

According to reports, a man had arrived at Troop G, Lewistown Station armed with a rifle and fired at patrol vehicles in the parking lot and shot one officer. After a search, troopers located the shooter where they exchanged gunfire. Both the shooter and Trooper Rougeau were shot and killed. Those who knew Trooper Rougeau say he knew from a young age that he always wanted to be a police officer. After graduating from Corry Area High School in 2012, he first interned with the city of Corry Police Department in 2014.

During the internship, Rougeau said his ultimate goal was to become a Pennsylvania State trooper. He enlisted in 2020 and started with Troop G just 3 months ago. Trooper Rougeau is the 104th member of the Pennsylvania State Police to make the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

If we can, take a look at this picture. This is somebody that is in the prime of their life, just starting off, in the position that he so coveted being a part of this group. He wanted to be a police officer. He wanted to serve Pennsylvania's citizens by being a Pennsylvania State policeman.

Unfortunately, he is gone. He leaves behind a wife, Chloe, who I am told was his high school sweetheart. I know that he has made the city of Corry and the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania proud for so bravely serving in law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I thank him for his service, and offer a moment of silence in honor of his memory. I ask if we could all please think for a moment about this young man, think about the unlived part of his life, and all who serve in the line of duty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will honor a moment of silence.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish his family could be here to see that the entire gallery just stood up and, even though you did not know Trooper Rougeau, you stood up to honor what he did in his line of duty.

This is a tragic loss not only for the community of Corry, but the entire

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This morning, I am praying for the family, friends, and colleagues of Trooper Rougeau, another person in law enforcement who died while responding to help others in danger.

STANDING UP FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. SANTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Speaker, in March, I introduced H.R. 1736, also known as the Equality and Fiscal Accountability Protection Act of 2023.

This bill will cut off the cash faucet the U.S. Government gives away to countries such as Uganda that persecutes, criminalizes, or discriminates against individuals based on their sexual orientation.

Since June is Pride Month, I thought this bill would be a great way to remind the American people and this body that the best way to celebrate the history and achievements of gay rights is to stand up to countries actively oppressing the LGBT community. Many countries are light-years behind everything we have worked for to be treated civilly and humanely in this country.

In fact, many countries are still persecuting their citizens for the simple fact that they are gay. Uganda is just one of many countries executing and prosecuting its people based on their sexual orientation; however, they received hundreds of millions of dollars in 2022 alone from President Biden's emergency plan for AIDS relief, or PEPFAR.

While waving rainbow flags and changing corporate logos is pleasant enough lipservice and virtue signaling, we need to send a clear message that the United States will not offer Federal aid to countries that habitually violate basic human rights based on sexual orientation.

We, as a Nation, have a responsibility to stand up for the human rights of all people, regardless of race, religion, or sexual orientation.

□ 1045

CONGRATULATING HARDIN VALLEY ACADEMY AEROHAWKS

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Hardin Valley Academy AeroHAWKS for their achievements at the American Rocketry Challenge.

AeroHAWKS Team 1 came in first place, and Team 2 came in 10th place. Both teams scored high enough that they were invited to participate in NASA's Student Launch Initiative, and Team 1 has just headed to Paris, France, to represent the United States in the International Rocketry Challenge.

I say ''Paris, France,'' because many of you realize there is a Paris, Tennessee, and that is home to the world's largest fish fry. I wanted to clarify that.

This was Hardin Valley's first appearance in this competition, and they competed alongside nearly 800 teams from 45 States. The fact they did so well demonstrates their intelligence, dedication, and teamwork abilities. They rose to the challenge and brought pride to east Tennessee.

My office gave these students a tour of the U.S. Capitol before their competition here in Washington, and it is clear these students are passionate and bright and will do great things with their future.

I congratulate everyone from Hardin Valley Academy who competed in the American Rocketry Challenge. I wish the best of luck to Team 1 as they compete in Paris for the world title. They are making east Tennessee and the entire Nation proud.

Mr. Speaker, on a personal note, from my days of rocketry with my Estes rocket, I believe my V2 rocket is still in the tree of my neighbor's house. I will state for the record that if any of these young people would like to climb up and get it, I would gladly reward them.

HONORING CORPORAL JOE ALLEN VINYARD

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an American hero who has finally been laid to rest in Blount County.

Corporal Joe Allen Vinyard was part of the 774th Tank Battalion during World War II. He tragically lost his life in the Battle of Hurtgen Forest, an important battle on the European front right before the Battle of the Bulge. Many of the men who sacrificed their lives for our freedom that day were not identified, including Corporal Vinyard.

In 2021, folks working at the Defense Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Accounting Agency figured out one set of remains could have been Corporal Vinyard's. Thanks to DNA testing from samples the family provided, scientists were able to identify his remains. By September 2022, the family had been notified that he would be brought back to Blount County.

Corporal Vinyard was laid to rest in Grandview Cemetery in Maryville this past weekend. He is buried beside his parents, just a few miles from his home. After almost 80 years, Corporal Joe Allen Vinyard has finally come home.

HONORING SERGEANT DANIEL CLIFFORD BRITTON

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Sergeant Daniel Clifford Britton, who served our country during the Gulf war.

Daniel graduated from Temple Baptist Academy in 2006. He went on to the University of Tennessee and participated in the Army ROTC program and enlisted in the Army on September 3, 2008.

Sergeant Britton attended his initial Active-Duty training at Fort Benning, Georgia. After graduation, he was assigned to the 15th Infantry Regiment. He graduated from the air assault course in September 2009, and in 2010, he deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, where he earned his Combat Infantry Badge. During his service, he was awarded the Iraq Campaign Medal with two stars, Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal twice, and many others. He was a patriot and loved this country to its core.

Sergeant Britton passed away in May and left behind a daughter who he loved with his whole being. I offer my condolences to his daughter and all his friends and family who knew and loved him.

It is my honor to recognize Sergeant Daniel Britton as the Tennessee Second District's June 2023 Veteran of the Month. His service to this country, his community, and his family will never be forgotten.

On a personal note, Mr. Speaker, as a Christian, I am not a very good one, but I owe everything in my life, except for my salvation, to the men and women who wore our country's uniform. I thank you for this opportunity. I appreciate your testimony here on the floor about that man, one of our brave officers, who lost his life. I thank the people in the gallery for standing up and showing him that respect.

This is a great country we have, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, brother, for your friendship.

RECOGNIZING 10TH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN'S DISTRICT OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, we had a slogan in Army aviation: ''High Above the Best.'' It was a reminder that the American people entrusted us, me and my men, to provide air support for the soldiers fighting for their lives on the ground each and every single day. Likewise, in Congress, our constituents, our customers, have entrusted our staff and myself to provide air support to the good people in our district fighting for their livelihoods each and every single day.

I stand here to say that my district staff has exemplified this slogan, ''High Above the Best.'' In under 6 months in this office, my team has already delivered on a monumental constituent casework milestone in a freshman office.

Earlier this month, my team surpassed $100,000 in Federal casework dollars returned to our constituents, to our customers. They are providing that air support to Michigan's 10th Congressional District, just like Army aviators.

It is a lot of work setting up a congressional office. Both our D.C. and district teams have burned the midnight oil to get everything up and running so

that we can serve you, our constituents, and deliver on the promises we made.

On top of all the work that had to be done getting our district office up and running, this staff delivered for the constituency and has returned over $100,000 in Federal dollars and about a trillion-and-a-half passport requests.

I recognize each and every single member of my district staff by name, in alphabetical other: Russ Cleary, Lisa Damon-Brown, Phil Rode, Linda Torp, and Kris Zrinyi.

I thank them all for helping me serve Michigan's 10th Congressional District, the greatest district in the United States of America.

Of the many cases my district team has closed this year, there are a couple that I reviewed that really stuck out to me.

We got a call from a veteran in our district who hadn't received his VA benefits in nearly 2 years. Together, my staff elevated this case within the VA and got them to act. Now, this veteran in my district has thousands in backpay and a monthly payment of roughly $2,000 that he earned serving our country in uniform.

My team also helped a single mother of two get her tax return from all the way back in 2015. This young mother is currently attending nursing school to better the future for herself and her two children and to serve her community. Between being a single mom and a student, she didn't have enough time in her busy schedule to work with the IRS, but she had time to give us a call. That is all that mattered. My diligent team was able to step up for her and help her to retrieve $9,000 from her tax return.

These are just two of the many stories and constituent cases that our district office worked so diligently to close over just the past 5 months—in under 6 months, under half a year. I am so grateful for all the work they have done for our constituents.

I am a combat veteran, but I am also a businessman, and I believe that constituent services, customer service, is why I am here.

Customer service, serving constituents, is my number one priority in Congress. I have served my country in combat, but the chance to serve this community is the honor of my lifetime. We are ready to continue to serve the good people of Michigan's 10th Congressional District. I thank them for trusting me to be High Above the Best.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Sovereign God, we look to You to receive guidance in our lives, strength in our battles, comfort in our sorrows, and peace in our world. We appeal to You on behalf of those at war in Ukraine and those who are making decisions affecting this grueling conflict and impacting countless lives. Grant them the belt of Your truth that their leadership would be bound in integrity and faithfulness.

To the men and women on the front lines so violently uprooted from their families and communities, now fighting a battle to preserve the livelihoods they once enjoyed without fear, grant Your breastplate of righteousness. Protect and defend them from the feelings of anger, betrayal, and vindictiveness. Safeguard them from any deed that would bring dishonor or disgrace. May the justness of their actions be undisputed.

Comfort the grieving with the shield of faith. Preserve their souls and spirits from the fiery arrows of heartache and despair. In You may they find the strength and comfort that transcends our finite grasp of Your steadfast and eternal love.

Your work, O God, is powerful. Speak into the warring chaos that threatens our world and wield Your word of peace.

In Your saving name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

BIDEN'S IRAN DEAL

(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, appeasing Iran endangers America and the world, according to Matthew Continetti of the American Enterprise Institute, as reported in the June 17 edition of National Review.

''For President Biden is on the verge of betraying Congress and the American people by rewarding the Islamic Republic of Iran for various misdeeds.

''According to news reports, Biden is prepared to authorize billions of dollars in payments to Iran in exchange for the release of U.S. prisoners. . . . Biden will say this perverse arrangement is necessary to free innocents. . . . What he won't be able to do is call it a deal.

''Biden can't call the agreement a deal because he wants to avoid congressional review. The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 forbids the President from relieving nuclear-related sanctions . . . without congressional approval.

''Notice that the deal-that-is-no-deal says nothing about Iran's deadliest proxy, Hezbollah, or about Iran's drone traffic,'' to attack Israel and murder Ukrainian civilians.

In conclusion, sadly, the insulting plea deal for Hunter Biden exposes the Biden crime family has shamefully corrupted the Federal judicial system.

DEADLIEST FORM OF CANCER

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, lung cancer is the deadliest form of cancer in the United States, taking more lives than prostate, colorectal, and breast cancers combined.

The United States Preventive Services Task Force recommends annual lung screenings for adults ages 50 to 80 who are at risk, but currently just 6 percent of eligible Americans are screened each year.

That is why we are introducing the Increasing Access to Lung Cancer Screening Act. This bipartisan bill will reduce barriers to preventive care by requiring public and private insurance to cover annual screenings for those who are eligible.

Early detection is our best protection against all cancer deaths, and this legislation extends coverage for those who are at greatest risk.

I ask my colleagues to join me, along with Representatives CASTOR and FITZPATRICK, in supporting this lifesaving legislation. Together we can take another step toward ending cancer as we know it.

HONORING DON WALTON ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of Nebraska's finest journalists, Don Walton.

Don has long been a trusted source of political news across Nebraska. He has a unique approach to his craft. He quietly builds relationships with people as he listens and grows trust.

During my time in the legislature and in Congress, I have worked with Don. He believes that people are never a means to a story, and he faithfully covers politics without engaging in them.

Over a week ago, Don surprised us all with his retirement announcement in his weekly column. He had shown no signs of stepping back, true to form. He did not make a spectacle of his farewell. In a brief open letter, he thanked his readers and encouraged and challenged them to be their best. He has had a 67-year career.

On behalf of Nebraska's First Congressional District, I honor Don for his service and his work. The way he treated people as he wrote about them will long stand as a testament to the value of local journalism.

CUTS TO WIC ARE ESPECIALLY CRUEL

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have said time and time again that they don't want to hurt pregnant mothers and young children, but they did just that with the FY 2024 agriculture spending bill that they advanced out of the House Appropriations Committee last week.

The Republican bill slashes WIC funding by $185 million from the current funding level and guts WIC's extra fruit and vegetable benefits for 5 million pregnant and postpartum moms and young children.

It is the first time ever that WIC has been intentionally underfunded. At a time when many families are still dealing with pandemic-caused inflation, these cuts are especially cruel. I am appalled that Republicans' idea of fiscal responsibility is taking healthy food away from pregnant moms and kids under 5. Seriously?

Mr. Speaker, let's not forget that Republicans also tried to cut Meals on Wheels and WIC in their original debt ceiling bill, and they have a bill to kick moms with young children and seniors off of SNAP.

Taking food away from the most vulnerable is completely heartless. It is shameful, and we are going to fight these cuts.

PATRIOTS AND HEROES PARK REDEDICATION

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the rededication of Patriots and Heroes Park in Lancaster, New York, and the many men and women who devoted their lives in service to our community.

Mr. Russell J. Salvatore founded and funded this memorial as a place for patriotism and peaceful reflection of the imagery honoring veterans, members of law enforcement, first responders, and the heroes that have dedicated their lives to the safety of others.

These monuments were vandalized heartlessly and defaced in March, and the images of the destruction shocked our community.

Now, fully restored, thanks to the work and support and funding of Mr. Russell J. Salvatore, our community is gathering once again at Patriots and Heroes Park today to honor those who served and sacrificed for this great Nation.

I thank the veterans, police officers, and first responders for their valor, courage, and service to their fellow Americans.

Mr. Salvatore has been a titan of Buffalo, and I know the people of the 23rd Congressional District are grateful for his generosity over the many years. I congratulate Mr. Salvatore on his many years of success and on the rededication of Patriots and Heroes Park.

Our community has chosen to turn this act of hatred into a new monument to thank our heroes and celebrate our patriotism as Americans. I am honored to join the celebration from the Halls of Congress.

ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR SUPREME COURT

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

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, today we learned that it wasn't just Clarence Thomas on the Supreme Court who accepted lavish gifts from a conservative billionaire and didn't disclose it, violating ethical rules.

We learned that Justice Samuel Alito also accepted lavish gifts from another conservative billionaire and didn't disclose it.

In addition, both Justices Thomas and Alito failed to disclose the private jet travel that they received from conservative billionaires. That is a violation of Federal law.

Americans used to respect the United States Supreme Court. Now I think the American people can rightfully ask: Is it turning into a cesspool of corruption? That is why I ask the Speaker of the House to put on the floor the bill authored by Democrats to put ethical standards on the United States Supreme Court.

Every Federal judge has to follow ethical standards except for these nine people. Who do they think they are?

ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS IN SCHOOLS

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, President Biden's and Secretary Mayorkas' handling of our southern border has made every State, including my home State of Tennessee, a border State. Now, illegal immigrants are being housed in public schools, threatening our children's ability to learn.

House Republicans are denouncing this heinous action by passing H. Res. 461, which condemns the use of public school facilities to house illegal immigrants.

Housing illegal immigrants at public schools diverts resources from students already suffering from historic learning loss. Additionally, schools with summer programs or activities will now be forced to consider the additional security threat housing illegal immigrants at their facilities poses.

Mr. Speaker, if the Biden administration would work with Republicans to secure the border, this wouldn't be happening. However, since it is, we must condemn it, which is why I urge Members to join me in supporting H. Res. 461.

PENN KINGSMEN REPEAT AS STATE CHAMPS

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

Mr. YAKYM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a very special group of Hoosiers.

Last Saturday, the Penn High School baseball team shut out top-ranked Center Grove 2–0 to win the Class 4A State championship for the second straight year.

Their victory Saturday marks the first time in program history that the Kingsmen have repeated as State champs, and now it is the sixth State crown under Hall of Fame Coach Greg Dikos' belt.

The Kingsmen's big win came just 1 week after the Lady Kingsmen softball team also won the State title, making Penn just the second school in Indiana history to win a softball and baseball State championship in the same year.

The most exciting moment in Saturday's game came in the bottom of the fourth inning when senior center fielder Cooper Hums laid out for an amazing, over-the-shoulder diving catch. In fact, Cooper's catch was so spectacular that it landed him a top spot on ''SportsCenter's Top 10'' playlist. I watched the clip, and it is worth your time to watch.

Congratulations to Cooper, Coach Dikos, and all the Kingsmen on defending their title and for bringing another State championship back to the Second District.

God bless them, and Go Kingsmen.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3564, MIDDLE CLASS BORROWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3799, CUSTOM HEALTH OPTION AND INDIVIDUAL CARE EXPENSE ARRANGEMENT ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 461, CONDEMNING THE USE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES TO PROVIDE SHELTER FOR ALIENS WHO ARE NOT ADMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 524 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 524

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3564) to cancel recent changes made by the Federal Housing Finance Agency to the up-front loan level pricing adjustments charged by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac for guarantee of single-family mortgages, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-8, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. 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 one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3799) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for health reimbursement arrangements integrated with individual health insurance coverage. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed 80 minutes equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-9, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. 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 one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 461) condemning the use of elementary and secondary school facilities to provide shelter for aliens who are not admitted to the United States. The amendments to the resolution and the preamble recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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.

□ 1215

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, last night the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 524, providing for consideration of three measures: H. Res. 461, H.R. 3799, and H.R. 3564.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3564 under a structured rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their designee.

The rule makes in order four amendments and provides one motion to recommit. The rule additionally provides for consideration of H.R. 3799 under a structured rule with 80 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committees on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees and Ways and Means or their respective designees. The rule makes in order three amendments and provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 461 under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled and by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees.

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

Today, the Republican majority continues its long process of reversing and repairing the damages inflicted on the American people by the Biden administration and the previous Democrat majority.

Mr. Speaker, included in the rule is H.R. 3799, the Custom Health Option and Individual Care Expense Arrangement Act, or the CHOICE Arrangement Act, introduced by my friend from Oklahoma, KEVIN HERN.

This legislation includes commonsense changes to help lower health insurance costs, increase competition in the healthcare market, and ensure access to high-quality, low-cost plans for Americans and small business owners and their employees.

In 2021, almost 55 percent of Americans were covered by employer-based health coverage. Employer-based health coverage is easily the most popular option for Americans to receive health insurance coverage. According to the National Federation of Independent Business, of small employers

that did not offer health insurance coverage to their employees, two-thirds reported that the reason they do not offer the health insurance is because it is simply too expensive.

In 2019, President Trump and his administration published regulations allowing employers to provide their employees with a fixed amount of money each year in tax-preferred individual health coverage reimbursement accounts that an employee could use to buy coverage in the individual market.

Current regulations allow employers to establish individual coverage health reimbursement accounts which employees can use to purchase individual market coverage and pay for their out-of-pocket medical expenses.

The CHOICE Arrangement Act seeks to codify these regulations to provide tax-advantaged funds for employees to buy portable health insurance plans and requires notification to employers of the availability of these tax-advantaged health insurance benefits.

The CHOICE Arrangement Act also includes provisions codifying the right of small businesses to band together and form association health plans to offer pooled health insurance coverage to their employees.

This legislation will give employers maximum flexibility in how they provide coverage options for their employees by providing CHOICE arrangements while also providing expected benefits like dental plans, vision plans, accident, disability benefits, and more.

This legislation will also ensure that stop-loss coverage is not subject to Federal regulation under the Employee Retirement Income and Security Act. These commonsense changes will stop the Biden administration from administratively making healthcare more expensive by regulating stop-loss coverage and ensuring that small businesses can, in fact, remain competitive.

Mr. Speaker, also included in this rule is H. Res. 461. This condemns the practice of retrofitting our children's schools to house illegal immigrants. President Biden and the Democrats' failures at the southern border are so comprehensive, so overwhelming that municipalities are now co-opting the schools where we educate our children because President Biden refuses to secure the southern border.

Because President Biden cannot or will not secure our southern border, Mr. Speaker, our local communities and municipalities are now casualties of President Biden's border crisis.

The American people rightfully demand that President Biden and Democrats in Congress acknowledge this crisis. They demand that they not only acknowledge the crisis, Mr. Speaker, they demand that their Federal Government solve this self-inflicted crisis that is pushing our communities well past the breaking point.

New York City and its mayor, Eric Adams, are the first to cry uncle. Mr. Speaker, 2 months is how long Mayor Adams and New York City lasted, suffering under conditions of a size and scale not even comparable to the conditions that Texans have been enduring these past 2½ years under an administration that has only now started to pay attention to this humanitarian crisis when it started to affect their constituents.

Over and over again, we have pleaded with the Biden administration to take this crisis seriously, only to be rebuffed time and again. This humanitarian catastrophe can be laid squarely at the feet of the Secretary of Department of Homeland Security, Secretary Mayorkas, and, of course, President Biden who have chosen to do nothing rather than be labeled xenophobes by their progressive colleagues for actually enforcing existing immigration law and securing our southern border.

Mr. Speaker, the temptation for the Biden administration has been to bury their heads in the sand and hope that these waves of illegal immigrants coming across our border will, in fact, magically disappear. They will not, Mr. Speaker, not until President Biden finally gets serious about the border crisis by demanding that the Secretary of Homeland Security do his job and secure our southern border, or maybe find someone else who can do that job.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3564, the Middle Class Borrower Protection Act of 2023. This bill would repeal the Federal Housing Finance Agency's recalibrated single-family pricing framework to guarantee mortgages which would charge borrowers with higher credit scores larger fees to subsidize borrowers with lower credit scores.

If not for our Republican majority, Mr. Speaker, one out of every two borrowers with higher credit scores would be assessed higher mortgage fees in President Biden's radical equity agenda.

President Biden is telling the American people that if you work hard, if you are responsible with your finances, if you pay your bills on time, you are going to get to subsidize the mortgages of those who did not make the same sacrifices that you did in order to attain a higher credit score. This sends a terrible message to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. DAVIDSON for bringing us this final piece of legislation that underscores that the Republican majority stands with those middle-class families who have done the right thing and should not be pushed by a radical administration that is obsessed with radical wealth distribution schemes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are in charge of the House of Representatives. They control the schedule here. They control when bills get brought up for debate. They make the Calendar. We could be debating a bipartisan bill that actually helps get more people on to healthcare or lowers prescription drug costs and makes coverage more affordable, but instead Republicans are bringing to the floor a bill to chip away at the Affordable Care Act. They are siding with billionaire corporations and insurance companies and actually spending money to kick people off of healthcare.

We could be debating bipartisan legislation that makes it easier for regular middle-class Americans to buy a home, but instead, Republicans are bringing to the floor a bill that literally increases mortgage fees charged to middle-income borrowers.

Time and time again, this majority brings to the floor bills that benefit billionaire corporations, insurance companies, the rich and powerful, Big Oil, Big Pharma, all at the expense of everyday people back home who send us here to fight for them.

□ 1230

We could be debating bipartisan legislation that actually addresses our broken immigration system. Instead, Republicans are bringing to the floor a nonbinding resolution that condemns a nonexistent problem so they can go after immigrants once again.

We had a Member in the Rules Committee last night yelling and screaming and ranting and raving about all he thinks is wrong with our immigration system and the border. It was actually kind of scary.

Listen, I get being passionate about this problem. I am not here to argue that our immigration system doesn't need to be fixed. We all know that it could use a comprehensive overhaul, but we don't need to be screaming at each other about this nonbinding press release of a bill that does literally nothing to help deal with our border. My God.

Republicans want to talk about immigration, so let's talk about immigration.

Let's talk about how the Republican solution to the border is building a stupid wall that even they know won't work.

Let's talk about fentanyl. Let's talk about how most of it is trafficked through legal ports of entry in the United States by U.S. citizens, by the way, and let's talk about how President Joe Biden seizes more fentanyl at the border than Donald Trump did. That is just a fact.

Yet, we had a Member last night have a complete meltdown over this issue. Would Republicans rather the Biden administration not seize fentanyl? I don't get it. Make it make sense.

Let's talk about how, since the end of title 42 on May 11, unlawful entries along the southern border have plummeted. As of June 6, Customs and Border Protection had an average of 3,700

encounters between points of entry or unscheduled encounters per day, a decrease of over 70 percent.

Republicans don't want to talk about any of that. Instead, they are going to try to get people all worked up by scapegoating vulnerable migrants who are fleeing awful circumstances in search of safety.

I can't believe I have to say this, but migrants are not political pawns. They come to our country seeking a better life, often fleeing violence and oppression. They are human beings and deserve to be treated with dignity and respect. Yet, Republican Governors have treated migrants like they are garbage, busing them across the country like luggage, with no advance notice or coordination, dumping them outside after they call the press to show up and make a scene. I find it disgusting. I find it racist. I find it disrespectful to all that this country stands for.

This nonbinding press release that they are bringing to the floor isn't a serious attempt to solve a problem. They are dropping migrants off in New York City and then attacking New York City for trying to come up with solutions to the problem. This is absurd.

Then, Republicans claim gyms can't be used to house migrants because they want to ''protect students.'' Give me a break. Migrants have never been housed in a facility with kids. That is just a fact. In the Rules Committee last night, we asked the person who was bringing the bill before the committee to give us examples. She couldn't.

If we want to talk about protecting students, let us talk about protecting students. A thousand kids have died from gun violence this year. Where will the next school shooting be? Parents are terrified their kid will be next. Teachers are terrified that their class will be next. Students are terrified they will be next. Republicans are here regulating gyms instead of guns. What the hell is wrong with these people?

This majority is obsessed with demonizing, demeaning, and targeting people who are coming to the United States in desperate search of a better life. Stop appealing to the worst instincts in people. Stop peddling hate. Stop fueling racism.

Here is a contrast I want people to know about. President Biden and the Democrats are working to expand the middle class, to build a strong economy from the bottom up and the middle out. Democrats are lowering costs for working families, helping cut inflation by more than half since last summer.

Democrats have taken on Big Pharma to reduce prescription drug costs, and Democrats continue to fight special interests to lower healthcare costs while making childcare and housing more affordable for working families.

Democrats are investing in America and have created more than 13 million jobs since President Biden took office. Democrats are bringing supply chains back home, fixing our roads and bridges, and delivering clean water and high-speed internet to more communities.

Democrats are making our communities safer. We are committed to building on the gun safety legislation we passed last year by strengthening background checks and keeping dangerous weapons of war off our streets to protect America's kids.

Democrats know that we don't have to choose between an immigration system that reflects our interests and our values, and we don't demonize and attack people who want to come to this country in search of a better life.

You are seeing on the floor today exactly what Republicans have to offer: nothing, not a thing, no plans, no ideas. They are just interested in helping the rich and powerful and using immigrants as political pawns to drive a wedge between people. It is a rotten, shameful thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues on the Republican side to get serious about bringing legislation to the floor that will actually make a difference, that will actually help fix some of the challenges that we face in this country. This is a joke.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), a valuable new member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, five counties in my district have declared a state of emergency in response to the influx of migrants since title 42 ended. These five counties didn't declare a state of emergency out of hate or a lack of compassion but because they simply do not have the resources to handle the unprecedented flood of illegal immigration.

Our local taxpayers and tax dollars meant to support our kids in schools across Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, and Allegheny Counties are instead going to house illegal immigrants, thanks to a crisis that the Biden administration created.

My colleagues across the aisle have claimed time and again that by opposing an unprecedented influx of illegal immigration, Republicans somehow lack compassion or humanity. Mr. Speaker, allowing fentanyl to flood in from our southern border, killing thousands of Americans, and offering no concrete solutions to combat this epidemic is not compassionate. Standing back and demonizing our Border Patrol agents while the cartels traffic countless human beings, including young children, into this country is not compassionate. The Department of Health and Human Services losing track of 85,000 migrant children, with an untold number trafficked and exploited, is not compassionate, either.

Foisting this inhumane crisis onto the backs of small-town America after the richest, most liberal enclaves in our country, like Martha's Vineyard, clutch their pearls at even the sight of one group of illegal immigrants is not compassionate.

I am proud to cosponsor H. Res. 461 to be considered under this rule, and I look forward to this and many more steps Republicans in the House are taking to secure our border and to force this administration to uphold our immigration laws.

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

I appreciate the gentleman's tirade just now, but the bottom line is that nothing in this bill that his party is championing as somehow this important piece of legislation does anything to provide any assistance to any of these communities. Not one penny goes to offset any of the costs that might be incurred—nothing, not a thing.

I just don't get it. People come onto this floor and speak in sound bites and do press releases and then bring legislation to the floor that is nonbinding, that means nothing, that does nothing. This is ridiculous.

We need to fix our immigration system. We tried to do that when we were in charge. We had challenges in the Senate trying to overcome the filibuster, but we were trying to fix the system. That is a contrast to what we are doing here now, which is a nonbinding resolution.

By the way, a nonbinding resolution, to anybody who is watching, means it is just somebody's opinion. It doesn't do anything—no money, no assistance, no help to anybody. It is just like: ''I want to tell you what my opinion is.'' Big deal.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we do, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which states that it is the House's duty to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.

We know, because we have heard from my friends, that they have their eyes on these programs. We need to get people on record to make sure that they will not vote for any cuts.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YAKYM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SORENSEN) to discuss that proposal.

Mr. SORENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in strong support of Social Security and the invaluable role that it plays in the lives of more than 2.2 million people in Illinois and over 150,000

of our neighbors and family members in the 17th Congressional District of Illinois.

Social Security benefits make up one-third of the income of our Nation's seniors, and benefits are the primary source of income for most seniors.

Social Security is not a handout. This is a program that working Americans have paid into for years with the promise that the Federal Government would stand by them and respect their hard work and their labor.

Too often over the past few months, we have heard threats from my colleagues across the aisle about cutting off these hard-earned benefits—first during the debt ceiling negotiations, and most recently, my colleagues in the Republican Study Committee recently put forth a budget that renews Republican attacks on Social Security benefits.

Their unserious proposal shows my colleagues care more about scoring political points and playing games with your future than governing responsibly and with your interests in mind. That we are having this conversation and considering these budgets shows how out of touch my colleagues across the aisle are with the struggles that real Americans face every single day.

Under their proposal, 9.7 million Illinoisans would see their retirement age increased, cutting their Social Security benefits and forcing them to work even longer for less.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. Social Security is a sacred promise to our Nation's seniors. It is not a political football. I will oppose any proposal that cuts the earned benefits that provide essential financial stability to millions of Americans.

Our communities have worked for decades to earn these benefits, and it is unconscionable to turn around and take that away from people, especially as prices still remain high for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up legislation that protects, not undermines, Social Security.

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

Mr. Speaker, the only entity cutting Social Security or Medicare right now is the White House, the Biden administration. Over the last 2½ years, cuts to Medicare have totaled probably $40 billion in the part B drugs administered in physician's offices and $300 billion in Medicare Advantage, all done through the Inflation Reduction Act last year. The only people talking about cutting Medicare right now is the administration, and that is really what ought to be stopped.

Right now, that is not the business at hand. What we are discussing today are three important bills that are going to be considered on the floor. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and in favor of the underlying bills.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a Washington Post article titled: ''House GOP eyes Social Security, Medicare amid spending battle.''

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

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 2023]

HOUSE GOP EYES SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE AMID SPENDING BATTLE

(By Tony Romm)

House Republicans have started to weigh a series of legislative proposals targeting Social Security, Medicare and other entitlement programs, part of a broader campaign to slash federal spending that could force the new majority to grapple with some of the most difficult and delicate issues in American politics.

Only weeks after taking control of the chamber, GOP lawmakers under new Speaker Kevin McCarthy (R–Calif.) have rallied around firm pledges for austerity, insisting their efforts can improve the nation's fiscal health. They have signaled they are willing to leverage the fight over the debt ceiling—and the threat of a fiscal doomsday—to seek major policy concessions from the Biden administration.

So far, the party has focused its attention on slimming down federal health care, education, science and labor programs, perhaps by billions of dollars. But some Republicans also have pitched a deeper examination of entitlements, which account for much of the government's annual spending—and reflect some of the greatest looming fiscal challenges facing the United States.

In recent days, a group of GOP lawmakers has called for the creation of special panels that might recommend changes to Social Security and Medicare, which face genuine solvency issues that could result in benefit cuts within the next decade. Others in the party have resurfaced more detailed plans to cut costs, including by raising the Social Security retirement age to 70, targeting younger Americans who have yet to obtain federal benefits.

''We have no choice but to make hard decisions,'' said Rep. Kevin Hern (R–Okla.), the leader of the Republican Study Committee, a bloc of more than 160 conservative lawmakers that endorsed raising the retirement age and other changes last year. ''Everybody has to look at everything.''

Any plan to rethink entitlements is likely to face steep opposition in the Democratic-led Senate and may never gain meaningful traction even among other Republicans in the House. Adding to the political challenge, former president Donald Trump waded into the debate Friday, warning his party publicly against cutting ''a single penny from Medicare or Social Security.''

Democrats, meanwhile, have been unsparing in their criticisms, saying millions of Americans could see their benefits cut at the hands of the new House GOP majority. President Biden has stressed he will not negotiate such a deal with Republicans, as he prepares to discuss a raft of fiscal issues with McCarthy in the coming days.

Speaking to reporters Tuesday, White House press secretary Karine Jean-Pierre said she had no update on the timing of a meeting with McCarthy. But she repeated Biden's belief that the debt ceiling should be addressed ''without conditions.'' The president himself later blasted the GOP for being ''genuinely serious about cutting Social Security, cutting Medicare,'' adding: ''Look, I have no intention of letting the Republicans wreck our economy.''

The early wrangling underscores the stakes as Republicans look for aggressive ways to limit federal spending. In a time of immense, growing debt, the party's looming decisions could carry vast consequences: Every cut in Washington, large or small, threatens to spell dramatic changes for millions of Americans' finances—not to mention the GOP's own political fortunes.

''We need to be taking this very, very seriously, and the tragic thing is, everybody knows it,'' said Rep. Vern Buchanan (R–Fla.), a top lawmaker on the tax-focused House Ways and Means Committee, lamenting the state of Social Security and Medicare.

But, Buchanan said, the early political sniping around the issue threatens to make any meaningful overhaul impossible. He stressed the two parties have to work together, or else Republicans could face a political drubbing if they forge ahead on their own. ''It's a good way to get fired quickly,'' he said.

For the moment, Republicans are only beginning to plot a new fiscal road map. To maximize their leverage, they have pursued spending cuts in exchange for their support to raise the debt ceiling, the legal cap that allows the U.S. to borrow money to pay its existing bills.

Unless Congress enacts a new limit or suspends the current one, the government is set to breach the threshold sometime this summer, which would trigger a historic, calamitous default that could thrust the economy into a recession. Last week, the Treasury Department began taking what it calls ''extraordinary measures'' to avoid hitting the cap, which could sustain the government until at least early June.

Hoping to engage top Democrats and the White House, GOP leaders have offered early hints of the deep cuts they seek: Some Republicans have suggested they want to pare back spending to levels approved in the 2022 fiscal year, meaning cuts across government could exceed $130 billion. Others have eyed new caps on key federal agencies and programs, hoping to keep domestic spending depressed for the next decade in ways Democrats have described as devastating.

Yet GOP leaders have not said exactly what they'd cut, or whether some areas might be off-limits, including money for the military and its veterans. Instead, they have promised to produce a blueprint in the coming weeks that balances the budget over the next 10 years. But balancing the federal till is no small feat—previous Republican majorities that passed measures to eliminate the deficit used gimmicks and other fiscal wizardry, and they only achieved a balanced budget on paper. This time, the task is especially immense, potentially requiring the GOP to identify more than $14 trillion in cuts through 2032, according to the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. which advocates for reducing the deficit.

So far, the cuts that Republicans have considered represent only a fraction of the government's overall ledger, which also includes mandatory spending—the category that encompasses Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps and a wide array of other federal payments that totaled more than $4.8 trillion in outlays over the 2021 fiscal year, according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO).

Social Security and Medicare are funded through payroll taxes collected from employers and employees. The programs are popular, and for many Americans, they are a financial lifeline: In 2022, an average of 66 million seniors received a Social Security check each month, according to the federal government; more than 59 million people are enrolled in a Medicare plan, recent private estimates show.

But these entitlements face annual shortfalls, especially as the number of retired Americans grows faster than the two programs' dedicated tax revenue. The complicated fiscal picture has led CBO to conclude that Social Security could exhaust its trust fund by 2033, at which point it would become insolvent, potentially resulting in a 23 percent cut to seniors' monthly checks unless Congress intervenes. For Medicare, meanwhile, its key hospital-focused trust fund faces a similar problem in 2028, risking payments toward Americans' health care, according to its trustees.

''That would represent a substantial reduction in payments to Social Security beneficiaries, many of whom have very modest income and would face real hardship if their benefits had to be cut back sharply at one fell swoop,'' said Paul Van de Water, a senior fellow at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a left-leaning think tank.

The looming deadlines have emboldened some Republicans in Washington to take a look at the two programs, which are considered to be the third rail of American politics. GOP lawmakers have been counseled by a wide array of right-leaning groups, including the Heritage Foundation, that the new majority should consider significant changes to entitlements as part of their commitment to cutting spending and balancing the budget. But historically, the organization has argued against tax increases—and in a new statement on Tuesday, it did not endorse cuts to mandatory spending in the context of the debt limit.

''You don't get out of our current situation without tackling entitlement programs,'' said Rachel Greszler, a senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation, noting the country is getting ''closer and closer to the date of insolvency.''

In an early sign of their interest, House GOP leaders initially included ''mandatory spending'' as a legislative priority during a meeting with rank-and-file lawmakers earlier this month. But Republicans did not mention explicitly what they hoped to address with Social Security and Medicare. An aide to Rep. Jason T. Smith (R–Mo.), the new chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, only said this week that ''tying those programs to the debt ceiling has not been a part of any conversation'' he has had.

Other GOP leaders have ruled out direct cuts for seniors currently collecting benefits, leaving the door open for discussions about other legislative proposals.

''You've got to protect Medicare and Social Security. And the path the Democrats are going, they are going to go bankrupt,'' McCarthy told reporters last week. ''Let's sit down and find a place that we can protect Medicare and Social Security for the future generations, let's put our house in order on how we're going to spend, and let's make the investments we need to make America stronger.''

In a sweeping road map unveiled last year, the Republican Study Committee—the largest GOP group in the House—called for significant revisions to Social Security and Medicare. Their plan would raise Medicare eligibility to age 67, while allowing for more private-sector plans, while lifting Social Security to age 70 for younger workers and changing the way benefits are calculated. That proposal also raised the possibility that lawmakers could rethink payroll taxes, allowing the money to fund private-sector retirement options.

Republicans proposed privatizing key elements of the Social Security system under President George W. Bush after the 2004 election, only to encounter an onslaught of opposition that scuttled the White House campaign. Eighteen years later, Biden and his top aides lambasted GOP lawmakers in the 2022 race for trying to ''deny seniors' benefits they have already paid into.'' The president saved some of his most forceful comments for proposals put forward by Sen. Rick Scott (R–Fla.), who sought to require Congress to reauthorize Social Security and Medicare every five years.

Still, some Republican lawmakers have signaled renewed interest in those plans. Earlier this month, Scott promised to seek entitlement reforms in the context of the debt limit, promising at the time that a ''day of reckoning is coming.'' Hern, the leader of the RSC, said in a separate interview that lawmakers should at least be able to discuss bipartisan legislation to change the retirement age for a ''child who has not paid a single dollar in payroll taxes.''

''No one needing Social Security right now, or expecting to get it in the near future, should be impacted,'' added Rep. Earl L. ''Buddy'' Carter (R–Ga.), another member of the Republican Study Committee, who described the debt ceiling as a means of political ''leverage.''

''We have a responsibility as guardians of the taxpayers' money to make sure we stabilize Social Security and Medicare,'' he said.

Other lawmakers have raised the prospect they could set up a special panel to explore entitlement spending on behalf of Democrats and Republicans who are wary of such a fight. Even a member of the president's own party, Sen. Joe Manchin III (D–W.Va.), has reaffirmed his recent interest in the idea: This weekend, he touted bipartisan legislation chiefly drafted by Sen. Mitt Romney (R–Utah) that would analyze entitlements and ease the process by which legislation involving those programs could come to the floor.

The idea could gain some traction in the House, where Buchanan pointed to the bill as he stressed the need to ''work together and not make this so political.'' Another top Republican, Rep. Jodey Arrington (Tex.), led a group of Democratic and GOP lawmakers two years ago in calling for ''special, bipartisan, bicameral rescue committees'' to study Social Security, Medicare and other federal trust funds, he wrote at the time.

''We're within the budget window of both the Medicare trust fund and the Social Security trust fund going insolvent. If we don't do something in that respect, then that's going to cause a benefit cut automatically, and nobody wants that,'' Arrington said in an interview.

As the new chairman of the House Budget Committee, Arrington is set to oversee Republicans' efforts to craft a blueprint that could eliminate the deficit over the next decade. He has previously endorsed changes to other federal benefit programs, including food stamps, seeking to impose new work requirements on poorer Americans.

But some lawmakers have expressed deep reservations about the creation of a new fiscal commission, fearing that would open the door for cuts—targeting seniors as well as those who are not yet eligible for Medicare and Social Security. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I–Vt.) said Saturday on Twitter that such a panel is the ''last thing we need,'' pointing to the fact a prior attempt to impanel experts on entitlements recommended cuts to the program. ''We must instead expand Social Security,'' Sanders said.

Appearing on CNN's ''State of the Union'' a day later, Manchin rejected his liberal colleague's claims. ''No cuts. No cuts to anybody that's receiving their benefits, no adjustments to that. They earned it,'' he said.

But Manchin appeared not to rule out other changes, as he broke with his own party in calling on Biden to negotiate with Republicans over the debt ceiling. ''Could we put basically something on the floor that we will get to vote on it? Let the people decide and see if we're willing to basically get our house in order,'' the senator said.

At the White House, Biden and his top aides broadly have held firm in their position that Republicans should not politicize a key fiscal deadline. But spokeswoman Jean-Pierre did not respond last week when she was asked if the White House had its own plan for preventing Social Security and Medicare from becoming insolvent, as she blasted the GOP for ''political gamesmanship.''

''We should not put on the chopping blocks the very programs that matter to the American people,'' she said.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is simple. To lower the national deficit, House Republicans plan to try to cut Social Security and Medicare. This includes potentially ''raising the Social Security retirement age to 70, targeting younger Americans who have yet to obtain Federal benefits.''

We have a number of Members on the Republican side who talk about privatization all the time. That is their favorite word when it comes to Social Security and Medicare. We want to make sure the American people understand who is on their side and who is trying to undercut things that are very meaningful to them.

Mr. Speaker, I also point out that my Republican colleagues have been in disarray since they took the majority, and they have failed to pass meaningful legislation into law on behalf of the American people. As I said, they control this Chamber, the schedule, the committees, and what they bring to the floor.

□ 1245

At this point in the 117th Congress, that is the previous Congress, Democrats had passed 17 bills into law. At this point in the 116th Congress, under divided government, we passed 21 bills into law.

You want to know how much this majority has passed into law?

Six.

They are failing the American people. They are incapable of bringing legislation to the floor that can garner bipartisan support that has any chance in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a comparison of the number of bills passed into law by May 31, which demonstrates how utterly unproductive this Congress has been.

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

There was no objection.

COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF BILLS PASSED BY CONGRESS BY 6/21

118TH CONGRESS

President: Democrat
Senate: Democratic Majority
House: Republican Majority

1. H.J. Res. 26—Disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022.

2. H.J. Res. 7—Relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020.
3. S. 619—COVID–19 Origin Act of 2023
4. H.R. 346—NOTAM Improvement Act of 2023
5. S. 777—Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023
6. H.R. 3746—Veterans' COLA Act of 2023

117TH CONGRESS

President: Republican
Senate: Republican Majority
House: Democratic Majority
1. H.R. 335—To provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces.
2. H.R. 1319—American Rescue Plan Act of 2021
3. S. 579—A bill to make a technical correction to the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019.
4. H.R. 1276—Strengthening and Amplifying Vaccination Efforts to Locally Immunize All Veterans and Every Spouse Act
5. H.R. 1651—COVID–19 Bankruptcy Relief Extension Act of 2021
6. H.R. 1799—PPP Extension Act of 2021
7. H.R. 1868—To prevent across-the-board direct spending cuts, and for other purposes.
8. S. 164—Advancing Education on Biosimilars Act of 2021
9. S. 415—A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the scope of new chemical exclusivity.
10. S. 422—Senate Shared Employee Act
11. S. 578—FASTER Act of 2021
12. H.R. 2630—Extending Temporary Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act
13. S. 937—COVID–19 Hate Crimes Act
14. H.R. 1318—Alaska Tourism Restoration Act
15. H.R. 941—TRANSPLANT Act of 2021
16. H.R. 2523—THRIVE Act
17. S. 475—Juneteenth National Independence Day Act

116TH CONGRESS

President: Republican
Senate: Republican Majority
House: Democratic Majority
1. S. 24—Government Employee Fair Treatment Act of 2019
2. H.R. 251—Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program Extension Act
3. H.R. 259—Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019
4. H.R. 430—TANF Extension Act of 2019
5. H.J. Res. 28—Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019
6. H.J. Res. 31—Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019
7. H.R. 439—National FFA Organization's Federal Charter Amendments Act
8. S. 483—Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018
9. S. 47—John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act
10. S. 49—A bill to designate the outstation of the Department of Veterans Affairs in North Ogden, Utah, as the Major Brent Taylor Vet Center Outstation.
11. S. 252—A bill to authorize the honorary appointment of Robert J. Dole to the grade of colonel in the regular Army.
12. S. 863—A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the grade and pay of podiatrists of the Department of Veterans Affairs.
13. H.R. 276—Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act
14. H.R. 2030—Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan Authorization Act
15. S. 725—A bill to change the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan.
16. H.R. 1839—Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019
17. H.R. 1222—Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act
18. H.R. 2379—To reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program.
19. S. 1693—National Flood Insurance Program Extension Act of 2019
20. H.R. 2157—Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019
21. S. 1436—A bill to make technical corrections to the computation of average pay under Public Law 110–279.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I spoke about the unproductiveness of my Republican friends and how they are squandering all opportunities to help the American people since they have been in control but let me just talk to you about some of the stuff that we did when we were in charge of this place.

Let me remind people that because of the Affordable Care Act, which I think almost everybody over there voted ''no'' on, 40 million Americans have health coverage under the ACA. Women have access to preventive health services like breast and cervical cancer screening at no cost to them. Prescription drugs are more affordable for older adults.

Americans with disabilities are protected from discrimination on the basis of medical history or preexisting conditions. Lifetime caps on essential health benefits are gone. They are gone.

Since 2010 when the bill became law, Republicans have been obsessed with tearing it apart. Under Republican majorities, we have voted nearly 70 times to repeal and undermine the law. Nearly 70 times Republicans have tried to dismantle a law that provides healthcare coverage to 20 million people and covers preventive health services.

Today, Republicans are continuing this effort to undermine the ACA. It is maddening where their priorities are. It is maddening. Here is the deal. They know that they can't just repeal it outright because everybody doesn't want them to do that. What they are doing is they are going after it bit by bit by bit, trying to chip away at the edges and trying to kill it through a thousand cuts so that maybe people won't notice, that people won't notice when essential benefits are no longer guaranteed.

Healthcare ought to be a right in this country, and we ought to be building on the ACA, not tearing it apart, not tearing it down, not trying to make it more difficult for people to get the essential services they need, not to try to give people plans that don't provide the coverage for whatever may occur to them and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to understand—again, the good news here is that all the bills they are bringing to the floor today have no chance in hell of going anywhere in the Senate because they are just over the top and extreme.

Make no mistake about what is happening here. They have a target on healthcare. They have a target on Social Security. They have a target on Medicare. Rather than trying to fix our immigration laws, what are they doing?

They are trying to tear this country apart. They are trying to demonize immigrants. They have no solutions, just a nonbinding resolution that does nothing. It basically addresses a fake problem that was totally ginned up by FOX News. That is where their priorities are. Certainly, we can spend our time doing more productive things.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there are hearings going on right now in the Energy and Commerce Committee for the reauthorization of the SUPPORT Act.

The SUPPORT Act passed in 2017–2018 in that Congress. It was a broadly bipartisan bill. It was geared toward dealing with the problems that were occurring in this country because of an opiate crisis.

Largely, the source of these opiates were prescription drugs that were diverted to other uses, and the consequence was people taking a good overdose and in fact dying from prescription drugs that were actually diverted from their intended use.

Five years later, we are in the process of reauthorizing the SUPPORT Act. The SUPPORT Act actually functioned as intended, it did reduce some of those overdose deaths downward until we were hit with the pandemic, and obviously that changed a lot of things.

In that 5-year interval, this disease has changed. It is no longer prescription opiates that are diverted, it is fentanyl. It is fentanyl that is poisoning our young people. It is fentanyl that is pouring in from the southern border.

Look, I get it. You want to say it is only coming in at the ports of entry—that is what you catch. Our Customs and Border Protection are so overwhelmed with the numbers of people who are coming in at the invitation of the President and the Vice President, people are pouring across our border.

Customs and Border Protection cannot do their normal job. They are doing housekeeping chores, taking care of people who are ill, children who are arriving at their doorstep, and they have no choice but to take care of them.

In the meantime, all other areas of the surveillance are non vis because Customs and Border Protection are tied up with this vast increase of humanity that is coming in. The bottom line is as we reauthorize the SUPPORT Act now, we are actually dealing with a different disease because fentanyl poisoning has replaced opiate overdose.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman that fentanyl is coming across the southern border because U.S. citizens are bringing it

across through ports of entry. Don't trust me on this. You can look to the conservative think tank CATO that will reinforce what I just said.

By the way, this bill that you are bringing here does nothing to solve the problem. It is a waste of time. There are no more resources; nothing to combat it. It is just a press release. What a joke that we are here debating something like this when we could be debating something that might make a real difference.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills. As our ranking member pointed out, these bills do nothing to solve the problems that Americans are asking us to face.

For example, these bills will hurt the middle class. Let's take healthcare. Americans want quality healthcare that doesn't discriminate against people with pre-existing conditions and that does not discriminate against women. That is why we passed the Affordable Care Act. Today, we can proudly say that only 8 percent of Americans are uninsured. The lowest level in history.

Republicans keep trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act. In fact, H.R. 3799 is yet another strike at that good bill. This bill that they are proposing, Republicans would expand association health plans that are not required to cover maternity or prenatal care.

Republicans rejected an amendment to require this essential care for women and their babies in all health insurance plans. How can you go back to our districts and look women in the eye and say, we have passed legislation that would not cover you when you are pregnant, waiting to give birth to the children of the future.

Republicans would also pass H.R. 3564, which would increase mortgage fees for middle-income borrowers and decrease fees for the wealthy. Americans want to buy a home of their own so that they can start saving and build their own wealth. They want to be part of that middle class, and homeownership is a key part of that.

You know what? They called this bill the exact opposite of what it is. It does not protect middle-income workers. It increases fees for the middle class.

Lastly, H.R. 461. It is an opinion that contradicts Americans' basic sense of decency and humanity. Undocumented immigrants toil in the hot sun to pick the food we place on our table. They take the most dangerous jobs in our slaughterhouses and on our construction sites.

Extreme Republicans will take their labor, but they would refuse education or shelter to immigrants and their children. Is this how we honor National Immigrant Heritage Month in this Chamber?

Scripture steers us in a more noble direction. In Matthew 25:35–40, it says: ''I was hungry and you gave me food. I was thirsty and you gave me drink. I was a stranger and you welcomed me.''

We should be more welcoming to those asylum seekers and refugees that are bringing so much pain, but also contributions to the American landscape.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 17 minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to say, what I am a little surprised about today is that nobody has raised the deficit or the debt because the Republicans were obsessed with that when they basically threatened to ruin this economy by not allowing us to move forward to increase the debt ceiling.

We had to have all these cuts from programs that help poor people. Throwing people off of programs like SNAP, the food benefit, that is what they did. I now understand why we are not talking about the deficit or debt today because of the bills that they are bringing to the floor.

One of the bills that we are talking about right now, the CHOICE Arrangement Act, cuts more than $348 million. That is what the CBO says.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the CBO score.

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

There was no objection.

ESTIMATED DIRECT SPENDING AND REVENUE EFFECTS OF RULES COMMITTEE PRINT 118–9 (H.R. 3799, CHOICE ARRANGEMENT ACT), AS AMENDED BY AMENDMENT 8 (SMITH), AS POSTED ON THE WEBSITE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES ON JUNE 13, 2023

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—												
	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2023–2028	2023–2033
Increases or Decreases (−) in Direct Spending													
Title I. Association Health Plans Act:													
Estimated Budget Authority	0	0	−2	9	20	28	32	33	34	37	40	55	231
Estimated Outlays	0	0	−2	9	20	28	32	33	34	37	40	55	231
Title III. Self-Insurance Protection Act:													
Estimated Budget Authority	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Estimated Outlays	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Title V. Recissions:													
Estimated Budget Authority	0	−245	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	−245	−245
Estimated Outlays	0	−50	−70	−82	−29	0	0	0	0	0	0	−231	−231
Total Changes in Direct Spending:													
Estimated Budget Authority	0	−245	−2	9	20	28	32	33	34	37	40	−190	−14
Estimated Outlays	0	−50	−72	−73	−9	28	32	33	34	37	40	−176	0
Decreases in Revenues													
Title I. Association Health Plans Act:													
Estimated Revenues	0	0	−6	−10	−25	−43	−48	−51	−54	−55	−56	−84	−348
Title III. Self-Insurance Protection Act:													
Estimated Revenues	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total Changes in Revenues:													
On-Budget	*0*	*	*−5*	*−8*	*−22*	*−39*	*−44*	*−47*	*−49*	*−50*	*−51*	*−74*	*−315*
Off-Budget	*0*	*	*−1*	*−2*	*−3*	*−4*	*−4*	*−4*	*−5*	*−5*	*−5*	*−10*	*−33*
Total Revenues	0	*	−6	−10	−25	−43	−48	−51	−54	−55	−56	−84	−348
Net Increase or Decrease (−) in the Deficit From Changes in Direct Spending and Revenues													
Total Effect on the Deficit:													
On-Budget	*0*	*−50*	*−67*	*−65*	*13*	*67*	*76*	*80*	*83*	*87*	*91*	*−102*	*315*
Off-Budget	*0*	*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*4*	*4*	*5*	*5*	*5*	*10*	*33*
Total Deficit	0	−50	−66	−63	16	71	80	84	88	92	96	−92	348

Sources: Congressional Budget Office; staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.
* = between −$500,000 and $500,000.

Title I. Association Health Plans Act: CBO and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) estimate that title I would increase federal deficits by $579 million over the 2023–2033 period, primarily because more self-employed people would take up health insurance coverage through association health plans. That increase would be slightly offset by effects stemming from lower premiums by the movement of people who currently have insurance from the fully regulated nongroup and small-group market into association health plans.

CBO and JCT estimate that after 2028, when the policy would be fully in effect, title I would increase the number of people with health insurance purchased through association plans by about 200,000 per year, on average. The agencies estimate that under current law, about 40,000 (or 20 percent) of that group have no insurance, and the rest have insurance purchased in the fully regulated nongroup or small-group markets.

Title III. Self-Insurance Protection Act: Title III would amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) to exclude stop-loss policies from that act's definition of health insurance coverage. Stop-loss policies insure against excess or unexpected losses and are obtained by self-insured group health plans or plan sponsors of a group health plan that self-insures. Excluding stop-loss policies from the definition of health insurance coverage would exempt those policies from regulation under ERISA. The bill also would preempt state laws that prohibit group health plans from obtaining stop-loss policies.

CBO and JCT estimate that title III would have insignificant effects on direct spending, revenues, and the deficit over the 2023–2033 period. The agencies' analysis of state laws indicates that few states prohibit the sale of stop-loss coverage; thus, the bill's preemption of state laws would affect only a small number of people.

Title V. Rescissions: In 2024, title V would reduce by $245 million the funding available to the Prevention and Public Health Fund. As a result, CBO estimates, direct spending would decline by $231 million over the 2023–2033 period. CBO expects that the outlay savings would be less than the reduction in funding because under current law some of that funding would not be spent.

Other Provisions: CBO and JCT estimate that title II, the CHOICE Arrangement Act, and title IV, the Small Business Flexibility Act, would not affect direct spending or revenues.

Spending Subject to Appropriation: CBO has not completed an analysis of any effects on spending subject to appropriation.

Mandates: Title III would impose an intergovernmental mandate as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) by preempting any state laws that prevent certain group health plans from using stop-loss policies to insure against excess or unexpected claims losses. CBO estimates that the cost of the mandate would not exceed the intergovernmental threshold established by UMRA ($99 million in 2023, adjusted annually for inflation). The bill would not impose any private-sector mandates.

Previous CBO Estimate: On June 15, 2023, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 2813, the Self-Insurance Protection Act, as ordered reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce on June 6, 2023. The language in that bill is the same as title III and the estimated budgetary effects for the provisions are the same.

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director, Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, that is just the beginning. House Republicans spent half a billion dollars on their H.R. 1 bill that would gut environmental protections and take tax credits away from people who want to upgrade their homes. Half a billion dollars was added to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, $6 billion was added to the deficit on their deeply flawed H.R. 2, a bill attacking immigrants and essentially ending asylum as we know it.

Get this, $114 billion—billion with a b—was added through their H.R. 23 to protect the wealthy from paying their fair share of taxes. That was their very first bill on the House floor in this Congress, their top priority adding $114 billion to the deficit.

Over $505 million was added through the Republicans' bill last week to enhance access to firearm stabilizing braces.

Republicans are on a spending spree, all on the backs of real people—not the rich, not billionaire corporations, not by reallocating funding from the bloated Pentagon budget. Maybe some of you saw the ''60 Minutes'' piece a few weeks ago about the cost overruns, where former Pentagon officials said that they are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on a switch that costs a couple hundred dollars.

We can't find a penny, yet they want to increase the Pentagon budget with no questions asked.

□ 1300

They can't touch any of the tax cuts for any of the billionaires or multimillionaires of big corporations. We can't do that, and we all know why. Google where they all spend their money on political campaigns. However, they spend all this money, and they want to balance the budget on the backs of regular, everyday people, and, in particular, the most vulnerable in our country.

Last night everybody was complaining about the CBO score—the CBO score. I guess I understand why my colleagues across the aisle would not want to support the hardworking, nonpartisan people at CBO. Maybe it is because they keep giving them bad news. Maybe it is because they keep saying to my friends that they are spending and spending and spending and it is adding enormously to our deficit and our debt.

Mr. Speaker, I raise this issue because my Republican friends like to come to the floor and talk about the deficit. Today they are not. I think it is because we had this conversation in the Rules Committee last night. I want people to know that they are driving up the deficit and the debt, and then when they want to talk about fiscal responsibility, where do they go?

They go to the middle class, and they go to the people who are poor. That is where their priorities are. So there is a big difference here.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has no other speakers, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised my friend has no further speakers. I thought because these bills were so important and unbelievably essential that there would be lots of speakers on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, we all know how valuable our time is here. We only have 13 scheduled legislative weeks until the end of the year—13 weeks that could be used to improve the lives of everyday Americans.

So how have Republicans in the House decided to use this week?

Are we working to make our communities safer or our educational system better?

No. We are not. Republicans would rather demonize immigrants and peddle hate than regulate guns or invest in schools.

They are in control. They can bring what they want to the floor. Don't take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. Look at what they are bringing to the floor.

Are we here to help regular Americans purchase their first home?

No. We are voting on a bill today that will make it easier for those well-off to get even further ahead while making it more difficult on middle-class home buyers.

Mr. Speaker, you can't make this stuff up, but that is what this bill does.

Are we passing legislation that will continue to expand people's access to affordable healthcare?

No. Republicans want to chip away at popular policy that provides quality coverage to millions.

There are very real issues that regular people in this country face every day, and I wish House Republicans could wise up and address them.

This is such a colossal waste of time. One of the bills is nonbinding, but the other bills aren't going anywhere. This is a waste of time. Rather than working across the aisle trying to find common ground, they continue to bring these messaging bills. These are bills that demonize immigrants and that continue to chip away at the Affordable Care Act. These are bills that continue to screw people in the middle class, and they continue to bring these bills to the floor.

I don't know who their base is, but apparently it is popular amongst their base.

This is not about legislating. It is not about making law, and it is not about improving the lives of anybody in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong ''no'' vote on the underlying legislation and a ''no'' vote on this rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, isn't it interesting that thanks to House Republicans and their investigative efforts there was a settlement yesterday where a member of the President's family has agreed to pay his taxes that he hasn't been paying.

So that is a good thing that delivers money to the Treasury.

Oh, yes, about those background checks, it turns out a member of the President's family wasn't adhering to the background checks and the proper handling of a firearm.

So maybe we all learned something in that exchange over the last 24 hours.

I also want to correct a few things on the underlying bills. Association health plans, like all large employer plans, are required to cover preventative healthcare. This requirement includes covering women's preventative health services without cost sharing. In addition, all AHPs are required to cover pregnancy-related conditions and coverage of a minimal hospital stay after childbirth as mandated by the Affordable Care Act.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act requires the plans to cover pregnancy, childbirth, and related conditions in the same manner as they cover other medical conditions under the association health plan.

The Newborns' and Mothers' Health Protection Act of 1996—that was about 10 years before the ACA—the Health Protection Act of 1996 requires large group association health plans to cover a hospital stay of at least 48 hours for a childbirth and at least 96 hours for a birth by caesarean delivery.

These are all requirements placed on large group employer-sponsored health plans. Expanding AHPs does not change these requirements. What it changes is making that valuable insurance available to more employees.

The CBO score that the gentleman referenced also had within it the notation that 200,000 people would be covered if this bill, the CHOICE Act, is enacted because insurance would not be as expensive for employers to provide and would give them more possibilities.

Here is probably the crux of that matter: 40,000 of these people have no insurance currently. So there will be 40,000 people moved from uninsured to insured by passing the CHOICE Act. I would say that is a good thing, and I think people would be supportive of that.

I do want to stress that it is important to support the rule and the underlying measures. I thank my colleagues for their diligence and hard work in bringing these important pieces of legislation to the floor today. The Republican majority has demonstrated, yet again, that we are putting forward a legislative agenda that works for all Americans and not just the well-connected few.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 524 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

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

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

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

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 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1315

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YAKYM) at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 524; and

Adoption of House Resolution 524, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3564, MIDDLE CLASS BORROWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3799, CUSTOM HEALTH OPTION AND INDIVIDUAL CARE EXPENSE ARRANGEMENT ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 461, CONDEMNING THE USE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES TO PROVIDE SHELTER FOR ALIENS WHO ARE NOT ADMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 524) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3564) to cancel recent changes made by the Federal Housing Finance Agency to the upfront loan level pricing adjustments charged by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac for guarantee of single-family mortgages, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3799) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for health reimbursement arrangements integrated with individual health insurance coverage; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 461) condemning the use of elementary and secondary school facilities to provide shelter for aliens who are not admitted to the United States, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 207, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

YEAS—215

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

Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—207

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

NOT VOTING—11

Buck
Crenshaw
Greene (GA)
Issa
Kildee
Kilmer
Meng
Posey
Pressley
Ramirez
Williams (TX)

□ 1344

Ms. PEREZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Mses. WEXTON and MATSUI changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BABIN). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 211, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—215

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

NOES—211

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

NOT VOTING—8

Gonzalez, Vicente	Kildee	Posey
Issa	Kilmer	Pressley
	Meng	Williams (TX)

□ 1354

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.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the privileged resolution noticed earlier today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 521

Whereas the allegation that President Donald Trump colluded with Russia to interfere in the 2016 Presidential election has been revealed as false by numerous in-depth investigations, including the recent report by Special Counsel John Durham, which documents how the conspiracy theory was invented, funded, and spread by President's Trump's political rivals;

Whereas Representative Adam Schiff, who served as ranking minority member and then Chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives (the ''Intelligence Committee''), occupied positions of extreme trust, affording him access to sensitive intelligence unavailable to most Members of Congress;

Whereas, for years, Representative Schiff abused this trust by alleging he had evidence of collusion that, as is clear from reports by Special Counsel Robert Mueller, Department of Justice Inspector General Michael Horowitz, and Special Counsel Durham, never existed;

Whereas, for years, Representative Schiff has spread false accusations that the Trump campaign colluded with Russia;

Whereas, on March 20, 2017, Representative Schiff perpetuated false allegations from the Steele Dossier accusing numerous Trump associates of colluding with Russia into the Congressional Record;

Whereas, once again abusing his privileged access to classified information, Representative Schiff released a memo justifying the accuracy of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) warrant application on Trump associate Carter Page, of which was later found by Inspector General Horowitz to have 17 major mistakes and omissions, provoking FISA Court Presiding Judge Rosemary Collyer to state unequivocally that the Federal Bureau of Investigation ''misled the FISC'';

Whereas, as ranking minority member and Chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Representative Schiff behaved dishonestly and dishonorably on many other occasions, including by publicly, falsely denying that his staff communicated with a whistleblower to launch the first impeachment of President Trump;

Whereas, as part of his impeachment efforts, during a hearing on September 26, 2019, Representative Schiff misled the public by reading a false retelling of a phone call between President Trump and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky;

Whereas, on March 28, 2019, every Republican member of the Intelligence Committee signed a letter calling for Representative Schiff's immediate resignation as Chairman;

Whereas Representative Schiff hindered the ability of the Intelligence Committee to fulfill its oversight responsibilities over the Intelligence Community, an indispensable pillar of our national security; and

Whereas these actions of Representative Schiff misled the American people and brought disrepute upon the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives censures Adam Schiff, Representative of the 30th Congressional District of California, for misleading the American public and for conduct unbecoming of an elected Member of the House of Representatives;

(2) Representative Adam Schiff will forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure;

(3) Representative Adam Schiff will be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker; and

(4) the Committee on Ethics shall conduct an investigation into Representative Adam Schiff's falsehoods, misrepresentations, and abuses of sensitive information.

□ 1400

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Clark of Massachusetts moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 218, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—208

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

NOES—218

Aderholt	Emmer	Kiley
Alford	Estes	Kim (CA)
Allen	Ezell	Kustoff
Amodei	Fallon	LaHood
Armstrong	Feenstra	LaLota
Arrington	Ferguson	LaMalfa
Babin	Finstad	Lamborn
Bacon	Fischbach	Langworthy
Baird	Fitzgerald	Latta
Balderson	Fitzpatrick	LaTurner
Banks	Fleischmann	Lawler
Barr	Flood	Lee (FL)
Bean (FL)	Foxx	Lesko
Bentz	Franklin, C. Scott	Letlow
Bergman	Fry	Loudermilk
Bice	Fulcher	Lucas
Biggs	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer
Bilirakis	Gallagher	Luna
Bishop (NC)	Garbarino	Luttrell
Boebert	Garcia, Mike	Mace
Bost	Gimenez	Malliotakis
Brecheen	Gonzales, Tony	Mann
Buchanan	Good (VA)	Massie
Buck	Gooden (TX)	Mast
Bucshon	Gosar	McCarthy
Burchett	Granger	McCaul
Burgess	Graves (LA)	McClain
Burlison	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Calvert	Green (TN)	McCormick
Cammack	Greene (GA)	McHenry
Carey	Griffith	Meuser
Carl	Grothman	Miller (IL)
Carter (GA)	Guest	Miller (OH)
Carter (TX)	Guthrie	Miller (WV)
Chavez-DeRemer	Hageman	Miller-Meeks
Ciscomani	Harris	Mills
Cline	Harshbarger	Molinaro
Cloud	Hern	Moolenaar
Clyde	Higgins (LA)	Mooney
Cole	Hill	Moore (AL)
Collins	Houchin	Moore (UT)
Comer	Hudson	Moran
Crane	Huizenga	Murphy
Crawford	Hunt	Nehls
Crenshaw	Jackson (TX)	Newhouse
Curtis	James	Norman
D'Esposito	Johnson (LA)	Nunn (IA)
Davidson	Johnson (OH)	Obernolte
De La Cruz	Johnson (SD)	Ogles
DesJarlais	Jordan	Owens
Diaz-Balart	Joyce (OH)	Palmer
Donalds	Joyce (PA)	Pence
Duarte	Kean (NJ)	Perry
Duncan	Kelly (MS)	Pfluger
Dunn (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Reschenthaler
Edwards	Kiggans (VA)	Rodgers (WA)
Ellzey		Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Van Drew
Rose	Smucker	Van Duyne
Rosendale	Spartz	Van Orden
Rouzer	Stauber	Wagner
Roy	Steel	Walberg
Rutherford	Stefanik	Waltz
Salazar	Steil	Weber (TX)
Santos	Steube	Webster (FL)
Scalise	Stewart	Wenstrup
Schweikert	Strong	Westerman
Scott, Austin	Tenney	Williams (NY)
Self	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Sessions	Tiffany	Wittman
Simpson	Timmons	Womack
Smith (MO)	Turner	Yakym
Smith (NE)	Valadao	Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Hinson	Kilmer	Pressley
Issa	Meng	Williams (TX)
Kildee	Posey	

□ 1407

So the motion to table was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to physically record my vote on the motion to table H. Res. 521. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 276.

Stated against:

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall No. 276.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes due to ongoing treatment from my recent cancer diagnosis. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall No. 274, ''nay'' on rollcall No. 275, and ''yea'' on rollcall No. 276.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD). Pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

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

Mr. Speaker, Americans do not trust Congress. From the highest levels of office, an elected Member of this body enabled the fraudulent spending of $32 million out of the pockets of our American people and threw it down the drain to knowingly chase ghosts, all for political gain.

This man occupied a position of the highest trust and authority.

As Chair of the House Intelligence Committee, Representative SCHIFF launched an all-out political campaign built on baseless distortions against a sitting U.S. President at the expense of every single citizen in this country and the honor of the House of Representatives.

With access to sensitive information unavailable to most Members of Congress, and certainly not accessible to the American people, Representative SCHIFF abused his privileges, claiming to know the truth, while leaving Americans in the dark about this web of lies. These were lies so severe that they altered the course of the country forever: the lie that President Donald Trump colluded with Russia to steal the 2016 Presidential election revealed to be completely false by numerous investigations, including the Durham report; the lie that the Steele dossier—a folder of falsified and since completely debunked collusion accusations funded by the Democratic Party—had any shred of credibility, yet Representative SCHIFF read it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as fact; the lies concocted and compiled in a false memo that was used to lie to the FISA court, to precipitate domestic spying on U.S. citizen, Carter Page, violating American civil liberties.

Not only was this an egregious abuse of Representative SCHIFF's privileged access to classified information, but this memo was littered with 17 major mistakes and omissions. The groundless memo violated Carter Page's civil liberties, publicly assassinated his character, and subjected him to multiple, abusive, unlawful investigations.

Representative SCHIFF exploited his position as Chair of the Intel Committee at every opportunity possible, threatening national security, undermining our duly-elected President, and bringing dishonor upon the institution. Perhaps most unforgivable, Representative SCHIFF ripped apart American families across the country with repeated false narratives.

His own political good was served by permanently destroying family relationships and sowing lasting division across our land, which we live with every single day.

The perpetrators of this web of deceit became mainstays on cable news, waking up every morning with one goal: to lie, lie, lie to the American people that there was direct evidence of a Russia collusion.

Despite transcripts from Representative SCHIFF's investigation showing that the Director of National Intelligence, former Obama Attorney General, former Deputy Attorney General, and FBI Director, to name a few, went on record telling Representative SCHIFF's committee that there was no direct evidence for his criminal conspiracy, yet to this day, Representative SCHIFF actively fundraises off of his exploitation of Americans, as if robbing them from the truth and $32 million in taxpayer dollars is not enough.

□ 1415

Can anyone in this Chamber comprehend this list of crimes and yet somehow believe there should not be an answer for it?

This is not a partisan act. This is not a conservative versus liberal vote. This is a clear vote between right and wrong, and I urge my colleagues to do the right thing.

I will end with repeating what I started with. The American people do not trust Congress. The cyclical pattern of lies has worn down the credibility of every institution and every official in the United States Government. You see it. I see it.

If we run away from this opportunity to hold this man accountable, there is only one fault and that is of ourselves. We will betray the people who trusted us and sent us here to do the right thing. We will be responsible for the end of any shred of justice in this body. We will reject the duty that we swore an oath to protect upon taking office.

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

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

Today, we meet not to lower the costs of prescription drugs, nor to expand President Biden's infrastructure plan, nor to protect the voting rights of the people, nor to protect the healthcare choices of women across America because we know they are definitely not interested in that. No, we meet, rather, for another stop on the GOP's endless revenge tour against Democrats who dared to tell the truth about Donald Trump and his repeated sellouts and betrayals of the American people over the last 6 years.

It is all about Donald Trump tightening his stranglehold over Republicans for the 2024 campaign and driving out anyone who dares to think for himself or herself.

Don't take my word for it. Just read Friday's statement by the twice-impeached inciter of insurrection, sexual abuser, defamer of women, and indicted pilferer of national security secrets, war plans, and top-secret classified documents himself. On Friday, Trump posted this order to his followers in this unveiled threat to anyone who would dare to defy his control over the GOP: ''Any Republican voting against [ADAM SCHIFF's] censure, or worse, should immediately be primaried.''

The Luna resolution is a weapon of mass distraction from Trump's indictment by a Florida grand jury on 37 Federal charges relating to obstruction and unlawful retention of defense information for storing dozens of classified, secret, and top-secret documents at his Florida resort in his bathroom, his bedroom, and beyond, and then refusing repeatedly for more than a year to return any of these official documents to the National Archives and the FBI.

It is amazing to me that they have to change the subject from one of Donald Trump's current offenses against America to one of his older offenses, welcoming Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential campaign.

Russia repeatedly intervened in the 2016 campaign to help Donald Trump, and that is not a matter of opinion. That is a question of direct, positive fact.

Special Counsel Robert Mueller, the former FBI Director whose report is cited authoritatively by Mrs. LUNA, found right at the beginning of his report that ''the Russian Government interfered in the 2016 Presidential election in sweeping and systematic fashion.''

Here is what the CIA, the FBI, the NSA, and the Office of the Director of

the National Intelligence found in 2017: ''Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. Presidential election.''

The Mueller investigation and the Moscow Project documented more than 250 episodes of collaboration and meetings between Russia and the Trump campaign, including Paul Manafort's repeated passing of campaign secrets, such as polling data, to Konstantin Kilimnik, a Russian agent, and the infamous meeting on June 9, 2016, at Trump Tower led by Donald Trump, Jr., Jared Kushner, and Russian lawyer Natalia Veselnitskaya.

Senator MARCO RUBIO, the Florida Republican, stated that the U.S. Senate bipartisan Select Committee on Intelligence ''found irrefutable evidence of Russian meddling'' in the American campaign.

The Mueller report, if you read it, makes no pronouncement on collusion, the punitive crux of the distinguished gentlewoman's complaint, because, as Mueller writes, ''collusion'' is not a legal offense or a legal concept.

The whole question of Trump's collusion with Russia is in the realm of opinion, and most Americans would see a lot of collusive activity, all the way up to the present day when Donald Trump refuses even to take the side of the Ukrainian people against Vladimir Putin's filthy, bloody, imperialist invasion of their country, which has been filled with lies, atrocities, and war crimes.

In any event, we don't censure Members over a difference of opinion.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the complete ethical collapse of a once-great political party. The Republican Party began as a pro-freedom, antiracist, proimmigrant, anti-Know-Nothing party. It has become an authoritarian cult of personality taking orders from an inciter of insurrection, bully, and braggart whose rage toward Mike Pence and whose spectacular disrespect for the rule of law endangered not only our entire constitutional order but everyone in this room. The party of Lincoln and his Lincolnites has become the party of LUNA and her LUNA followers.

Today's madcap antics are an obvious deflection from Trump's deepening legal troubles. His allegedly criminal conduct in pilfering, hoarding, and refusing to return national security documents has caused his own Attorney General, William Barr, to say that: ''Trump's conduct is indefensible. . . . He is not a victim here. He was totally wrong.'' And, ''There is no excuse for what he did here.''

Yesterday, Representative BOEBERT offered a resolution of impeachment against President Biden. The GOP simply has no ideas for our economy, no ideas for our country, and no ideas for our people but is on an embarrassing revenge tour on behalf of Donald Trump, who treats them like a ventriloquist dummy.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and dear friend, Congresswoman LUNA, for leading the charge to hold our Democrat counterparts responsible for their gross misuse of power.

ADAM SCHIFF abused his power as chairman of the House Intelligence Committee to create false narratives that were sold to the American people about President Trump. The Mueller report and Durham report both proved that the basis for the so-called Russian collusion investigation was nonexistent.

The Representative from California misled the American people and compromised the interests of the United States of America in service of defeating, persecuting, attacking, and defaming President Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, he was hasty, prejudiced, and wrong. It is clear he was concerned for no one but himself and the advancement of the Democratic Party's political agenda. Now, $32 million later, the American people are left with lies and the obligation to pick up the tab for this boondoggle of a political witch hunt.

The Representative from California prioritized personal political gain over the interests of our Nation, and he more than deserves to be censured by the people's House.

The Democratic Party has allowed an invasion on our southern border where every small town in America is now a border town. Every one of us knows someone who has been poisoned or overdosed because of fentanyl. Illegals are raping and killing people across our country. What do they do? They claim to have a solution, and they have none.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, to my Republican colleagues who introduced this resolution, I thank you. You honor me with your enmity. You flatter me with this falsehood.

You, who are the authors of a big lie about the last election, must condemn the truthtellers, and I stand proudly before you. Your words tell me that I have been effective in the defense of our democracy, and I am grateful.

Yet, this false and defamatory resolution comes at a considerable cost to the country and to the Congress. At a moment when many millions of people in our home State of California are unable to find a place to live or afford a place to live, Speaker MCCARTHY chooses to occupy the resources of Congress for 2 straight weeks on this hollow sop to the MAGA crowd. He offers nothing to those who are homeless or addicted to opioids, or to millions of college students mired in debt, but this paltry distraction.

Donald Trump is under indictment for actions that jeopardize our national security, and MCCARTHY would spend the Nation's time on petty political payback, thinking he can censure or fine Trump's opposition into submission.

But I will not yield, not one inch.

The cost of the Speaker's delinquency is high, but the cost to Congress of this frivolous and yet dangerous resolution may be even higher, as it represents another serious abuse of power.

Donald Trump has threatened that any of you who defy him and vote against this partisan resolution will be met by a primary challenge.

He calls for my imprisonment. If a transient majority can punish and attempt to silence Members who hold a corrupt President to account, there is no telling what further corruption of office will follow.

I say this to Speaker MCCARTHY and others who wish to gratify Donald Trump with this act of subservience or bend to his demands: Try as you might to expel me from Congress or silence me with a $16 million fine, you will not succeed. You might as well make it $160 million. You will never deter me from doing my duty.

No matter how many false justifications or slanders you level against me, you but indict yourselves. As LIZ CHENEY said: ''There will come a day when Donald Trump is gone, but your dishonor will remain.''

This resolution attacks me for initiating an investigation into the Trump campaign's solicitation and acceptance of Russian help in the 2016 election, even though the investigation was first led not by me but by a Republican chairman.

It would hold that when you give internal campaign polling data to a Russian intelligence operative while Russian intelligence is helping your campaign, as Trump's campaign chairman did, that you must not call that collusion, though that is its proper name, as the country well knows.

It would fine me for the costs of the critically important Mueller investigation into Trump's misconduct, even though the special counsel was appointed by Trump's own Attorney General.

It would reprimand me over a flawed FISA application, as if I were its author or I were the Director of the FBI, and over flaws only discovered years later and by the inspector general, not Mr. Durham.

In short, it would accuse me of omnipotence, the leader of some vast deep state conspiracy. Of course, it is nonsense.

Here is the real gravamen of my offense: I led the first impeachment of Donald Trump for one of the most egregious Presidential abuses of power in our history, and I led a trial which resulted in the first bipartisan vote to remove a President in history. I would do so again.

I warned that if Trump was not held accountable, he would go on to try to

cheat in even worse ways in the next election, and he did, inciting a violent attack on this very Capitol.

After that, I participated in some of the most important hearings in congressional history, hearings that exposed Donald Trump's incitement of a dangerous insurrection to prevent the peaceful transfer of power.

My colleagues, if there is cause for censure in this House, and there is, it should be directed at those in this body who sought to overturn a free and fair election.

The question, my Republican colleagues, is not why I am the subject of this false resolution for doing my constitutional duty, but why are you not? Why are you not standing beside me, the subject of a similar rebuke for speaking the truth?

Why did you not stand up to Donald Trump? Why did you not reject his immortality? Why did you not condemn his dishonesty?

Why did you not speak out when his horde attacked this Capitol or now when he treats the Nation's secrets with such carelessness, lawlessness, and disdain? Why did you hide from efforts to hold him accountable?

Why were you silent, afraid, unwilling to do your ethical, constitutional duty? Why did you cower? Why did you cower, and why do you still?

Will it be said of you that you lacked the courage to stand up to the most immoral, unlawful, and unethical President in history but consoled yourselves by attacking those who did?

Today, I wear this partisan vote as a badge of honor, knowing that I have lived my oath, knowing that I have done my duty to hold a dangerous and out-of-control President accountable, and knowing that I would do so again in a heartbeat if the circumstances should ever require it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not each other in the second person.

□ 1430

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. LUNA for leading on this resolution.

Representative SCHIFF used his position as the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee to mislead the American people by falsely claiming that there was classified evidence of Russia colluding with President Trump, which was not true.

The Mueller report and the Durham report make clear that the Russia collusion hoax was a political lie designed to hurt President Trump and mislead the American people.

Representative SCHIFF used the Intelligence Committee to advance a political narrative against his political opponents, which violated the important nonpartisan tradition of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues today in holding Representative SCHIFF accountable for his actions because the American people deserve justice.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus and a former member of the January 6th Select Committee.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the resolution.

It is shameful that the temporary Republican majority continue to waste the American people's time with baseless accusations and rightwing conspiracy theories.

Instead of joining House Democrats to address the gun violence epidemic, we are forced to debate on gas stoves and partisan grudges. This resolution today is motivated by the same groups and individuals who to this day promote the lie that the 2020 election was stolen—a lie that ADAM SCHIFF stood up to time and time again.

I have had the privilege of serving alongside ADAM in the California delegation and the January 6th Committee. He has never shied away from taking on the toughest fights, and he is not going to be intimidated by anyone, including the former President or his allies.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with the gentleman from California today, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to this resolution.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, in this body we are privileged to serve our districts and do right by the American people. We have been entrusted with a tremendous responsibility that shapes the future of our Nation.

First and foremost, we must remember that we are not here to serve our own interests or pursue personal agendas.

Unfortunately, one of the most powerful members of the Democratic Caucus, ADAM SCHIFF, abused his role and violated the trust of the American people. As chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, SCHIFF initiated an unfounded investigation into the leftist lies around Russian collusion.

This investigation was predicated on nothing more than political propaganda. The Durham report clearly shows that the Russia hoax was manufactured by the left to divide our Nation and discredit and derail President Trump's agenda.

He not only wasted countless hours of committee work, but he also wasted nearly $32 million in taxpayer dollars.

SCHIFF repeatedly used the authority he was afforded in his position as chairman to lie to the American people to support his political agenda. Even after the Durham report discredited the Russia hoax, he continued to knowingly lie and peddle this false narrative.

These actions leave a real and lasting stain on this institution. We cannot allow Representative SCHIFF to continue to serve in this body with no consequences for the abuse of his power.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to send a clear message to the American people that we will hold Members of Congress accountable.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the minority leader and a member of the first House impeachment team.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this fake, phony, and fraudulent censure resolution brought against ADAM SCHIFF, the distinguished gentleman from the great State of California.

House Democrats will continue to put people over politics, to fight for lower costs, better-paying jobs, safer communities, defend democracy, fight for freedom, and build an economy that invests and grows the middle class.

This is a do-nothing Republican-controlled Congress, that is why this censure resolution is on the floor today. Extreme MAGA Republicans have no vision, have no plan, and have no agenda to make life better for everyday Americans.

House Democrats will continue to work for the people. Clearly, as this resolution demonstrates, extreme MAGA Republicans work for the twice-impeached, disgraced former President of the United States of America, the insurrectionist in chief, the extreme puppet master, who clearly ordered that this fake, phony, and fraudulent resolution be brought to the floor today after it failed last week.

In fact, the supreme puppet master even threatened the other side of the aisle with primaries if they didn't bend the knee. When he says, ''bend the knee,'' extreme MAGA Republicans say, ''how high.''

ADAM SCHIFF has done nothing wrong. ADAM SCHIFF is a good man. ADAM SCHIFF has served this country with distinction. ADAM SCHIFF served this country well as a Federal prosecutor, fighting to keep communities safe. ADAM SCHIFF served this country well as the chair of the House Intelligence Committee, investigating people without fear or favor, including those at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue because he believes in the Constitution and his oath of office.

ADAM SCHIFF served his country well as the lead impeachment manager during the first impeachment trial of the former President of the United States, prosecuting his corrupt abuse of power. Yes, ADAM SCHIFF served this country well in the aftermath of the violent insurrection. He pushed back against the big lie told by the puppet master in chief and participated as a prominent member of the January 6th Committee to defend our democracy.

ADAM SCHIFF has done nothing wrong. He has worked hard to do right by the American people. The extreme MAGA Republicans have no vision, no agenda, and no plan to make life better for the American people, so we have this phony, fake, and fraudulent censure resolution.

ADAM SCHIFF will not be silenced. We will not be silenced. House Democrats will not be silenced today. We will not be silenced tomorrow. We will not be silenced next week. We will not be silenced next month. We will not be silenced next year. We will not be silenced this decade. We will not be silenced this century. You will never ever silence us.

We will always do what is right. We will always fight for the Constitution, fight to defend democracy, fight for freedom, expose extremism, and continue America's long, necessary, and majestic march toward a more perfect Union.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' against this phony, fake, and fraudulent censure resolution.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I proudly stand with Congresswoman LUNA to back this censure of a man that has been long overdue. I am glad the galleries are now open where people can see firsthand that you cannot get up in front of Congress or the American people and completely deny the truth and continue to spread falsehoods.

There is no TV that could have been turned on over the last couple of years when you didn't see ADAM SCHIFF being questioned: Where is your evidence on the Russia collusion? Where is it?

He couldn't answer it. It was always coming.

He used his position on the Intel Committee—and for those of you who are listening, it is information we don't get as regular Congresspeople. He used his position on the Intel Committee to spread continuous lies with no facts. How did he do that?

He had access not only to the most sensitive information, he also did not share the access or facts that backed what he was saying. The trusted and sensitive position was abused by Congressman SCHIFF to weave purposeful falsehoods around the Russia collusion.

The Mueller report and the Durham report make clear that the foundations of his investigations were bogus. It showed that the Director of National Intelligence, a former Obama Attorney General, former Deputy Attorney General, and the FBI Director, among others, all told his committee there was no direct evidence of criminal conspiracy. Yet, he kept making the statements that his evidence was coming, and it just never did.

Not only did he spread falsehoods that abused his power, he went after a man, Carter Page, who was completely innocent. Inspector General Horowitz found 17 major mistakes.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Inspector General Horowitz later found 17 major mistakes and omissions, which provoked the FISA court presiding judge, Rosemary Collyer, to state unequivocally that the FBI misled FISA.

The public smearing of Carter Page as a Russian collaborator, and justification of spurious investigations of him were carried out with Representative SCHIFF's contribution. This is a violation of American civil liberties, and it is the very abuse that should not be warranted in Congress.

All this to spend $32 million on an investigation that went nowhere. It is an insult to the American people. The American people deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Congresswoman LUNA bringing this up. Words have actions. Just because they continue to say it, does not make it true. That is the case of what ADAM SCHIFF has done.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of serving with the gentleman from California on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for 8 years. I had an in-the-ring view of his work.

Obviously, it is not what Mr. SCHIFF did that was wrong, it is what he did so well. That is what bothers the majority. He defended our country from threats, foreign and domestic. He defended the rule of law. He defended our democracy at one of its most critical and pivotal points. He held the ethically and legally challenged former President accountable.

What really gnaws on the majority and what really bothers them is that Mr. SCHIFF was way better than anybody on their team at debate, at leadership, at messaging, and at legal knowledge. He kicked their ass. He was better, he was more effective, and that still bothers them.

They couldn't beat him on the field, so they voted him off. We voted people off committees because they posted threats, not because they can't compete.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from profanity in their remarks.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report to my friends on the other side that we are not voting today on whether or not to censure President Trump, but one ADAM SCHIFF.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this censure resolution. ADAM SCHIFF has denigrated the office which he holds, and the standards of this very body. The American people, when they elect their Representatives, place trust in them that they will act with honesty and integrity.

ADAM SCHIFF had access to our Nation's secrets and then intentionally created a web of lies, falsely alleging his tales of foreign interference and Russia collusion. He perpetrated blatant falsehoods, publicly, loudly, and repeatedly to the American people.

□ 1445

How many times did we hear him claim that he had seen evidence of Russian collusion?

He betrayed the trust of the American people. This resolution will censure SCHIFF for his gross abuse of power using his position as chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to access our Nation's most sensitive information to then mislead the American people and his colleagues here in this Congress.

The other side often speaks of decorum and holding up the integrity of this body. Now it is time for them to put their actions to their words.

Will they continue to support the lies promoted by the Congressman from California, or will they vote in favor of maintaining the integrity of this distinguished body?

I challenge them to vote today for integrity, to vote for truth, and to vote to censure ADAM SCHIFF in this House.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Boy, is ADAM SCHIFF powerful. He can, at once, be the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the special counsel investigating Donald Trump, manage and run the FBI, and be a judge ruling on FISA applications. It is remarkable that he from his perch in Congress can do all of that.

Of course, he didn't do any of that. All he did was properly impeach the President of the United States for his gross abuse of power.

Mr. Speaker, do you want to talk about collusion?

Let me ask my Republican colleagues: If a campaign manager for a campaign is giving internal information to a Russian intelligence agent, is that collusion?

Because that was the once-classified information that is now public and now constitutes collusion. There are so many other issues. There is nothing in this resolution that is true.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues said that we will hold Members accountable.

The Republicans are the party of GEORGE SANTOS.

Whom are they holding accountable?

The guy is an alleged and acknowledged liar and indicted, and the Republicans protect him every day.

Mr. Speaker, don't lecture us with your projection and your defense of Donald Trump. It is pathetic, it is beneath you, and it is beneath this body.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the original version of this resolution, not to defend Mr. SCHIFF's lies, but to defend the process that exposed those lies. We must never punish speech in this House, only acts. The only way to separate truth from falsehoods or wisdom from folly is free and open debate. We must never impose excessive fines that would effectively replace the constitutional two-thirds vote for expulsion with a simple majority.

This new version removes the fine and focuses instead on specific acts, most particularly the abuse of his position as Intelligence Committee chairman by implying he had access to classified information that did not exist and his placement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Steele dossier that he knew or should have known was false.

I hope, however, that we will hereafter return to the principles of due process that the Democrats stripped from our precedents in the last session.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I could go point by point and prove that the resolution is false, but time is short. I will just say: ADAM tells the truth.

He told the truth when we were managers on the first impeachment that resulted in a bipartisan vote for conviction.

He told the truth when we served on the January 6 Committee and found that the ex-President was the leader of a plot to overturn the Constitution and the electoral vote.

Why is this before us today?

The truth hurts, doesn't it?

I think it is before us today because the ex-President has recently been charged with dozens of felonies.

I am a former chair of the Ethics Committee. This resolution is a departure from what has been the norm in the Congress in terms of censure. Not only does this resolution disgrace the MAGA Republicans who advanced it, but it also disgraces this institution.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, ANNA PAULINA LUNA, for leading on this very important issue.

ADAM SCHIFF is a complete disgrace to our Nation and to our Constitution. He put the American people through 4 years of an endless impeachment hoax that he knew from the beginning was a lie. He represents the worst of permanent Washington, using his position of trust to lie to the American people.

He received intelligence briefings that other Members and the public did not have access to. He used this position of trust to lie and to advance his own partisan agenda. SCHIFF's disgraceful time in Congress has destroyed Americans' faith in our institutions.

Today, I am proud to stand with my colleague and friend from Florida, ANNA PAULINA LUNA, to try to undo some of the damage that ADAM SCHIFF has done by finally holding this crook accountable.

Today, we are saying that enough is enough by censuring him and referring him to the Ethics Committee.

He told the American people that he had proof that the Trump campaign asked the Russians for help in a conspiracy. That was a lie.

He claimed that he was not working with anonymous informants during the impeachment hoax. That was a lie.

Everyone with common sense knew that ADAM SCHIFF was lying all along, including the Director of Intelligence, Obama's former Attorney General, the FBI deputy director, and more. However, ADAM SCHIFF doubled down on his big lie claiming he had a smoking gun proof of a conspiracy, but the only conspiracy going on was his conspiracy to defraud the American people by taking down their duly elected President.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. When ADAM SCHIFF got caught lying, he did what all liars do and tried to cover the truth even more. He even used his taxpayer-funded staff to ask Twitter to censor journalists fact-checking his lies, but ADAM SCHIFF won't get out of this one by calling in a favor. Today, we are holding him accountable and censuring him for his lies to the American people.

In order to restore the trustworthiness of the House of Representatives, every Member should vote to censure ADAM SCHIFF so that we can speak with one voice to assure the American people that these lies will not be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every one of my colleagues with good and decent intention to vote for this resolution.

If ADAM SCHIFF has a shred of human decency left, he would resign from Congress in disgrace. His tombstone should read of his failed career in Congress and should be one word: liar.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES: Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard the gentleman from Virginia say that this is not a censure of Donald Trump, and he is right about that, and, boy, is he right about that because there is no behavior—not a discussion of how he would handle women, not an attack on this Capitol, and not the misuse of classified information—that will ever result in a peep from the Republican majority much less a censure of that behavior. This is a question of standing, Mr. Speaker, amongst other things, if that is what you stand upon.

As my colleagues pointed out, we don't hear anything about a colleague whose entire campaign and entire resume was built on falsehood. Instead, we hear that Russia was a hoax.

Mr. Speaker, I was there. The investigation began by a Republican chairman. All these investigations were predicated on the fact that a Donald Trump foreign policy aide told the Australian ambassador that they were expecting dirt from the Russians.

The most important thing I can say is that I sat next to ADAM SCHIFF for years. He is a man of integrity and dignity. This vote, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, is a testament to your dignity or lack thereof.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things that happen here in Congress that waste the American people's hard-earned tax dollars, but one of the most outrageous wastes of hard-earned taxpayer dollars has been the Russian collusion hoax led by ADAM SCHIFF.

ADAM SCHIFF lied to American people by leading the fake Russian witch hunt against President Trump. He weaponized the House Intelligence Committee to abuse all principles of due process and perpetuate the lies of Russian collusion, and he did that in the media over and over again.

His committee conducted approximately 53 interviews during its 2017–2018 Russia probe. These transcripts from the Director of National Intelligence, former Obama Attorney General, former Deputy Attorney General, and the FBI director, among others, proved that there was zero direct evidence of criminal conspiracy.

He not only refused to release these interview transcripts, but he also continued to peddle lies to the American people that Russia interfered in the elections.

He falsely claimed that Russians offered help, that the campaign accepted help, that the Russians gave help, and that the President made full use of that help when referring to allegations between President Trump and Russia during the 2016 election.

In November 2020, he specifically asked Twitter to take action against spreaders of misinformation by removing content that questioned his baseless claims of Russian collusion. The biggest spreader of misinformation was ADAM SCHIFF.

As we know, the Mueller report determined there was no criminal collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia. Thanks to the Durham report, we know now the entire Russian hoax

was bought and paid for by Hillary Clinton and the DNC.

During the probe, SCHIFF also abused his position on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and violated civil liberties by subpoenaing phone records from AT&T and a former Republican colleague on an entirely baseless claim.

His lies and abuse of power continued during the sham. During the Hollywood-produced January 6 Committee witch hunt, he and his staff doctored a text message between Representative JIM JORDAN and former White House Chief of Staff MARK MEADOWS to deliberately manipulate information presented to the American people. What a lie.

He displayed a graphic of a text message which cut a sentence in half—in half—and eliminated the final two paragraphs of a detailed legal summary that were contained in the original text message.

He did this to peddle more lies to the American people and to perpetuate the fake narrative that January 6 was an insurrection, and it was not.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, now ADAM SCHIFF is running for Senate in California. California has a lot of things messed up, and California is not the model that the United States needs. As a matter of fact, their government policies are atrocious.

So if California decides to send ADAM SCHIFF to the Senate, they will be sending a proven liar, and that is what he is aiming to do. He is raising money off of being a liar and running for Senate.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Speaker, this is not a House floor proceeding. This is a partners meeting of Insurrection, LLC.

I ask them to tell me where ADAM was wrong.

He said at the first impeachment: Can we be confident that Donald Trump will not continue to try to cheat this 2020 election?

The answer is: No, we can't.

We can't trust this President to do the right thing, not for 1 minute, and not for one election. He will not change, Mr. Speaker, and you know it.

Was he wrong when that President aimed and sent a mob into this Chamber and made all of us leave?

Was he wrong when he said that Donald Trump has betrayed our national security and will do so again? Was he wrong when he said that Donald Trump stole and shared classified information?

Was he wrong when he said that?

□ 1500

Maybe he was wrong when he said to the country, you are decent. Donald Trump is not who you are.

I ask my colleagues: Are you as indecent as Donald Trump? Will you be remembered as footnotes and foot soldiers in history's books that chronicle Donald Trump's corruption, or will you be as decent as ADAM SCHIFF?

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H. Res. 521 to censure and condemn Congressman ADAM SCHIFF.

The bottom line is this: Congressman SCHIFF utilized his position and hid behind classifications to mislead the American people.

He abused his congressional authority and security clearance to push his own party's political agenda. This was not meant to be an unbiased jurisdiction of change; this was meant to be a political witch hunt.

When Members are appointed to the select committees on intelligence, they are trusted with privileged information. Other Members of the House are taking them for their word.

As someone who has worked within the intelligence community, I can tell you that our classifications that were available to take and read is not to be abused for our own ulterior motives.

I hope my colleagues will join Congresswoman LUNA to censure and hold Congressman SCHIFF accountable and to put an end to the waste, fraud, abuse, and the gross neglect in how we take advantage of the American people.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to observe that there are dozens of Members on our side who have come to stand with Mr. SCHIFF, and it appears to have been evacuated on the other side. There is nobody standing with the Luna resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ADAM SCHIFF is tough. ADAM SCHIFF is smart. ADAM SCHIFF gets the job done. ADAM SCHIFF holds the powerful accountable.

That is exactly why we are here today. Extreme MAGA Republicans are trying to punish our colleague for doing his job, holding the twice-impeached, twice-indicted former President accountable.

The MAGA wing of the Republican Party can't stop ADAM. My friend ADAM SCHIFF will always fight to defend our democracy. He will always do what is right.

Trump's pals in Congress can create whole committees to defend him. They can try threatening outrageous fines. They can try to outright waste all of our time trying to prop up a man that has threatened our democracy over and over again.

It is no surprise that former President Donald Trump was in a Miami courthouse last week, and we are here today discussing this topic.

Mr. Speaker, we have to stop enabling this nonsense. When the whole House entertains conspiracy theories, nonsense, and political vendettas, it is the entire GOP that is responsible.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN), a member of the second House impeachment team.

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 521 because this is not a serious resolution.

This is political theater by the author, who clearly was not here, to distract from Donald Trump's history of transgressions and now indictments. It is also an attempt to punish Congressman ADAM SCHIFF for effectively holding Trump to account.

Congressman SCHIFF protected us from fascism at home and abroad. First, on the so-called perfect call, Donald Trump withheld a meeting and crucial weapons from President Zelenskyy to protect Ukraine from Russia unless they gave him dirt on now-President Joe Biden.

Mr. SCHIFF stepped up as chairman of the Intelligence Committee and eventually as lead manager to defend against executive corruption.

Then, when the former President lost the 2020 election and summoned his supporters to storm this very Capitol, Mr. SCHIFF stood up again on the January 6th Committee to expose the former President's grotesque role.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I don't know why my colleagues are so intimidated here, but I think it reveals their weakness.

They are intimidated by a bully, and this censure attempt reveals they are also intimidated by a patriot and the truth. Lucky us to serve with ADAM SCHIFF.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take my duties as Wyoming's lone congressional Representative very seriously, and my obligation to be honest and trustworthy is the foundation of my ability to carry them out.

This privileged resolution isn't about politics. It is about the seriousness of being honest and forthright as a Member of Congress and upholding the oath of office that we all take upon being sworn in.

It is true that the gentleman from California wouldn't be the first Member of Congress to exaggerate or stretch the truth; however, willfully lying about serious issues our country has faced is something entirely different and claiming that a sitting President has committed what amounts to treason is beyond simple hyperbole.

This Member's lies led to the wasting of millions of taxpayer dollars for unnecessary investigations and the deflection of our attention from the most pressing issues at hand to focus on a made-up crisis.

This Member's actions were designed to delegitimize the 2016 election and to hamstring the Trump administration.

For all the talk about not accepting the election results in 2020, perhaps Democrats and the media, which are mostly one and the same, might want to look at their actions in 2016.

To make matters worse, this Representative perpetuated these lies while he was chair of the House Intelligence Committee and consistently implied, if not outright stated, that he had inside information.

In that capacity, he lied about the following:

How the FBI and DOJ obtained and renewed a FISA warrant; that FBI and DOJ officials did not omit material information from the FISA warrant; how the DOJ used the Steele dossier; what was collected by the FISA warrant; the FBI's vetting process for the Steele dossier; that he had an alleged smoking gun showing that President Trump colluded with Russia.

Each of these claims has proven to be false.

The lies have continued. In fact, they have become compulsive, and they continue right through to this very day.

The lies weaken this body, and if left unchecked, threaten the rule of law, our election integrity, and the civil rights of his targets.

The words and actions of this Member were dangerous and untrue—knowingly untrue. There must be a serious consequence for that. Being censured is the least of what he should be subjected to, and I support this resolution.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the resolution. This latest stunt reeks of partisan politics and does nothing but advance an extremist agenda. Worst of all, this resolution attacks a great defender of democracy, a Member who is among our best.

There is a legitimate role for censure in this institution, but the majority has debased it and rendered it meaningless in a cheap partisan slap. Shameful.

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

I take a second to thank all of my colleagues from across the aisle who have spoken today for putting themselves on the RECORD defending the Russia collusion hoax, even after the Burisma payments to Hunter Biden and the big guy have been made public. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a very useful accountability tool.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, they defend the big lie, they defend the insurrection, they defend GEORGE SANTOS, but they attack ADAM SCHIFF.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, what I do know is that ADAM SCHIFF defended the U.S. Constitution. He led an impartial investigation which followed the facts and led to the first of two impeachments of a former President.

As a senior member of the Intelligence Committee, I have had the honor of working closely with Mr. SCHIFF for years.

He is a man of integrity, and he deeply loves this country like we all do. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this dangerous and purely vindictive attempt to silence someone because of his work to hold Donald Trump accountable.

I urge my colleagues not to be fooled by these distractions. Don't ignore the facts. This resolution is a fig leaf to hide the very clear facts about a twice-impeached President, a twice-indicted ex-President who has put our national security at risk.

I urge my colleagues to stop these political games and get back to the business of the American people.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans care more about personal vendettas and sucking up to Trump than about doing what is right for the country.

ADAM SCHIFF has been an incredible Member of Congress. He exposed Trump's lies and corruption, impeached him, and got a bipartisan conviction vote in the Senate. He has passed real and consequential laws that solve real problems and help real people.

What has the sponsor of this censure done? What is Congresswoman LUNA's record? I want her constituents to know in her congressional career, five of the six legislative items she has ever introduced are about ADAM SCHIFF. Doesn't she have anything better to do—like, I don't know, help her district?

This is what is known as lunacy, and it is all about deflection, retaliation, and distraction from Trump's 37 felony charges.

The people who came up with the big lie want to censure ADAM SCHIFF for telling the obvious truth, all so they can defend a three-time loser ex-President who has been indicted more times than he has been elected.

What an embarrassing day for this institution. What an insult to the American people. I urge a ''no'' vote, and I stand proudly with Congressman SCHIFF.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee for those astute remarks. I note that dozens of Members of our caucus have come to stand with Mr. SCHIFF today, while the sponsor of this resolution, Mrs. LUNA, appears to be completely isolated over on her side of the aisle.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I remind people that this is on behalf of the American people in restoring order to the House and in an effort to bring back trust, which is something that this institution has lacked for many years.

I am very proud and I own my vote in saying that I will be voting for the censure of ADAM SCHIFF.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI).

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing this censure measure, I am reminded of Will Rogers' quip: ''I don't make jokes. I just watch the government and report the facts.''

This month, despite the pressing needs of the American people, we have spent a week and a half arguing about gas stoves. Next week it will be about toaster ovens.

Today, we are voting on a joke of a measure to censure ADAM SCHIFF, a true public servant and patriot. I urge a strong ''no'' against this resolution targeting a true American hero.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW), a member of the first impeachment team.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, here are some facts.

Fact number one, Donald Trump remains one of the greatest dangers to our democracy that we have ever seen, and he is a demagogue.

Fact number two, demagogues don't like people who call them out, who speak the truth, and who pose a threat to their grand designs to destroy our democracy.

Fact number three, I have spent my life serving this country in uniform, out of uniform, and I would be hard-pressed to find somebody who is more committed to democracy, who has more integrity, and who is more committed to the rule of law than ADAM SCHIFF.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this absurd proposal, to set yourself free from your servitude of Donald Trump so we can move forward as a country.

Set yourself free. You know the truth, and the truth shall set you free.

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

As a United States Air Force veteran and a proud Mexican-American woman that happens to be almost 8 months pregnant, I say that in regard to integrity, what happened in this country, what happened with the divide that occurred after the fact that the Russia

collusion hoax was pushed down the throats of the American people is not what I would consider integrity.

If we want to talk about these little fun games and comments back and forth, we are not here about Donald Trump. We are not here about January 6. We are here about the former chairman of the Intelligence Committee who used a lie that broke apart this country.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are here precisely because of Donald Trump, because he wants this retribution exacted against ADAM SCHIFF for standing up against Donald Trump's lies and assaults on American democracy.

I congratulate the gentlewoman on her forthcoming baby. That is awesome news. I am wondering if she would share some of her time with me because I have started to run out of time, and she has no speakers over on her side, so consider that.

In the meantime, I recognize for 1 minute the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE). I recognize for 1 minute the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the January 6th Select Committee.

□ 1515

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, with all the challenges our Nation faces today, why are we relitigating the ex-President's first impeachment from 2019?

After a similar resolution failed last week, why are extreme MAGA Republicans hijacking this House yet again by devoting precious floor time to attacking my friend and colleague ADAM SCHIFF?

Maybe it has something to do with the fact that the leader of their party is facing trial on 37 felony counts of conspiracy and mishandling of classified documents. The disgraced ex-President even stored some of the Nation's most sensitive secrets in the bathroom of his Florida club.

These attempts to censure ADAM have been orchestrated to distract, but no one is fooled.

Extreme MAGA Republicans are targeting ADAM because he is everything they wish they could be. He is tough, principled, and effective.

I have stood shoulder to shoulder with ADAM.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work we did on January 6. It speaks for itself.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the steadfast patriotism and integrity of ADAM SCHIFF. This scurrilous resolution is so dishonest and defamatory that it would justify a lawsuit if it were made anywhere other than the Halls of Congress.

This is pure political revenge and exposes both the depths to which the House Republican majority has sunk and their threat to our constitutional order.

I encourage our colleagues to seriously consider how stunts like this bring dishonor upon this House and to condemn it unequivocally.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA).

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a joke.

They are trying to smear Congressman SCHIFF for his work to defend our institutions. Meanwhile, the same people who attack ADAM SCHIFF for seeking the truth refuse to take action against a serial and admitted fraudster in their own Conference.

ADAM SCHIFF did not win his elections on false pretenses. He has not been accused of crimes in the U.S., nor has he admitted to crimes in Brazil. Unfortunately, not all my House colleagues on the Republican side can say the same.

Thirty-five days ago, every House Republican voted to defend GEORGE SANTOS. Instead, they want to censure someone who stands for truth and justice, ADAM SCHIFF.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today is a proud day for California, but particularly for the San Fernando Valley.

Hundreds of Members of this House did their best to protect America from Donald Trump, but only one did it so well that he is the focus of this ridiculous resolution. He was effective, he was direct, and Donald Trump has demanded that he be attacked.

Mr. Speaker, I thank ADAM for doing his job so well. California is proud, and America is grateful.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ADAM SCHIFF did his job. That is why they are trying to censure him today.

Mr. Speaker, he held a mirror up to today's Republican Party, and they can't stand the ugliness. Instead, they want to protect the most corrupt, indicted, and perhaps soon-to-be-convicted President of the United States.

We should vote ''no'' on this censure resolution.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the former Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his great presentation today.

Today, we are on the floor of the House where the other side has turned this Chamber where slavery was abolished, where Medicare and Social Security and everything were instituted, into a puppet show.

Do you know what? The puppeteer, Donald Trump, is shining a light on the strings. You look miserable. You look miserable.

The only advantage to all of this is that instead of reversing what we did on the IRA to save the planet or reversing what we did to reduce the cost of prescription drugs, we are wasting time.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

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

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

Again, as I said, this is not about Donald Trump. This is about holding accountable someone who exploited their official position and had access to information that most Members of Congress do not have access to and bringing accountability back to the American people.

Regardless of whatever the gentlewoman from California says or anyone else, you guys are not being honest about the focus of this resolution and this censure. That is exactly why we are here today to debate it out.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has the only time remaining.

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

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

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CUSTOM HEALTH OPTION AND INDIVIDUAL CARE EXPENSE ARRANGEMENT ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on H.R. 3799.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HAGEMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 524 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3799.

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

□ 1524

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3799) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for health reimbursement arrangements integrated with individual health insurance coverage, with Mr. CRAWFORD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 80 minutes equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, or their respective designees, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we are here today considering this legislation because we have listened to the American people and are taking action on their behalf.

The Ways and Means Committee has traveled over 5,000 miles to hear directly from working Americans about the impact today's economy has had on them and their communities. Whether it be in a lumber mill in West Virginia or a cattle ranch in Oklahoma, workers, families, farmers, and small businesses have told us the same thing: They need relief from the Biden economy.

The legislation before us today will help make life a little bit easier on small businesses. It allows them to provide more options to their employees when it comes to health insurance benefits.

The CHOICE Arrangement Act gives small businesses more flexibility to provide health insurance benefits to current and future workers. Introduced by Representative HERN, this legislation codifies a Trump administration rule allowing small businesses to reimburse employees for buying their own health insurance on the individual market.

Washington should not stand in the way of workers getting the healthcare coverage that is best for them and their families. Just as important, workers should be able to take their insurance plan with them if they leave their current job. This bill gives small businesses the opportunity, if they so choose, to shed the administrative burden of managing traditional insurance coverage. At the same time, it gives workers more options for their own healthcare and makes the coverage portable.

Also included in the underlying bill is a provision from Representative TENNEY that ensures small businesses are made aware of the flexible, tax-advantaged insurance coverage options available to them and their employees. We have heard that 70 percent of small businesses are not aware of the various health insurance options out there, such as CHOICE arrangements, qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements, or the small business healthcare tax credit. This bill would make sure small businesses are notified about the availability and tax benefits of these options so businesses can make more informed decisions about how to support their employees' healthcare choices.

This legislation also includes important provisions to increase access to stop-loss insurance and expand association health plans, which will create more choices for American small businesses to offer health benefits to their workers at lower costs.

Mom-and-pop stores did not set out to be paper pushers and benefit managers, and we should not force them into that role. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to help small businesses support their workforce and let them focus on what they do best: serving their customers and employees.

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

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

Millions of Americans are finding the security and the peace of mind that comes from having access to a family physician through the Affordable Care Act. If the gentleman has been listening to the American people, he has turned a tin ear to the 16 million Americans that have now enrolled in the marketplaces under the Affordable Care Act.

Republicans, unwilling to accept the success of what they demeaned as ObamaCare, Republicans who failed more than 60 times in this House to repeal ObamaCare, who failed three times in the Supreme Court to undermine ObamaCare, have now embarked on a new strategy, which is to circumvent and undermine the invaluable protections of the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1530

With this bill, Republicans are demanding that every individual who gets stuck in one of these newfangled plans that they have is denied protection from having their insurer exclude preexisting conditions, no assurance of coverage for essential medical care, and no assurance of affordability.

I offered an amendment to correct one part of this defective bill to give Americans statutory protection, so they are not back in the old pre-Affordable Care Act period of losing coverage when they needed it most because they had something the insurance company defined as a preexisting condition, but that was rejected.

At the time, they claimed that was their intent, but when you look at the specific statutory language, there is no doubt that the protection for preexisting conditions and essential conditions is excluded from their legislation.

These so-called Individual Coverage Health Reimbursement Arrangements, ICHRAs, are about as convoluted as the name suggests. They are as my grandson, Canyon, would say, they are icky.

Handing people a voucher and telling them to go shop for coverage follows the same ill-conceived Republican approach to sabotage Medicare, which they continue to promote in their latest budget. Instead of giving Medicare beneficiaries guaranteed coverage, they would give seniors a voucher with declining value and tell them to go find coverage.

Instead of the guaranteed, comprehensive coverage workers now receive, this bill would force so many people to find healthcare in a sea of junk, exposing them to misleading marketing and aggressive brokers. An estimated 2 million workers would be immediately impacted by this sorry bill, and with another provision that is in the bill that directs the Treasury Department to go out and promote access to junk plans, we could expect these numbers of impacted workers to increase.

Inevitably, the result is bare-bones, junk insurance that misleads on coverage, has high out-of-pocket costs, and abandons those with preexisting conditions. The policy's fine print takes away all the bold promises of the marketing. Those who need coverage the most will be unable to afford it or receive minimal junk coverage.

In a Nation that is as rich as America, going broke shouldn't be a side effect of trying to get healthcare, but exposing more people to financial ruin is exactly what this kind of legislative approach will achieve.

This misguided scheme suffers, I think, from a form of preexisting condition itself. It is called amnesia, because they forget the conditions that

existed for so many Americans in this country before the Affordable Care Act became law. Situations like those who contacted me from Texas: Someone who had been a victim of domestic violence declared to have a preexisting condition; an infant born with some preexisting condition denied the coverage that they need; any number of excuses when coverage was needed the most because of preexisting conditions.

That is why I thought it was so important to amend this legislation, and the refusal of my Republican colleagues to clarify that now sends forward loud and clear that that is their objective.

There is even more ick to the ICHRA bill that is being introduced, and that is the opportunity that is created for class discrimination. This bill legalizes that discrimination. My amendment would have prevented that also.

Employees that are out there on the assembly line; those who are in the chicken processing plant, or the meatpacker, or out in the cornfields; they are in the dirtiest, most difficult, and usually the lowest-paid jobs. They can be treated one way under this bill, while the executives sitting off in the office tower are treated another and getting an entirely different kind of coverage because of the way they have written their bill.

Lower-wage workers who would be eligible, in fact, for a better policy under the Affordable Care Act with a no-premium or low-premium policy, would instead be required to search for a policy with more holes than safety net.

Finally, we discover something on which Republicans are pro-choice. I didn't think they were pro-choice on anything, but the genuine choice they provide is to the employer, not to the employee, a choice to divide employees into the haves and the have-nots; providing employer coverage to some and leaving others to fend for themselves.

Predictably, that burden will fall on the low-wage workers and the sick employees that employers don't want to cover. One survey already of employers found that 60 percent of large firms intended to offer ICHRA to only low-wage workers. That is icky.

To prohibit discrimination by employers and junk plans alike, the amendment I offered would have offered protection. This bill, as it stands, does not. It should be rejected.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chair, all CHOICE Arrangement Act plans must cover preexisting conditions, cap out-of-pocket expenses, and cover key health benefits.

CHOICE arrangements do not allow employers to discriminate against any group of employees. They require equal contributions to all employees with the same employment status, and only adjust contribution amount for age and family size, to make the record straight.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HERN. Mr. Chairman, as a small business owner and job creator for over the past 35 years, I offered healthcare plans to my employees and worked with them to find the best coverage for their families. I have seen firsthand the impact of increasing healthcare, and I have also done the burdensome paperwork to manage the plans on the back end.

I came to Congress 4 years ago, and the reason I came was because of the burden that this Congress over the years has put on job creators across America.

The small business healthcare package being debated today helps simplify healthcare and empower people in one of their most personal decisions, their healthcare.

I find it ironic that the gentleman across the aisle identifies the ACA requirements as junk because the CHOICE Arrangement Act follows the ACA guidelines. It encourages people to go out and shop. It follows the rules on preexisting conditions.

But what we really know, what they don't like about this is it doesn't go in the direction they want to go, which is to federalize all healthcare. That has been the mission since day one, for the government to run your healthcare. That just simply won't work.

I am proud that this package includes my bill, the CHOICE Arrangement Act, which allows employees to use money from their employer to buy the healthcare plan that works best for them.

Four years ago, the Trump administration finalized a rule to create CHOICE accounts, allowing businesses to reimburse their employees for the cost of the health insurance plan of their choosing. CHOICE accounts put individuals—individuals, not the Federal Government—in the driver's seat when it comes to picking their healthcare plan and lets their employer financially support their decision.

This bill would codify that rule into law, benefiting everyone and, overall, increasing the amount of people who have health insurance. You would think that would be a good thing, but apparently not with my Democratic colleagues.

Every patient's health needs are unique, and every person's situation is different. This is why it is so important to expand and protect the different options available to employers to provide health benefits in different ways.

I am happy to see Congress address the burdens small businesses face when providing healthcare benefits to their employees. This bill fulfills part of a promise that the Republican Party has made to America, to bring back true choice to American healthcare by enabling small businesses to provide the best care for their employees.

As the chairman said, time and time again, in hearings that we have been at across America talking to people that are experiencing the burdens that come out of this Congress, it is amazing to me that the Democrats who are businesspeople that are on the committee, when talking without their talking points identify—

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HERN.—businesses as people who apparently abuse their employees and the employees continue to come to work. That is the irony of this. They have no idea what they are talking about.

The reality is there are other job openings for everybody to go to, and yet, people continue to work. The only way you are prosperous in America and run a great business is if you take care of your people. That is it. That is all you have. That is what differentiates you in the world of a free market. I would hope that my Democratic colleagues would recognize that and give a little credit to the people who are out there putting their money and their risk on the line.

In addition to my bill, this small business package includes legislation from my colleagues BOB GOOD, CLAUDIA TENNEY and TIM WALBERG that will provide small businesses access to the association health plans to build their negotiating power, stop-loss insurance to protect from catastrophic losses, and reporting from Treasury to update small business owners on new healthcare plans.

Small businesses make up the foundation of the American economy and have true incentives, moral and financial, to pay to keep Americans healthy. We should enable them to do so. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman has repeated his stated intent to provide the protection that his bill denies, and I would refer him, again, to page 3, line 2 of this bill as it was presented in committee, and the failure to refer to section 2791(b)(5) of the Public Health Service Act means that that protection will not be there. It could easily have been added if that were the true intent. It is omitted.

Same page, line 12, the failure to include guarantees against nondiscrimination is not there.

He is concerned about federalizing healthcare. Well, all that I want to do is set a minimum Federal standard that no person in this country will be denied because of a preexisting condition the healthcare that they deserve. That is what the Affordable Care Act was designed to achieve, not only for those in the marketplace, but beyond.

Secondly, I want to ensure that different classes of employees are not treated differently. Let me just describe a little more of what is involved there.

Just as they would allow insurers to discriminate against a newborn with a

heart murmur and call that a preexisting condition, their bill would permit an employer to discriminate against their own employees.

Just to give you a practical example. We have a lot of chicken processing plants down in northeast Texas. If there is a facility out there where the chicken pluckers are chasing the chickens, removing the feathers that are flying, those tough, dirty, hot jobs processing them may be managed by a group in some high-rise in Dallas or Tyler.

Well, this bill, as it is written, will allow those executives to get their group health insurance policy with all the protections against preexisting conditions and being able to see, perhaps, a concierge service for their healthcare. But the folks that are down there chasing the chickens and plucking the chickens, they get an ICHRA. All they get is ick. That is wrong.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the CHOICE Arrangement Act will expand coverage for more types of workers by allowing employers to offer a CHOICE Arrangement to different groups of employees who may not have been offered health insurance previously, such as part-time or seasonal workers.

Under this policy, nearly 1 million workers will have health insurance coverage for the very first time.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), who is an author of a piece of this legislation.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the CHOICE Arrangement Act and my Small Business Flexibility Act, which is included in the underlying bill as the chairman just recognized.

Over the past 10 years, health insurance premiums have gone up 130 percent, and deductibles have increased by 125 percent, and that is on average. It is even greater in some areas, especially for small business owners.

This lack of affordability has led to the percentage of small businesses providing health insurance decreasing from almost 45 percent to 31 percent today. In addition, 75 percent of businesses with fewer than 200 employees now only offer one healthcare choice. That is no choice.

Small business operators want to provide for their employees. They want to offer competitive benefits that promote choice in the marketplace while prioritizing excellent care, quality, and affordability. The problem is these costs are simply prohibitive.

We should not accept this as the status quo, and, thankfully, there are commonsense solutions that can help small businesses lower cost and increase choice for their employees.

Recent surveys have found that 70 percent of small businesses are not even aware of the flexible opportunities to help them provide affordable health insurance as a benefit to their employees, such as the Small Business Healthcare Tax Credit, CHOICE Arrangement Act, and Qualified Small Employer Health Reimbursement Arrangements.

My Small Business Flexibility Act will close this awareness gap by requiring the Treasury Department to notify and educate small businesses on the flexible coverage options.

Small employers want to provide these benefits to their employees for, among so many other reasons, long-term retention to allow them to ensure that they have high quality of life, and each of them has access to healthcare.

It is time that we increased awareness of these programs and address any obstacles to their successful and effective implementation. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the CHOICE Arrangement Act and the Small Business Flexibility Act.

□ 1545

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3799.

The comments by Mr. DOGGETT and others would make you think it is an entirely different bill. There is nothing in this bill that would change coverage for preexisting conditions. I don't know what he is talking about with icky because more people will have healthcare available to them as a result of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on two committees that have crafted pieces of this legislation, the Ways and Means Committee and the Education and the Workforce Committee. I think that all of us—and I think this is probably shared on both sides of the aisle—want all Americans to have access to the healthcare and to the insurance that they choose for themselves. As I said, I think we share that.

Certainly, as a small business owner myself, I can relate to businessowners who want to ensure that their employees, their team members have access to the healthcare. They want them to be healthy; they want them to go home from work healthy; and they are very interested in ensuring that their employees have affordable coverage.

This committee focused on expanding the CHOICE arrangements, which is a system that will provide numerous benefits for employees and small businesses because it lets job creators offer their workers cash to purchase individual health plans, which will help by ensuring that if workers move from one job to another, they can take their health plan with them. They are more portable, so that is a great change that will help a lot of individuals.

On the Education and the Workforce Committee, we wrote legislation that expands association health plans, or AHPs, which enable employers and the self-employed to band together. I have heard from a lot of self-employed individuals in my community who are having trouble accessing health insurance that they prefer. This would allow them to band together across State lines to purchase health coverage for themselves and, in the case of small businesses, for their workers.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chair, there is one other thing in this bill which I think is very positive. We took action to preserve self-insurance. This is a system in which large and small employers pay for healthcare services directly instead of purchasing plans with a large insurer, which leads to savings and leads to collaboration between employers and workers at their company to ensure better wellness approach to keep employees healthy and not be required to access healthcare costs. It helps the workers, and it saves costs across the board. Self-insurance is another part of this bill that we preserve, which I think is very great.

The bottom line is that American workers and businesses need affordable and flexible healthcare options. This package of bills achieves those goals, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He says there is nothing in this bill about preexisting conditions and discrimination, and he is absolutely right. That is the whole failing of this bill. It does not include the protections that are necessary to ensure that no American is discriminated against on the basis of preexisting conditions and that no employer can discriminate among groups of its employees.

He also says this is going to open more opportunities for more people to get health coverage. I would point out that studies have shown that 95 percent of the people who are in these icky plans now once had good group health coverage. My concern is that we will see even more people lose their good group health coverage and be put into an icky plan.

As for the Small Business Flexibility Act, I am for the Treasury and others educating all employers and employees about their rights and opportunities, but I think this part of the overall package is very slanted. Treasury needs to be out there educating employers, some of whom may not know themselves the limitations that these junk plans have and how much they will disserve their employees. We need education of employees on how to understand whether their employer's offer of coverage meets the minimum standard and is truly affordable for the

purposes of being able to otherwise enroll in subsidized marketplace coverage. I think there are limitations on that portion of the bill as well and that it, therefore, should be rejected.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, when Democrats expanded ObamaCare subsidies in the Inflation Reduction Act, those billions of dollars flow directly to large health insurers. CHOICE arrangements, however, allows small businesses—small businesses—to reimburse their own employees directly for them to shop and purchase their own health insurance. This is how Washington should be empowering small businesses, not bailing out large health insurers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER).

Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CHOICE Arrangement Act.

Small business owners are being hamstrung by soaring healthcare costs. I know firsthand because I am a small business owner, but you don't have to take my word for it. The data speaks for itself.

In Deschutes County in my district, the average small business premium for a family has increased by 111 percent from 2014 to 2022.

It is past time to provide small business owners with more options so workers can access cheaper coverage. We can accomplish this by expanding association health plans and providing more flexibility to ensure employees can get the coverage that fits their needs best.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support small businesses, which create jobs, foster innovation, and keep our economy running strong.

Let's get this done to ensure these employers can keep their doors open.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The chairman of our committee says that there were great gifts to insurance companies. What the Build Back Better bill did was to give individuals additional tax credits. Some Republicans call those tax cuts, but they were credits given to people to be able to afford insurance. As a result of that improvement, many more Americans got the insurance that they need.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I remind the body that Build Back Better was never signed into law because neither the Democrats in the Senate nor the White House would even support it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of Ways and Means, my good friend from Missouri, very much for having this important debate for the CHOICE Arrangement Act.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does nothing more than expand the association health plans. Businesses want to have current coverage that exists today. They can keep it. President Trump years back enacted an expansion of association health plans which greatly benefited the farmers in my district and the small businesses in my district to find plans that suited them.

They used the power of their numbers to reduce costs 29 percent. We have better coverage, preferable to the entities, at lower costs. If they like their current coverage, they can keep it. It sounds way too logical, apparently, for this body. There is no logical reason to oppose H.R. 3799 other than for special interests or political motivation.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I say to the chairman, he is absolutely correct. I referred to the Build Back Better instead of the American Rescue Plan. It is easy to get confused about them. The American Rescue Plan was, of course, signed into law and has helped so many Americans. However, we always know that whatever the name, Republicans are against all of them, as they were, and voted unanimously against all of the opportunity that they created for millions more Americans to get and keep health insurance and provide themselves security.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas has no further speakers, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I focused on one part of this entire package of bills, but together it is truly a thinly veiled attempt to circumvent the Affordable Care Act. Being unable to repeal it, having nothing but nothing care to replace it with is really kind of a death by a thousand cuts, making healthcare less accessible and affordable for so many at-risk workers.

The bills in this package include a codification of the Trump-era rule that allows employers to offer these ICHRA plans to their employees instead of employer-sponsored health plans.

Under this plan, employers may offer a voucher and force their employee to shop for their own coverage.

Under this bill, employers are permitted to pick and choose among their employees and discriminate against some with their vouchers.

This bill also includes an expansion of the association health plans, which my colleague from Virginia will discuss at greater length. That has been a standard tenet of Republicans' assault on the Affordable Care Act. It is a provision that would allow self-employed individuals and small businesses to circumvent the guarantees of the Affordable Care Act and steer consumers into shoddy coverage that does not cover the healthcare they most need when they need it, the essential health benefits.

It also does not offer them protection against preexisting conditions or age or the fact that before the Affordable Care Act was adopted, women were discriminated against at a great rate and often denied the coverage that they needed or it was priced so high they could not afford it.

The bill would also preempt State regulation of association health plans and disrupt risk pools as these plans do not have to follow standard premium-setting rules and risk adjustment. This bill is similar to the Trump administration rule that was struck down in 2019.

If you are beginning to recognize a pattern here, this is all Trump, Trump, Trump because he is still the Pied Piper for the Republican Conference, as we just saw in this disgraceful presentation about our honorable colleague ADAM SCHIFF.

This package also contains a provision to encourage employers to offer self-funded plans, which are not required to comply with ACA protections, again, on preexisting conditions, on essential health benefits, and more. Most employers do not want to take on the risk of offering a self-funded plan. However, by expanding stop-loss coverage, which sets a catastrophic amount the employer will be responsible for, and then covers any other costs that may come up from covering their employees, self-funded plans will be more attractive.

This legislation prevents Federal and State governments from regulating stop-loss coverage and risks more employers opting for self-funded plans that do not protect healthcare consumers.

Finally, without providing any additional resources, this legislative package tells the Treasury Department to educate employers about how great these new icky plans are and their health reimbursement accounts, which would bar workers from more affordable coverage under the marketplace already available.

At the heart of this effort is just the perpetual push by House Republicans to weaken the protections of the Affordable Care Act, which have prevented financial ruin for so many people and assured access to healthcare for so many people.

Under the provisions of this bill, employers can form association health plans to skirt some of the requirements of the ACA like the essential health benefits. State and Federal regulators will be hamstrung in their ability to protect small businesses and workers in self-funded plans.

Utilizing these icky ICHRA plans, employers can also push those with preexisting conditions, women, and older workers into the individual market with vouchers while keeping their younger and healthier employees on employee-sponsored insurance. Therefore, the sick get treated differently.

Those who have disabilities, who have had long-term chronic conditions, could be treated very differently and put at great risk.

I think for all these reasons that this legislation should be soundly rejected. This is an opportunity to defend all that the Affordable Care Act has meant to Americans and offer that opportunity to more people rather than deception that is the hallmark of this bill and following the Trump approach that junk insurance is what would be most available to Americans.

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

□ 1600

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Congress has an opportunity to help small businesses by making it easier for those who choose to provide health insurance for their employees.

This bill is the best of both worlds for small businesses and workers. It relieves many small businesses of the burden of administering a complex health insurance plan by allowing them to instead offer meaningful financial support to employees so that they can buy their own insurance. It takes some of the guessing game out of offering coverage by making sure small businesses are informed of the various options they have. It gives workers the freedom to choose the best possible coverage for themselves and their families.

By passing this legislation, we will allow small businesses to get back to the basics, helping their customers, taking care of their employees, and serving their communities.

I want to address the misleading claims we have heard from our Democrat colleagues. At our markup, one of my Democrat colleagues called the health plan options under this bill junk plans. That is unequivocally false. These funds can only be used to purchase plans that cover preexisting conditions. Regardless of what you hear on the other side, this covers plans with preexisting conditions. It covers plans that cap out-of-pocket expenses and guarantees coverage during open enrollment.

They also claim that we are opening a backdoor for businesses to discriminate in the health benefits offered to their employees. CHOICE arrangements provide the opposite of discrimination. They provide equal contributions to all employees with the same employment status, only adjusting for age and family size.

In fact, many businesses today don't offer health benefits to any of their part-time employees. Through CHOICE arrangements, these employees may be seeing their first offer of meaningful health benefits.

Today, we are taking another step forward to cut the bureaucratic red tape holding back small businesses. We should make it easier, not harder, to give America's workers, families, farmers, and small businesses access to flexible healthcare options.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. WAGNER). The Chair now recognizes the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

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

Madam Chair, I rise today to support the House Republican package to alleviate rising healthcare costs for small businesses. I am proud that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has taken a leading role in this effort.

Healthcare cost is the number one issue facing small businesses today. In fact, according to the NFIB, it has been their top issue for over 30 straight years. Through the dot-com bubble, the Great Recession, the COVID–19 pandemic, and record inflation, small businesses have consistently identified healthcare costs as their greatest concern.

House Republicans recognize that these small businesses are the engines of the American economy, and this package is the first step toward much-needed relief.

I will take a moment to discuss the two pieces of this package from the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee. First, this package incorporates Representative GOOD's Self-Insurance Protection Act. We passed the Self-Insurance Protection Act through committee because small businesses are being squeezed. There is no other way to put it.

On the one hand, premiums are skyrocketing, and it is costing small businesses a fortune to cover their employees. Single-coverage premiums cost about $8,000 per year now, and they are drastically outpacing inflation. The bottom-up inflationary pressures have inevitably forced small businesses out of the insurance marketplace, and more and more are deciding to self-insure. Experts predicted this when the ACA passed, and it has held true.

On the other hand, the government is coming from the top down and telling small businesses they cannot access stop-loss insurance. Stop-loss insurance is a financial tool that self-insured businesses typically buy to protect themselves from catastrophic costs, but the government overreaches, overregulates, and denies many small businesses this critical tool.

For example, in New York, insurers are expressly prohibited from selling stop-loss insurance to employers with fewer than 100 employees. The New York State Association of Health Underwriters wrote regarding the law: ''Some groups have already lost their employer-provided health coverage altogether and have had to go into the New York health insurance marketplace exchange to obtain coverage, only to find that their new coverage has higher copays, larger deductibles, greater total out-of-pocket annual limits, narrower in-plan healthcare provider networks, and fewer out-of-network medical specialists.''

Like in a pincer maneuver, the government is coming from both sides and trapping small businesses in the middle with no options.

The Self-Insurance Protection Act is the solution. It provides a lifeline to small businesses and hardworking Americans who are being squeezed by the soaring cost of traditional health insurance. It would stop Federal and State overregulation of stop-loss insurance, allowing self-insured small businesses a way out of the government's two-sided trap.

Next, this package also incorporates Representative WALBERG's Association Health Plans Act, which is perhaps the single best cost-saving tool at our disposal. The Association Health Plans Act would offer immediate relief for everyday workers, taxpayers, and job creators. I know this because it has been tested.

In 2019, before the courts stopped President Trump's association health plan, AHP rule, America got a chance to see and feel the impact of deregulation. AHPs produced savings of up to 29 percent on average. At the upper limit, groups saved 50 percent with their newly formed AHPs.

AHPs achieve these savings by allowing small businesses to band together to increase their bargaining power when purchasing health insurance. Currently, many regulations restrict small businesses and individuals from doing so.

Enabling small economic actors to pool resources is critical to their competitiveness in the market. In healthcare, big companies enjoy large economies of scale, and only more so with each passing year.

Countless studies and evidence point toward this worrisome trend of market consolidation. Three pharmacy benefit managers own 80 percent of the market. Physician practices and hospitals are merging at a rapid pace. Thankfully, hospital mergers have slowed during and after the pandemic, but it is not enough. This bill helps mom-and-pop shops and self-employed workers fight back.

I should also clarify that this bill does not turn healthcare into the Wild West, like some Members claim. Important regulatory guidelines exist to make sure enrollees would not be defrauded under AHPs.

For example, every AHP must have a board consisting of at least 75 percent employer membership. This ensures that AHPs are maintained in good faith.

They are also required to abide by existing consumer protections, such as prohibitions against discriminating

based on an individual's health status and prohibitions against using preexisting conditions to deny coverage, increase premiums, or impose waiting periods.

The benefits of the Association Health Plans Act can be summed up in the words of Trump's DOL: ''AHPs are about more choice, more access, and more coverage.'' I agree.

Let's help small businesses get the relief they need and working Americans the coverage they deserve.

Madam Chair, I urge passage of this healthcare package, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, the proposals in H.R. 3799 are yet another recycled, futile attempt to sabotage the Affordable Care Act and actually make it harder for workers and families to find affordable, high-quality health insurance.

This legislative package includes two bills that were marked up by the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The first is the Association Health Plans Act. This act undermines a core promise of the ACA, access to affordable healthcare for all. This faulty legislation may provide lower costs for some enrollees, but it would do so by skimping on benefits and increasing costs for everybody else.

Specifically, the bill would allow association health plans to cherry-pick low-risk, young individuals for a pool separate from the ACA marketplace. You may hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tout the bill's nominal protections against discrimination based on preexisting conditions, but they omit the details regarding the other large loopholes that leave consumers vulnerable in this bill, such as charging higher risk groups more so that the plan will not be attractive to them and charging low-risk groups less so that they will be the ones that come in.

In fact, this legislation explicitly authorizes AHPs to set premiums based on the ''specific risk profile'' of employer members, enabling them to charge higher premiums to groups based on their age, gender, and other factors. AHPs could also exclude certain categories of coverage, such as maternity care, mental health, or substance abuse disorder, to dissuade certain groups or individuals from enrolling. Under the bill, association health plans could also evade essential health benefits and other consumer protections under State and Federal law.

It is a bad idea because of simple arithmetic. If healthy, low-risk individuals can leave the Affordable Care Act marketplace risk pool and join a separate association and pay lower rates on average, those that did not get into these plans will, on average, pay higher premiums.

Let's be clear. Only low-cost groups will be in these plans because if you are a high-risk group, the cost will be too much and will not be attractive. If they are high-risk groups with preexisting conditions, older groups, and whatnot, they will not be able to form groups that charge less than the ACA marketplace, and nobody will want to join.

Under the ACA, everybody pays an average. If you have a preexisting condition or do not have a preexisting condition, everybody pays the same, and everybody gets insurance at an affordable cost.

Everybody enjoys all the essential benefits under the ACA. Association plans, for example, do not have to provide coverage for essential benefits like maternity benefits. All the costs of maternity care will be borne by fewer and fewer people.

The average cost of insurance for those not in the plans will slowly grow as the number of association plans grows.

□ 1615

Various versions of this legislation have been pushed by Republicans for decades, but all iterations suffer from the same fundamental flaw, they shift costs to the most vulnerable. That is why more than 30 leading consumer and patient groups have expressed serious concerns with this harmful legislation.

The other bill marked up in the Education and the Workforce Committee was the Self-Insurance Protection Act, legislation that further erodes the ACA by exempting stop-loss insurance from key consumer protections.

The bill would prevent the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, Labor, and the Treasury from regulating stop-loss insurance coverage. Even more troubling, the bill makes it virtually impossible for States to protect consumers from abusive practices by invalidating State laws that regulate stop-loss.

Stop-loss insurance usually covers costs above a catastrophic level, over a million dollars or something like that. They can be written to cover everything over a thousand dollars when they become essentially regular insurance except that they are not regulated. There are no solvency regulations, no benefit regulations, no nothing.

We can all agree that small businesses and self-insured people deserve access to affordable healthcare, and that is what you get under the Affordable Care Act. We should also agree that people deserve basic consumer protections to ensure that they have insurance with quality, solvency, an agency to call if something goes wrong, and coverage for essential benefits. That is why we passed the Affordable Care Act in the first place. It is also why, when Democrats were in charge in the last Congress, we passed the American Rescue Plan and the Inflation Reduction Act to make coverage even more affordable.

The question before us is: Do we want to make sure that every individual can continue to find affordable and quality healthcare coverage, or do we want to pass H.R. 3799 and create roadblocks for Americans seeking care?

Madam Chair, I would hope that we would oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, our colleagues are opposed to freedom in choosing healthcare. They want everyone in government-controlled healthcare and are quite willing to mislead the American people on what these bills do.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3799, the CHOICE Arrangement Act. I thank both the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Education and the Workforce for their hard work in bringing this important bill to the floor.

I must state that what I have heard over the last 20 minutes of sitting here and listening to my colleagues, it would lead me to believe that they think Republicans don't want good healthcare, that we don't need good healthcare, that we don't use good healthcare, and that we would support employers not giving us good healthcare or our constituents good healthcare, and that we would expect that Republican employers wouldn't feel the same impact of trying to compete with other employers whose benefits their employees look for.

That is just not true. I don't think the American public believes that. We have the same concerns. We want good healthcare. That is why this bill has been put forward.

With the ACA, true, everybody had insurance, but not everybody had healthcare when they tried to use it. The high cost of healthcare remains a struggle for small businesses, many of whom are facing lingering hardships from the pandemic as well as inflation.

In fact, a recent survey from the NFIB showed that while employers by and large believe offering health benefits is important, 98 percent of small businesses are concerned that healthcare costs will become unsustainable within the next 5 to 10 years.

The CHOICE Arrangement Act provides innovative healthcare solutions to bring down healthcare costs for small businesses.

I am proud that H.R. 3799 includes my legislation to expand association health plans. AHPs are commonsense solutions that empower small employers and their employees when making health coverage decisions.

Right now, small businesses are often on an unequal playing field with larger companies and unions. Because they have fewer employees, small businesses have limited bargaining power when it comes to negotiating for lower insurance costs for their workers and higher care coverage.

By providing small businesses with greater bargaining power, the Association Health Plans Act allows them to offer more quality options for workers at a better price.

Madam Chair, the Association Health Plans Act will level the playing field for small businesses and empower their employees to access quality healthcare at a lower cost. It also represents an important step toward purchasing health insurance across State lines.

Today's vote is an immediate first step to help job creators provide affordable healthcare options to their employees and transition toward a patient-centered healthcare system that works for Republicans and Democrats.

Madam Chair, I encourage support of H.R. 3799.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan, I am sure there are many Republicans who want to assure good healthcare to all people. The problem is with this specific bill.

The one-page amendment that I offered could have guaranteed these ICHRA employees that they would face no discrimination among classes of employees and no barrier of preexisting conditions.

That clarification would have solved this problem, and their failure repeatedly to accept that one-page amendment, with no explanation other than that they wanted to do the same thing, or that it was duplicative, betrays the promise of this bill and suggests that discrimination and denial of coverage based on preexisting conditions is what Americans in these plans will face.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, our colleague from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) closed by saying that his goal is to cut red tape. Well, that is a goal that I think all of us can share, but I am afraid that this bill, as written, will only throw more Americans into the red and into medical debt, which is already high despite the protections that we have provided to date.

There are so many families overwhelmed by medical debt, and some who will be denied the opportunity to get the protection they need from their healthcare providers because they simply cannot afford it.

Madam Chair, I would say at the appropriate time I will offer a motion to recommit to this bill and send it back to committee. If the House rules permit it, I would have offered this motion with an appropriate amendment to the bill.

My amendment would ensure that this bill does not take effect unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services certifies that this bill will not result in anyone losing access to coverage of essential health benefits or see their healthcare costs rise, the very objective that the gentleman from Virginia has been discussing.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD the text of this amendment.

Mr. Doggett moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3799 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE VI—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 601. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services submits to Congress a certification that such provisions and amendments will not result in—

(1) individuals losing access to coverage of essential health benefits (as defined for purposes of section 1302(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022(b))); or

(2) higher costs to individuals for coverage that includes such benefits.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting it, recommitting this, pursuing the objective of better healthcare for all, and protecting all Americans from preexisting condition barriers, and ensuring they are not the subject of discrimination.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD), who introduced this resolution, and is chair of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the CHOICE Arrangement Act because it charts a course for Americans to take charge of their healthcare.

This bill includes several important provisions, including one of my bills, the Self-Insurance Protection Act. Self-insured healthcare plans give employers more choices to build and tailor health plans that best meet the needs of their employees.

Self-insured plans are popular. In fact, in 2022, 65 percent of workers were enrolled in self-insured plans. Small and midsize businesses are turning to self-insured plans because of the flexibilities they provide in offering high-quality healthcare coverage at an affordable cost to employees.

Stop-loss insurance is a critical component of an employer's ability to successfully self-insure in a way that best suits their needs. Most employers choose to purchase stop-loss insurance to manage financial risk, shielding them from potentially catastrophic medical claims that could sink their businesses.

Unfortunately, Washington bureaucrats have tried to regulate stop-loss insurance into nonexistence. The Obama administration threatened to regulate stop-loss as traditional health insurance, a move that would make self-insurance inaccessible, and force individuals onto the ObamaCare exchange and drive up costs.

My bill would make sure the Biden administration can't mandate the decision of small business owners and weaponize regulations to prevent access to stop-loss policies for small business owners.

Additionally, some State laws unfairly limit small businesses from accessing the self-insured market solely based on the size of their operations. My legislation would protect the ability for businesses to self-insure and ensure that no government entity can prevent them from making the best possible decision for their business and their employees.

Another key provision of the CHOICE Arrangement Act would make Association Health Plans more accessible for small businesses and self-employed workers.

This policy is a big win for my home State of Virginia. Last year, Virginia passed a law allowing realtors to form Association Health Plans. Sadly, the Biden administration has threatened to block implementation of the State law because it doesn't comply with ObamaCare.

Voting for the legislation today would allow for the Virginia law to flourish without Federal Government intervention. The Medicare for All mentality thinks that businessowners aren't equipped to provide quality health coverage for their employees. That simply is not the case.

A majority of Americans, 159 million, in fact, have health benefits through their jobs, and they like their plans. Madam Chair, 78 percent of employers decide to enroll in employer-sponsored insurance when given the option.

The CHOICE Arrangement Act responds to the needs of the American people, and I hope all of my colleagues can support this effort to empower small business owners across America.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I would inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 11½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Chair, the gentleman from Michigan talked about the motive of employers. I think the employers want to give good coverage. The problem with this bill is it enables one company to find loopholes to get a good deal for that company even if it results in higher costs for everybody else. That is the problem with this legislation.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter of opposition written by the AFL–CIO.

Among other things, the letter states that this bill undermines comprehensive coverage and subjects workers to financial risk.

AFL–CIO
LEGISLATIVE ALERT,
June 20, 2023.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL–CIO, I urge you to oppose the CHOICE Arrangement Act (H.R. 3799). This package would make two substantial changes in

health coverage policy—both harmful to workers.

First, H.R. 3799 will loosen the definition of association health plans (AHPs), opening the door for more employers to establish plans that evade Affordable Care Act (ACA) requirements to cover essential health benefits and participate in market-wide risk pools. Despite what their name suggests, association health plans are not a form of niche coverage for professional associations. Under current rules, AHPs may be established by multiple employers and draw broadly from insurance markets to enroll self-employed individuals. With the ability to set rates based on a limited pool of enrollees, AHPs have been able to offer coverage with lower premiums, but their track record is poor. Too often, these plans misjudged the risks involved and have gone insolvent, leaving enrollees in the lurch. In other cases, enrollees have been defrauded by scammers who exploited the AHP regulatory loopholes.

Second, under the guise of ''protecting'' stop-loss insurance for self-funded group health plans, H.R. 3799 would allow employer health plans to avoid the ACA requirement that insured plans cover essential health benefits. The policy is intended to allow plans that are unable to actually self-fund with adequate reserves to instead purchase a high level of stop-loss insurance. Lack of adequate reserves leave many of these plans, and their enrollees, at risk since stop-loss insurers often retain the right to drop the insurance if medical costs for the group begin to climb. This is not a stable form of coverage.

By allowing plans to offer coverage that does not comply with ACA essential health benefits requirements, both of these policies would allow plans to cherry pick healthier, less-costly enrollees from the small group and individual markets. This will increase premiums for good comprehensive coverage because risks cannot be spread widely to reduce costs for all.

We urge you to protect working people by opposing this legislation that undermines comprehensive coverage and subjects workers to financial risk.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a broad post written by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Among other things, the post states that the bill will undermine consumer protections, segment insurance markets, and impose new burdens on individuals to navigate an already complex system.

[From the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, June 20, 2023]

HEALTH BILLS HEADED FOR A VOTE IN THE HOUSE UNDERMINE CONSUMER PROTECTIONS AND MARKET RULES

(By Sarah Lueck)

The House is moving toward a vote on legislation that would weaken Affordable Care Act (ACA) consumer protections and private market rules. Proponents of these changes claim they will increase choices and reduce red tape for employers, but a closer look shows the problems they would create. The legislation would:

Expand association health plans (AHPs). The legislation would allow AHPs, a type of health plan that trade associations, professional groups, and other organizations may offer their members, to cover self-employed individuals and small businesses as if they were large employers. This would exempt them from ACA standards that otherwise apply to health plans in the individual and small group markets. Similar to a Trump-era rule a court struck down in 2019, the bill would segment insurance risk pools: some individuals who are younger and healthier, or small businesses whose employees have that profile, could get plans with lower premiums because they would be priced separately from ACA-compliant coverage and would not have to meet ACA standards, such as a requirement to cover a set of essential health benefits. As a result, other individuals and small businesses remaining in ACA-regulated markets would see higher premiums.

Expand Individual Coverage Health Reimbursement Arrangements (ICHRAs). The legislation would codify provisions similar to a Trump-era rule currently in place that allows employers to forgo offering a regular group health insurance plan and instead offer an HRA (a tax-favored, employer-funded account) that workers could use to buy their own individual insurance coverage. Increasing such arrangements could raise ACA marketplace premiums; they are likely to attract sicker-than-average firms that can spend less to fund an ICHRA than they must pay for a group health plan. And firms may find strategies to shift sicker workers to HRAs, even with guardrails in the legislation meant to prevent this.

Plus, these arrangements require employees to do considerable work compared with signing up for an employer plan—they must apply for and select a plan, set up premium payments, and understand what expenses the ICHRA covers. Also, workers offered an ICHRA could be confused about whether the offer renders them ineligible for a marketplace premium tax credit—that is, whether it constitutes an ''affordable'' employer offer that precludes credit eligibility. And while employers must give workers a notice of HRA rules, they needn't personalize them to tell individual workers whether their plan is affordable. These complications for employees could drive down coverage.

Increase self-insured employer plans. Another provision would encourage more small employers with healthier workers to self-insure (meaning that the employer bears the financial risk), rather than offering a fully insured health plan (for which an insurer bears the risk). Specifically, the bill would protect a complex self-insurance arrangement known as level funding from tighter regulation. Similar to AHPs, this scheme allows small firms with healthier workers to provide plans that avoid ACA small-group market premium and benefit standards without being a large employer or taking on the risk of self-insurance. This provision would make level funding an even more common way for smaller firms to avoid having to offer plans that meet ACA market rules—this would raise premiums for small businesses that remain in the fully insured, small-group market if small firms with younger and healthier workers move to self-insure.

House committees recently approved other health bills that raise concerns. The Ways and Means Committee moved to expand health savings accounts (HSAs), which overwhelmingly benefit high income people and exacerbate racial and ethnic inequities in coverage access and wealth accumulation. HSA tax benefits currently are only available when someone has a high-deductible health plan that meets certain federal rules. But the committee approved a bill that would allow high-deductible plans to cover telehealth services pre-deductible, while still qualifying for HSA tax benefits. It is estimated to cost $5 billion from 2025 through 2033.

Another bill, approved by the House Education and Workforce Committee, would let employers offer workers stand-alone telehealth-only plans and exempt the plans from providing ACA consumer protections or meeting other federal laws that otherwise apply to employer coverage. The bill would exempt telehealth plans from, for example, covering mental health care at parity with other care and providing preventive services at no cost to enrollees. The plans could also impose annual and lifetime limits on coverage and sharply limit the types of conditions they would address.

Additional policy changes are needed to make health coverage and care more affordable for many people, despite the ACA's significant benefits for individuals and small businesses. But the legislation heading to the House floor is misguided. It would undermine consumer protections, segment insurance markets, and impose new burdens on individuals to navigate an already complex system.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Chair, I rise today to urge a vote in support of the CHOICE Arrangement Act to enhance the flexibility and affordability of healthcare options for small businesses. Competition is the only way to drive down costs.

□ 1630

Democratic policies like ObamaCare have led to consolidation in the marketplace, skyrocketing premiums, and a broken individual health market that costs taxpayers more than $1 trillion a year while covering only 4.6 percent of the population. Make no mistake, Madam Chair, the Federal Government owns healthcare, and there is no private system to compete with it.

As a small business owner, I was fortunate to be able to offer my employees private health insurance without having to send them to the ACA exchange, and I understand how much employers want to be able to offer their employees quality healthcare coverage at a low cost. I guarantee you, Madam Chair, that the business community will figure out healthcare and how to lower costs.

Unfortunately, many small businesses lack the economies of scale needed to negotiate lower prices with insurance companies. This commonsense package aims to reduce administrative burdens and empower small employers to be able to provide healthcare coverage to their employees by removing barriers and implementing innovative solutions like association health plans.

Small businesses and private employers can band together in association health plans to be in a better bargaining position to reduce healthcare costs for their employees. As an original cosponsor of the Association Health Plans Act, I am pleased it was included in the package we have before us today.

This legislation will also expand association health plans by allowing self-

employed individuals to participate in an ERISA-covered health plan.

I was proud to work with Congressman HERN on the Healthy Future Task Force Affordability Subcommittee last Congress, and the legislation we are debating today is a culmination of our hard work. We were able to produce solutions to provide high quality, affordable, and personalized healthcare for workers and their families, as well as innovative policies so more small businesses can offer healthcare benefits.

I am proud to have worked on the solutions included in the CHOICE Arrangement Act which will give small businesses the freedom to focus on serving their customers and employees.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I regret that my Republican colleagues continue to relitigate the Affordable Care Act. However, what we have seen is not new. It is what we have seen time and time again over the last 13 years. They continue using every tool they can to undermine the ACA and limit access to quality healthcare, weaken consumer protections, and increase average costs.

The provisions of this package do nothing to lower overall healthcare costs for workers and their families. In fact, for most consumers, the result of this legislation is that while some may save a little bit, most consumers will end up paying more.

Madam Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, my colleagues have explained that many things that our colleagues across the aisle have said about these bills are not accurate.

I am not going to say it again, but I think it is important that we say that these bills are going to do good things for the American people. It is going to provide choice and it is going to provide lower costs.

I am certain of two things: one, healthcare costs present a significant burden on small businesses; and, two, inaction is not going to cut it.

This comprehensive small business healthcare package is a proven first step on free market principles and reducing government interference. By empowering small businesses with choice in competition, we can lower healthcare costs and increase access to high-quality care.

I hope the other side of the aisle gives this legislation the serious consideration it deserves. I often hear complaints that Republicans don't have a plan to fix healthcare costs. Here it is.

Let's reduce healthcare costs together and pass this package.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118–9, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 118–115, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 3799

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembly,

TITLE I—ASSOCIATION HEALTH PLANS ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Association Health Plans Act''.

SEC. 102. TREATMENT OF GROUP OR ASSOCIATION OF EMPLOYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(5) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The term'' and inserting ''(A) The term''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), a group or association of employers shall be treated as an 'employer', regardless of whether the employers composing such group or association are in the same industry, trade, or profession, if such group or association—

''(i)(I) has established and maintains an employee welfare benefit plan that is a group health plan (as defined in section 733(a)(1));

''(II) provides coverage under such plan to at least 51 employees after all of the employees employed by all of the employer members of such group or association have been aggregated and counted together as described in subparagraph (D);

''(III) has been actively in existence for at least 2 years prior to establishing and maintaining an employer welfare benefit plan that is a group health plan (as defined in section 733(a)(1));

''(IV) has been formed and maintained in good faith for purposes other than providing medical care (as defined in section 733(a)(2)) through the purchase of insurance or otherwise;

''(V) does not condition membership in the group or association on any health status-related factor (as described in section 702(a)(1)) relating to any individual;

''(VI) makes coverage under such plan available to all employer members of such group or association regardless of any health status-related factor (as described in section 702(a)(1)) relating to such employer members;

''(VII) does not provide coverage under such plan to any individual other than an employee of an employer member of such group or association;

''(VIII) has established a governing board with by-laws or other similar indications of formality to manage and operate such plan in both form and substance, of which at least 75 percent of the board members shall be made up of employer members of such group or association participating in the plan that are duly elected by each participating employer member casting 1 vote during a scheduled election;

''(IX) is not a health insurance issuer (as defined in section 733(b)(2)), and is not owned or controlled by such a health insurance issuer or by a subsidiary or affiliate of such a health insurance issuer, other than to the extent such a health insurance issuer—

''(aa) may participate in the group or association as a member; and

''(bb) may provide services such as assistance with plan development, marketing, and administrative services to such group or association;

''(ii) meets any set of criteria to qualify for such treatment in an advisory opinion issued by the Secretary prior to the date of enactment of the Association Health Plans Act; or

''(iii) meets any other set of criteria to qualify for such treatment that the Secretary by regulation may provide.

''(C)(i) For purposes of subparagraph (B), a self-employed individual shall be treated as—

''(I) an employer who may become a member of a group or association of employers;

''(II) an employee who may participate in an employee welfare benefit plan established and maintained by such group or association; and

''(III) a participant of such plan subject to the eligibility determination and monitoring requirements set forth in clause (iii).

''(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'self-employed individual' means an individual who—

''(I) does not have any common law employees;

''(II) has an ownership right in a trade or business, regardless of whether such trade or business is incorporated or unincorporated;

''(III) earns wages (as defined in section 3121(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) or self-employment income (as defined in section 1402(b) of such Code) from such trade or business; and

''(IV) works at least 10 hours per week or 40 hours per month providing personal services to such trade or business.

''(iii) The board of a group or association of employers shall—

''(I) initially determine whether an individual meets the requirements under clause (ii) to be considered a self-employed individual for the purposes of being treated as an—

''(aa) employer member of such group or association (in accordance with clause (i)(I)); and

''(bb) employee who may participate in the employee welfare benefit plan established and maintained by such group or association (in accordance with clause (i)(II));

''(II) through reasonable monitoring procedures, periodically determine whether the individual continues to meet such requirements; and

''(III) if the board determines that an individual no longer meets such requirements, not make such plan coverage available to such individual (or dependents thereof) for any plan year following the plan year during which the board makes such determination. If, subsequent to a determination that an individual no longer meets such requirements, such individual furnishes evidence of satisfying such requirements, such individual (and dependents thereof) shall be eligible to receive plan coverage.

''(D) For purposes of subparagraph (B), all of the employees (including self-employed individuals) employed by all of the employer members (including self-employed individuals) of a group or association of employers shall be—

''(i) treated as employed by a single employer; and

''(ii) aggregated and counted together for purposes of any regulation of an employee welfare benefit plan established and maintained by such group or association.''.

(b) DETERMINATION OF EMPLOYER OR JOINT EMPLOYER STATUS.—The provision of employee welfare benefit plan coverage by a group or association of employers shall not be construed as evidence for establishing an employer or joint employer relationship under any Federal or State law.

SEC. 103. RULES APPLICABLE TO GROUP HEALTH PLANS ESTABLISHED AND MAINTAINED BY A GROUP OR ASSOCIATION OF EMPLOYERS.

Part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1181, et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 736. RULES APPLICABLE TO GROUP HEALTH PLANS ESTABLISHED AND MAINTAINED BY A GROUP OR ASSOCIATION OF EMPLOYERS.

''(a) PREMIUM RATES FOR A GROUP OR ASSOCIATION OF EMPLOYERS.—

''(1)(A) In the case of a group health plan established and maintained by a group or association of employers described in section 3(5)(B), such plan may—

''(i) establish base premium rates formed on an actuarially sound, modified community rating methodology that considers the pooling of all plan participant claims; and

''(ii) utilize the specific risk profile of each employer member of such group or association to determine contribution rates for each such employer member's share of a premium by actuarially adjusting above or below the established base premium rates.

''(B) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'employer member' means—

''(i) an employer who is a member of such group or association of employers and employs at least 1 common law employee; or

''(ii) a group made up solely of self-employed individuals, within which all of the self-employed individual members of such group or association are aggregated together as a single employer member group, provided the group includes at least 20 self-employed individual members.

''(2) In the event a group or association is made up solely of self-employed individuals (and no employers with at least 1 common law employee are members of such group or association), the group health plan established by such group or association shall—

''(A) treat all self-employed individuals who are members of such group or association as a single risk pool;

''(B) pool all plan participant claims; and

''(C) charge each plan participant the same premium rate.

''(b) DISCRIMINATION AND PRE-EXISTING CONDITION PROTECTIONS.—A group health plan established and maintained by a group or association of employers described in section 3(5)(B) shall be prohibited from—

''(1) establishing any rule for eligibility (including continued eligibility) of any individual (including an employee of an employer member or a self-employed individual, or a dependent of such employee or self-employed individual) to enroll for benefits under the terms of the plan that discriminates based on any health status-related factor that relates to such individual (consistent with the rules under section 702(a)(1));

''(2) requiring an individual (including an employee of an employer member or a self-employed individual, or a dependent of such employee or self-employed individual), as a condition of enrollment or continued enrollment under the plan, to pay a premium or contribution that is greater than the premium or contribution for a similarly situated individual enrolled in the plan based on any health status-related factor that relates to such individual (consistent with the rules under section 702(b)(1)); and

''(3) denying coverage under such plan on the basis of a pre-existing condition (consistent with the rules under section 2704 of the Public Health Service Act).''.

SEC. 104. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt a group health plan which is an employee welfare benefit plan offered through a group or association of employers from the requirements of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1181 et. seq.), including the provisions of part A of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act as incorporated by reference into this Act through section 715.

TITLE II—CHOICE ARRANGEMENT ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Custom Health Option and Individual Care Expense Arrangement Act'' or the ''CHOICE Arrangement Act''.

SEC. 202. TREATMENT OF HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS INTEGRATED WITH INDIVIDUAL MARKET COVERAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9815(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)'' and inserting the following: ''EXCEPTIONS.—

''(1) SELF-INSURED GROUP HEALTH PLANS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) CUSTOM HEALTH OPTION AND INDIVIDUAL CARE EXPENSE ARRANGEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subchapter, a custom health option and individual care expense arrangement shall be treated as meeting the requirements of sections 2711 and 2713 of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act.

''(B) CUSTOM HEALTH OPTION AND INDIVIDUAL CARE EXPENSE ARRANGEMENTS DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'custom health option and individual care expense arrangement' means a health reimbursement arrangement—

''(i) which is an employer-provided group health plan funded solely by employer contributions to provide payments or reimbursements for medical care subject to a maximum fixed dollar amount for a period,

''(ii) under which such payments or reimbursements may only be made for medical care provided during periods during which the individual is covered—

''(I) under individual health insurance coverage (other than coverage that consists solely of excepted benefits), or

''(II) under part A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act or part C of such title,

''(iii) which meets the nondiscrimination requirements of subparagraph (C),

''(iv) which meets the substantiation requirements of subparagraph (D), and

''(v) which meets the notice requirements of subparagraph (E).

''(C) NONDISCRIMINATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An arrangement meets the requirements of this subparagraph if an employer offering such arrangement to an employee within a specified class of employee—

''(I) offers such arrangement to all employees within such specified class on the same terms, and

''(II) does not offer any other group health plan to any employees within such specified class.

''(ii) SPECIFIED CLASS OF EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this subparagraph, any of the following may be designated as a specified class of employee:

''(I) Full-time employees.

''(II) Part-time employees.

''(III) Salaried employees.

''(IV) Non-salaried employees.

''(V) Employees whose primary site of employment is in the same rating area.

''(VI) Employees who are included in a unit of employees covered under a collective bargaining agreement to which the employer is subject (determined under rules similar to the rules of section 105(h)).

''(VII) Employees who have not met a group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage, waiting period requirement that satisfies the of section 2708 of the Public Health Service Act.

''(VIII) Seasonal employees.

''(IX) Employees who are nonresident aliens and who receive no earned income (within the meaning of section 911(d)(2)) from the employer which constitutes income from sources within the United States (within the meaning of section 861(a)(3)).

''(X) Such other classes of employees as the Secretary may designate.

An employer may designate (in such manner as is prescribed by the Secretary) two or more of the classes described in the preceding subclauses as the specified class of employees to which the arrangement is offered for purposes of applying this subparagraph.

''(iii) SPECIAL RULE FOR NEW HIRES.—An employer may designate prospectively so much of a specified class of employees as are hired after a date set by the employer. Such subclass of employees shall be treated as the specified class for purposes of applying clause (i).

''(iv) RULES FOR DETERMINING TYPE OF EMPLOYEE.—For purposes for clause (ii), any determination of full-time, part-time, or seasonal employment status shall be made under rules similar to the rules of section 105(h) or 4980H, whichever the employer elects for the plan year. Such election shall apply with respect to all employees of the employer for the plan year.

''(v) PERMITTED VARIATION.—For purposes of clause (i)(I), an arrangement shall not fail to be treated as provided on the same terms within a specified class merely because the maximum dollar amount of payments and reimbursements which may be made under the terms of the arrangement for the year with respect to each employee within such class—

''(I) increases as additional dependents of the employee are covered under the arrangement, and

''(II) increases with respect to a participant as the age of the participant increases, but not in excess of an amount equal to 300 percent the lowest maximum dollar amount with respect to such a participant determined without regard to age.

''(D) SUBSTANTIATION REQUIREMENTS.—An arrangement meets the requirements of this subparagraph if the arrangement has reasonable procedures to substantiate—

''(i) that the participant is, or will be, enrolled in coverage described in subparagraph (B)(ii) as of the beginning of the plan year of the arrangement (or as of the beginning of coverage under the arrangement in the case of an employee who first becomes eligible to participate in the arrangement after the date notice is given with respect to the plan under subparagraph (E) (determined without regard to clause (iii) thereof), and

''(ii) any requests made for payment or reimbursement of medical care under the arrangement and that the participant remains so enrolled.

''(E) NOTICE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), an arrangement meets the requirements of this subparagraph if, under the arrangement, each employee eligible to participate is, not later than 90 days before the beginning of the plan year, given written notice of the employee's rights and obligations under the arrangement which—

''(I) is sufficiently accurate and comprehensive to appraise the employee of such rights and obligations, and

''(II) is written in a manner calculated to be understood by the average employee eligible to participate.

''(ii) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—Such notice shall include such information as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe.

''(iii) NOTICE DEADLINE FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES.—In the case of an employee—

''(I) who first becomes eligible to participate in the arrangement after the date notice is given

with respect to the plan under clause (i) (determined without regard to this clause), or

''(II) whose employer is first established fewer than 120 days before the beginning of the first plan year of the arrangement,

the requirements of this subparagraph shall be treated as met if the notice required under clause (i) is provided not later than the date the arrangement may take effect with respect to such employee.''.

(b) NO INFERENCE.—To the extent not inconsistent with the amendments made by this section—

(1) no inference shall be made from such amendments with respect to the rules prescribed in the Federal Register on June 20, 2019, (84 Fed. Reg. 28888) relating to health reimbursement arrangements and other account-based group health plans, and

(2) any reference to custom health option and individual care expense arrangements shall for purposes of such rules be treated as including a reference to individual coverage health reimbursement arrangements.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2023.

TITLE III—SELF-INSURANCE PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Self-Insurance Protection Act''.

SEC. 302. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Small and large employers offer health benefit plan coverage to employees in self-funded arrangements using company assets or a fund, or by paying premiums to purchase fully-insured coverage from a health insurance company.

(2) Employers that self-fund health benefit plans will often purchase stop-loss insurance as a financial risk management tool to protect against excess or unexpected catastrophic health plan claims losses that arise above projected costs paid out of company assets.

(3) Stop-loss coverage insures the employer sponsoring the health benefit plan against unforeseen health plan claims, does not insure the employee health benefit plan itself, and does not pay health care providers for medical services provided to the employees.

(4) Employer-sponsored health benefit plans are regulated under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, however, States regulate the availability and the coverage terms of stop-loss insurance coverage that employers purchase to protect company assets and to protect a fund against excess or unexpected claims losses.

(5) Both large and small employers that choose to self-fund must also be able to protect company assets or a fund against excess or unexpected claims losses and States must reasonably regulate stop-loss insurance to assure its availability to both large and small employers.

SEC. 303. CERTAIN MEDICAL STOP-LOSS INSURANCE OBTAINED BY CERTAIN PLAN SPONSORS OF GROUP HEALTH PLANS NOT INCLUDED UNDER THE DEFINITION OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

Section 733(b)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191b(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following sentence: ''Such term shall not include a stop-loss policy obtained by a self-insured group health plan or a plan sponsor of a group health plan that self-insures the health risks of its plan participants to reimburse the plan or sponsor for losses that the plan or sponsor incurs in providing health or medical benefits to such plan participants in excess of a predetermined level set forth in the stop-loss policy obtained by such plan or sponsor.''.

SEC. 304. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

Section 514(b) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1144(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(10) The provisions of this title (including part 7 relating to group health plans) shall preempt State laws insofar as they may now or hereafter prevent an employee benefit plan that is a group health plan from insuring against the risk of excess or unexpected health plan claims losses.''.

TITLE IV—SMALL BUSINESS FLEXIBILITY ACT

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Small Business Flexibility Act''.

SEC. 402. NOTIFICATION OF FLEXIBLE HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 9835. NOTIFICATION OF FLEXIBLE HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall notify employers of the availability of tax-advantaged flexible health insurance benefits, with an initial focus on small businesses.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) EMPLOYER.—The term 'employer' has the meaning given such term in section 3(5) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (29 U.S.C. 1002(5)).

''(2) FLEXIBLE HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS.—The term 'flexible health insurance benefits' means—

''(A) an individual contribution health reimbursement arrangement (as described in the rule entitled 'Health Reimbursement Arrangements and Other Account-Based Group Health Plans' (84 Fed. Reg. 28888 (June 20, 2019));

''(B) a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2)); and

''(C) the small employer health insurance credit determined under section 45R.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter C of chapter 100 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 9835. Notification of flexible health insurance benefits.''.

TITLE V—RESCISSIONS

SEC. 501. PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

Section 4002(b)(7) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11(b)(7)) is amended by striking ''for each of fiscal years 2024 and 2025, $1,300,000,000'' and inserting ''for fiscal year 2024, $1,055,000,000, and for fiscal year 2025, $1,300,000,000''.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part D of House Report 118–115. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. HAYES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part D of House Report 118–115.

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, after line 13, insert:

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 501. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect unless the Secretary of Labor certifies that the amendments made by this Act would not result in higher premium rates for older workers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to the CHOICE Arrangement Act.

This bill, as written, makes healthcare less accessible and affordable for our most at-risk workers. My amendment prevents older workers from obscene healthcare premiums and discrimination.

As of January 2023, a record 16.3 million people, including older Americans, were insured under the Affordable Care Act.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, under the Affordable Care Act, older adults' uninsured rate has dropped by one-third, a factor that is a key indicator their health and wellness has improved. Further, they are now protected from coverage exclusions and cost increases due to preexisting conditions.

In 2019, people aged 55 to 64 had the lowest uninsured rate among nonelderly adults, but instead of working to build upon this success, my colleagues are bolstering individual coverage health reimbursement arrangements and association health plans which have a long, well-documented history of cutting costs for themselves by cherry-picking the cheapest people to cover, leaving the more expensive and vulnerable ones behind. This raises costs for those not chosen and causes premiums to go up for the rest of the insurance market.

Republicans have been pushing these efforts for decades, and experts have consistently found it to be harmful. In its final rule adopted in 2018 by the Trump administration, the Department of Labor acknowledged as much, noting the ''AHPs could use their regulatory flexibility to design more tailored, less comprehensive health coverage . . . Which will necessarily lead to some favorable risk selection toward AHPs and adverse selection against individuals and small group markets.''

They predicted this would raise premiums for consumers who are left behind in the small group and individual markets.

For decades, independent experts at the American Academy of Actuaries and the Congressional Budget Office have repeatedly found premiums for older workers would be higher as a result of the association health plan legislation.

The bill has only superficial protections from discrimination based on

health status and is entirely silent on discrimination and pricing against older individuals. In fact, by explicitly allowing associations to base premiums on the risk factor on each employee within the group, it invites them to discriminate against other characteristics.

My amendment requires the Department of Labor to certify that the bill would not raise premiums for older Americans before taking effect.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment to protect older Americans and implore that we work together to address the real healthcare problems in our Nation and move toward a more equitable healthcare system for older workers.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Madam Chair, I am pleased my Democratic colleagues are finally expressing some concern for rising healthcare costs, particularly the burden those costs can impose on our Nation's seniors.

I remind my Democrat colleagues that Medicare is expected to become insolvent in 8 years. Increasing access to AHPs may be a lifesaving option for these seniors if Congress does not address Medicare's insolvency issues.

Unfortunately, for seniors, premiums of older Americans have risen drastically thanks to ObamaCare. In fact, health plans in New York just requested rate bumps of up to 40 percent.

The percentage of healthcare costs paid by a health insurance plan is known as the actuarial value, AV. On average, the AV of an individual employer-sponsored plan is 83 percent. When compared to the 70 percent AV of a silver plan and even the 80 percent AV of a gold plan on the Affordable Care Act exchanges, employer-sponsored plans provide affordable and more comprehensive coverage than ACA plans.

Employer-sponsored plans also have lower average deductibles: $1,763 for an individual employer-sponsored insurance plan compared with $5,155 for an individual ACA exchange silver plan.

I will repeat that: $1,763 on an employer-sponsored plan, for an individual employer-sponsored insurance plan, compared with $5,155 for an individual ACA exchange silver plan.

Individual employer-sponsored plans have lower average out-of-pocket costs than ACA exchange plans.

Madam Chair, $4,355 is the average maximum for an individual-sponsored insurance plan compared with an average maximum of $8,519 for an individual marketplace silver/ACA plan.

Clearly, our government-run and government-subsidized healthcare programs are facing incredible fiscal challenges. I urge my colleagues to be more concerned with the older adults enrolled in those programs than those enrolled in large group employer plans.

This amendment is an insincere attempt to delay implementation of commonsense policy that will increase health coverage options for all Americans. Instead, AHPs and the coverage options provided under this bill give older Americans more affordable coverage options.

Madam Chair, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment and ''yes'' on the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. Association health plans have a long, well-documented history of cutting costs for themselves by cherry-picking the cheapest people to cover and leaving the more expensive behind. This raises costs for everybody else and causes premiums to go up in the rest of the market. Republicans have been pushing this idea for decades, and experts have consistently found it to be harmful.

The Affordable Care Act made a number of reforms to commercial insurance markets, including a requirement that plans in the individual and small group markets cover essential health benefits such as maternity care and prescription drugs. The ACA also prevented these plans from charging higher rates based on health status and limited the premium amount that older people could be charged compared to younger people. This was a vital protection that ensured that an age tax would not make coverage unaffordable for older individuals.

□ 1645

This legislation has no protection without this amendment. The bill is entirely silent on discriminatory pricing against older people. In fact, by explicitly allowing associations to base premiums on risk factors of each employer within the group, it actually invites them to charge older Americans much more.

This amendment would ensure that older workers are protected by providing in this bill that it would not take effect until the Secretary of Labor certifies that it would not have the impact of raising premiums for older workers.

I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for her leadership on the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I believe I have the right to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to protect older Americans with preexisting conditions.

The ACA expanded Medicaid for low-income Americans and protected coverage for people with preexisting conditions. We want to make sure we continue that tradition and make sure that the CHOICE Arrangement Act will not go into effect until the Secretary of Labor certifies that this bill will not result in higher premiums for older Americans and seniors. It is critical that we protect this access.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, again, our colleagues continue to try to mislead the American people about what this bill does. These plans cannot cherry-pick, cannot exclude, and must cover preexisting conditions.

The opposition to this bill from our colleagues across the aisle, unfortunately, is to freedom of choice. The title of this bill is the CHOICE Arrangement Act, freedom of choice, which would allow people to stay out of the non-affordable care act, known as ObamaCare, but still have affordable health insurance.

This bill is about choice, freedom, and good healthcare coverage, and we should approve the bill without this amendment.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part D of House Report 118–115.

Mr. MOLINARO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 22, line 17, insert '', particularly in rural areas (as defined in section 1393(a)(2))'' after ''businesses''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MOLINARO. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the opportunity this afternoon to speak on my

amendment to the underlying bill, which, as we know, does help to unlock the growth and prosperity of our Nation's small businesses and their employees.

My amendment is simple and straightforward. It will ensure that small businesses and employers, particularly those in rural communities across the country, are made aware of tax-advantaged flexible health insurance benefits. Employers, especially in the rural areas like the ones I represent in upstate New York, should have the tools to provide their employees with various options to lower their healthcare costs and to access quality care.

As a member of the House Committee on Small Business, I know the unique challenges businesses in rural communities and those businessowners and employees face every day. With a comprehensive focus on rural areas, we can help ensure that all businesses, regardless of their ZIP Code, have equal opportunity to provide affordable, high-quality healthcare benefits.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this amendment. I urge its consideration, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment has a rather nominal effect in not improving what is a very bad and deceptive bill.

It is appealing to talk about rural areas. I am concerned about those rural areas, about the chicken pluckers, about the meatpackers, about the field workers, and the way they will be discriminated against under this bill.

I will elaborate on that. While this is mainly a Republican caucus that follows the seditious pied piper who was our President, in this case, even under the Trump administration, when they considered this kind of proposal, the Treasury Department, the Labor Department, and the Health and Human Services Department came together and recognized the danger of discriminating against different classes of employees.

Ultimately, unfortunately, the Trump administration did not provide the protection against discrimination, so that people who are working in rural areas under this bill may be discriminated against by their employer as a result of this legislation.

It is the failure to have clear language in this bill to prevent such discrimination against rural workers, in favor of those who are in the office towers managing everything, that is at the heart of our opposition, as well as the refusal to provide protection and guarantees against people being denied as a result of their preexisting conditions.

Rural Americans are more likely to die from heart disease, cancer, stroke, unintentional injury, and respiratory disease. Yet, we would take our sickest workers, our most vulnerable low-income workers, and deny them a comprehensive employer plan with many protections and allow them to be the subject of discrimination.

There has already been too much discrimination against rural areas and rural workers. We ought to prevent it, not make it worse.

There are no guarantees that these people can find any coverage with their ICHRA plan, let alone affordable and quality coverage.

I think rural Americans deserve far better than this amendment to try to put a patch on a very sorry bill that undermines the protections of the Affordable Care Act that has offered great benefit to so many Americans, and I urge everyone to vote ''no.''

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLINARO. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I appreciate Mr. MOLINARO's amendment. I support it, and I appreciate his working to make a good bill better.

Mr. MOLINARO. Madam Chair, this amendment, as a reminder to my colleagues across the aisle, is simply meant to broaden access and educate small business owners all across this country as to the benefits that are available to them to access affordable, quality healthcare.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I would say that the only education that would be really helpful on this bill would be to educate both employers and employees about all the shortcomings of this bill.

Educating employers that they ought not to be discriminating against classes of workers and treating the rural, hardworking employees there at lower wages differently where they get an ICHRA policy that denies them preexisting conditions, that denies them the essential benefits under the Affordable Care Act, while the folks in the city in management get treated differently—they get a concierge kind of treatment that is not available to the rural workers. Just educating about this bill, which allows that discrimination, would not accomplish much of anything.

I think what we are going to see with this kind of legislation is more and more workers in rural areas, as well as urban areas, who face discrimination and who face great medical debt because these plans are so weak. They are junk insurance that will deny the benefits that most people need.

Educating about them, if truthful education, if not the kind of deception that is buried in this bill, educating about them will only tell people the limitations and the shortcomings. Otherwise, it will be a kind of education that covers up, as this bill does, the great harm that is being done in denying folks access to a family physician with the protection that is there.

Remember that in moving to these ICHRA plans, we already know that 95 percent of those that are in ICHRA plans today, that have this icky kind of coverage, are people who once had good group health insurance that I would like to see available to more Americans.

Again, I urge my colleagues to definitely vote ''no'' on this amendment and vote ''no'' on this sorry bill and support our motion to recommit.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part D of House Report 118–115.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, after line 13, insert the following:

TITLE V—SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT AMERICANS SHALL HAVE HEALTHCARE FREEDOM

SEC. 501. SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT HEALTHCARE FREEDOM IS THE FUTURE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the future of healthcare lies in healthcare freedom, not in socialized medicine;

(2) Congress should take steps to address the broken healthcare system by restoring free market practices to lower costs;

(3) coverage is not care, and expanding direct access to healthcare should be prioritized over expanding access to coverage; and

(4) patients and doctors, not government bureaucrats or insurance bureaucrats, should make healthcare decisions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I notice that my friend and colleague from Texas talks about the current system discriminating. Well, the current system discriminates against small businesses and people who can't afford the massive cost of insurance or care. That is the truth.

My colleague refers to an icky kind of coverage. The fact of the matter is

that we have a large segment of the American people who are trapped in so-called coverage, but they are not able to get care.

That is why we are here. We are trying to increase options for the American people.

My only concern about what we are doing with this legislation, which I wholeheartedly support, and trying to encourage small businesses and give them options to be able to provide better options for their employees, is I don't believe that, in America, you should only be able to get insurance through government or your employer.

We should be freeing up the system. We should be embracing healthcare freedom. We should be creating an environment where the American people control their healthcare rather than employers and government. That is the truth.

I offered an amendment to simply spell that out in the form of a sense of Congress, a sense of Congress that the future of healthcare lies in healthcare freedom, not in socialized medicine; that Congress should take steps to address the broken healthcare system by restoring free market practices to lower costs; that coverage is not care and expanding direct access to healthcare should be prioritized over expanding access to coverage; and that patients and doctors, not government bureaucrats or insurance bureaucrats, should make healthcare decisions.

Why do I think that? Well, the deals that are struck with the government by big corporations are the problem. For example, most recently, ObamaCare guaranteed their actual growth and profit. For example, Anthem had a 344 percent increase in government revenue from 2010 to 2020. UnitedHealthcare had a 198 percent increase. Cigna, Anthem, UnitedHealthcare, and Humana have seen an average increase of 562 percent in their stock prices from January 2011 to January 2021.

Here is the kicker. In 2018, for at least three of these companies, the majority of their revenue came from the government: UnitedHealthcare, 53.4 percent; Anthem, 58.7 percent; and Humana, a whopping 86.9 percent.

It is that corporate cronyism that is reducing options. They are making it more difficult for the American people.

The fact is, for Americans who are trapped in coverage through ObamaCare—for example, when I came to Congress as a Member of Congress, I was put on ObamaCare, not some gold-plated plan that flies around on the internet that we supposedly have, but on ObamaCare. The place I went to cure the cancer that I had a decade ago, MD Anderson, I wouldn't be allowed to use. What kind of coverage is that?

That is what we are telling the American people. That is the best we can do in the freest, greatest country in the history of the world. Bow down to the altar of government and corporate America to be able to figure out how you should get care.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The ACTING Chair. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I don't believe that we have noted yet in the course of this debate the great irony, the fact that this is called the CHOICE Arrangement Act, that we have some pro-choice Republicans here who want to give employers the choice and allow them to discriminate against different classes of their own employees. All of this is happening the same horrible anniversary week of the Supreme Court's wrongful decision to overturn decades of reliance upon Roe v. Wade and to eliminate the right to an abortion with an effect on women's healthcare that is so far-reaching that it is affecting our colleges of medicine across the country and delivery of healthcare to women who may never have been involved in the slightest way with an abortion.

□ 1700

They called this healthcare freedom today. I call it the repression and the interference with the basic healthcare rights of women.

By the terms of their own amendment, patients and doctors should make healthcare decisions, not government bureaucrats or insurance companies. The CHOICE Arrangement Act comes at the same time that they interfere with what happens in our bedrooms and our doctors' offices and, most recently, even in our kitchens.

They would sentence patients under this basic legislation with preexisting conditions to a future of very few choices and no freedom. With no choices for adequate and affordable healthcare, this legislation guarantees one kind of prescription and one kind of prescription only, and that is a prescription for personal bankruptcy and unlimited medical debt from policies that do not provide essential healthcare benefits.

It is really a shame that, in a country as wealthy as ours, we still have millions of citizens who go without health coverage. Over 30 million Americans, in fact, lack coverage, and many in our home State of Texas lack coverage because of the fact that our State legislature and Governor were never willing to provide the guarantee we anticipated with the Affordable Care Act of Medicaid expansion as most States have done.

Patients do not have a choice, do not have freedom when they suffer a heart attack or are diagnosed with a dreaded disease or a broken arm, and they lack insurance coverage that provides them the benefits that they need.

Under this amendment, which is a sense of Congress resolution that really doesn't accomplish much of anything, this bill is not improved. Americans would have so much skin in the game they would get burned just as the Republican dirty fossil fuel plan would burn up our planet.

It is not just the Affordable Care Act that is being targeted today. There is reference to socialized medicine of the kind that Newt Gingrich once attacked in this body when he suggested Medicare should ''wither on the vine.''

Contrary to Republican attacks, we have heard about public insurance programs. Seniors on Medicare value their Medicare as do the 16 million people who signed up for the Affordable Care Act this year.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, do you know who should decide what an essential health benefit is? The consumer, the American, not a government bureaucrat or a corporate bureaucrat. I will stand up for the 5,000 babies that have been born in Texas greater than last year's number of babies in the wake of the Dobbs decision.

Let me just say this. According to the CBO, Federal subsidies for health insurance coverage for Americans under the age of 65 will hit $1 trillion this year. The average American family spends more than $22,000 a year on premiums for themselves through their employees. Again, coverage is not care.

There are other healthcare models that work. The Wall Street Journal showed what cutting out the middleman in healthcare can do for costs: $150 a month to cover a family of five on a direct primary care model.

A DPC practice in my district charges only $50 to $80 for an X-ray compared to the national average of $125. MRIs are $300 to $450 compared to the national average of $1,325.

It is not just primary care. For example, at the Surgery Center of Oklahoma, a direct care model, a knee replacement costs $18,000 compared to the average cost of $50,000 in the United States.

Healthcare sharing ministries are driving down costs for the American people, giving them coverage and giving them options.

The fact is we should imagine an America where, through a health savings account, your employer can give you real dollars, rather than a faceless insurance company, to pursue real care of your choice, so for a flat monthly fee, you and your children have unlimited access to the physician of your choice. You could still get insurance for the big stuff, walking into a doctor's office and knowing how much things are going to cost.

Right now, the American people do not have options. I support this bill, but this amendment is important because we need a trajectory change in this country in favor of healthcare freedom, in favor of personalized care, in favor of patients and doctors over bureaucrats and corporations that are getting rich because the government is subsidizing their corporate cronyism.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, this is the freedom resolution on the week that we have the anniversary of the anti-choice Dobbs decision as part of the CHOICE Arrangement Act.

Well, I am reminded of the lyrics of a famous Janis Joplin song: ''Freedom is just another word for nothing left to lose.'' No choice is left. No freedom is left. This is our future under Republican plans—so much to lose, nothing left tomorrow.

We need to protect more Americans from the dangers of health debt and bankruptcy. We need to ensure broader coverage. There is a huge coverage gap that is leaving perhaps as many as 2 million Texans without coverage because of the failures and ideological objections of our State Republican government.

Those Americans deserve the same protection that 16 million Americans got when they signed up for the Affordable Care Act this year. They have access to a family physician that is so very important. They have access to the essential benefits of the Affordable Care Act, getting access to the kind of care that they need to ensure their family is secure.

I believe that there are many improvements that are necessary in the Affordable Care Act. We were limited in being able to make those improvements when all we had for more than a decade were 60-plus Republican attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Let us reject this bill and this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SELF) having assumed the chair, Mrs. WAGNER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3799) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for health reimbursement arrangements integrated with individual health insurance coverage, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO ''WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS OF FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 7, 2023, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the 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 Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of June 7, 2023, at page H2775.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the veto message of H.J. Res. 45.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding President Biden's veto of H.J. Res. 45, a Congressional Review Act resolution nullifying the Biden administration's attempt to circumvent the will of the Congress and the role of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, President Biden's radical plan to cancel up to $20,000 in student debt via executive fiat is utter hogwash. The American people are not fooled by the deceptive, doctored-up talking points on student loans that the left has attempted to force-feed them over the past 2 years.

Appealing words like ''forgiveness'' have been cast around innumerable times as if to imply that a massive student loan bailout is the equivalent of a sweepstakes giveaway.

Here is a reality check for our colleagues across the aisle: There is no such thing as forgiveness.

This entire scheme is nothing more than a transfer of wealth from those who willingly took on debt to those who did not or had the grit to pay off their loans.

Two-thirds of this debt transfer plan would go to the top half of earners. It takes from those in the lower half of earners and gives to the upper half. It redistributes wealth, but from the bottom of our socioeconomic ladder to the top. The 87 percent of Americans who owe no Federal student debt are paying for the 13 percent who do.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle also claim that this transfer of wealth is about fairness. No, it is about sticking hardworking taxpayers with the tab and those who owe it walking away from it scot-free.

Mr. Speaker, if this is not the textbook definition of limousine liberalism, I don't know what it is.

What is more, according to the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, inflation could rise by as much as 27 basis points if mass student debt cancellation is implemented. That means we could see an additional two rate hikes by the Federal Reserve because of this inflationary policy alone.

To halt the biggest transfer of wealth from blue-collar workers to white-collar professionals in our Nation's history and to prevent any further extension of the student loan repayment pause, the House and Senate both passed H.J. Res. 45.

Following the President's predictable veto, this resolution comes before the House again. We must continue to take a stand and defend the interests of hardworking citizens. As the institution that holds the power of the purse, it is our responsibility to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cut through the political noise that the left continues to gin up about so-called student loan forgiveness and vote in favor of overriding the President's veto on H.J. Res. 45.

Fiscal responsibility must be given the due deference it deserves.

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

□ 1715

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 45, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 43 million Americans are eligible for President Biden's student loan relief. That is about 100,000 people, on average, in each of our districts.

Nearly 26 million borrowers in congressional districts all over the country have already applied for relief, including 16 million who had already been approved for relief prior to litigation stopping the process. H.J. Res. 45 seeks to deny these borrowers the relief that they were promised.

To be clear, the people who would be impacted are not the wealthy and well-connected. Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of the relief would go to borrowers earning less than $75,000 a year, and you are not even eligible if you are making more than $125,000. That is in stark contrast to the Trump tax scam where 80 percent of the benefits went to the

top 1 percent and corporations. For the top 1 percent, that is about half a million dollars.

Moreover, my Republican colleagues refuse to acknowledge the serious questions that have been raised about how the resolution would actually be implemented, because under a Congressional Review Act resolution, you don't pick and choose which parts of the rule you are overturning, you have to overturn the whole rule, including the pause in student payments and the deferral of interest.

Now, how do you unpause a payment that you were supposed to make many months ago? What is going to happen to all those interest payments that now have to be added back to those loans?

What happens to the credits that participants in the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program were promised during those months?

Are the firefighters and teachers and police officers and other public servants who may have already had their loans forgiven based on those credits, now back on the hook for additional payments?

The reality is that H.J. Res. 45 would trigger a wave of delinquencies and defaults for most of our vulnerable borrowers. Intentionally or not, this resolution would create chaos for borrowers and their families, as well as loan servicers. The Congressional Research Service has confirmed that this chaos would be triggered by the retroactive application of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, anyone in this country who wants to take advantage of the benefits of a college education should be able to do so, not just the wealthy few. That is the way it used to be.

Just several decades ago, the Pell grant covered 80 percent of the cost of attending a State college. Now it is less than 30 percent, and States are paying a much lower portion of the costs of State colleges than they used to.

This proposal does nothing to help students, so I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, President Biden ignored the will of this Congress and issued a veto message of my resolution, which would have nullified his reckless, unconstitutional, immoral student loan transfer scheme.

As others have said, he is not trying to forgive student loans, he is trying to saddle unsuspecting taxpayers with the burden of paying for others' student loan debt.

Republicans and Democrats should come together, as they have already done on a bipartisan basis, and send a strong message on congressional authority to the executive branch.

Again, President Biden simply does not have the authority to forgive student loans, and thus, spend hundreds of billions of dollars, taxpayer dollars, hard-earned taxpayer dollars, as he transfers debt to those who did not incur it.

The power of the purse belongs to the legislative branch. It belongs to the House of Representatives. I suspect the Supreme Court will confirm that if we don't override this veto.

The President seems to even know this himself. When talking about student loan forgiveness on CNN just about a year ago, he said, ''I don't think I have the authority to do it by signing with a pen.''

Student loan cancellation, again, doesn't make the debt go away. It transfers the costs from the borrowers to the taxpayers, those who never went to college, those who worked hard and paid off their student loans, or those who worked their way through school to avoid student loan debt.

In fact, 60 percent of the constituents in my district do not have a college degree. Yet, the Biden administration wants them to have to pay for the college education of others, even those earning up to $250,000 in a typical family, or a nontypical family, I should say.

So we are going to make plumbers and welders and carpenters pay for the student loan debt for the high-income earners.

There were a handful of Democrats in the House and the Senate who supported my resolution when it was first sent to the President's desk. I urge more of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to act today to stop the unilateral actions of President Biden that are worsening the higher education financial crisis, unfairly transferring debt to those who didn't borrow it, and usurping the constitutional congressional authority of this House.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from approximately 200 different organizations in opposition to this resolution.

MAY 8, 2023.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

LEADER SCHUMER, MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, SPEAKER MCCARTHY, AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: The undersigned 261 organizations representing millions of students, workers, people of color, veterans, people with disabilities, consumers, and people of faith write in strong opposition to bicameral efforts to use the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to overturn President Biden's actions to pause student loan payments and provide student debt relief for low-income and working-class Americans continuing to recover from the deadly COVID–19 pandemic and its devastating economic fallout.

In March, policymakers in the House and Senate unveiled a CRA resolution to retroactively overturn the pause of federal student loan payments and interest accrual, and President Biden's debt relief plan. If successful, these CRA efforts would immediately force tens of millions of borrowers into abrupt and unplanned repayment with devastating effects, including adding thousands of dollars of payments and interest onto their loan balances. It will also force the Department of Education to unwind loans forgiven under Public Service Loan Forgiveness for first responders, nurses, educators, servicemembers, and hundreds of thousands of other public service workers across the country. These actions are a clear attack on millions of the most vulnerable workers and families who are still reeling from the devastating impact of COVID–19.

The President's student debt relief program and extension of the pause on student loan payments are both plainly legal and desperately needed by the more than 43 million borrowers drowning in nearly $1.76 trillion in student loan debt. While they await the Supreme Court's decision regarding the fate of debt relief, tens of millions of borrowers and their families are relying on the federal student loan payment pause as they continue to face the economic aftershocks of the pandemic, including high inflation. Data show that the payment pause has been of greatest help to student loan borrowers who were in financial distress even before the pandemic and has successfully provided relief for those borrowers more than other COVID–19 assistance programs. The payment pause is broadly supported among individuals with and without student loan debt and has been recognized as necessary by the Trump and Biden Administrations alike. Further, the U.S. Secretary of Education's use of the HEROES Act of 2003 to pause student loan repayment falls within a long line of waiver and modification authority exercised by prior administrations without the invocation of the CRA, including by his immediate predecessor for precisely the same purpose.

Overturning the payment pause and forcing borrowers into immediate repayment would have a devastating effect on borrowers in every community. U.S. Department of Education (ED) analysis demonstrates that a resumption of loan payments without cancellation will spike delinquency and default rates for the most financially vulnerable. Further, more than 26 million Americans applied for student debt cancellation in the few weeks before it was shut down by partisan attacks in the federal courts. This extraordinary engagement with President Biden's cancellation plan is further evidence of both the crushing burden this debt places on workers and families from all walks of life and the promise of hope debt cancellation offers for millions seeking an economic fresh start.

Recent polling illustrates that cancellation enjoys broad popular support, underscoring the massive impact of student debt across families, communities, and entire generations of Americans, and the reasons for the program's popularity are clear. Cancellation will also benefit many Americans who have suffered the most throughout the pandemic—with 90 percent of relief dollars going to borrowers earning below $75,000 a year. These are student loan borrowers who are low- and middle-income, borrowers with disabilities, public servants who face high educational costs and low wages, women and Black and Latino/a borrowers who come from low-wealth families unable to foot the bill for higher education upfront, and many more. Cancellation will help prevent a wave

of defaults and delinquencies when repayment resumes and ensure that these borrowers will be able to afford basics like food, housing, and other necessities that pandemic-related financial hardship would otherwise put out of reach.

The American people, the law, and the economic instability of the present moment all emphasize the necessity of debt cancellation and the continuation of the payment pause until cancellation is realized. Policymakers now seeking to reverse such critical relief through the CRA are ignoring the economic needs of their own constituents and threatening our nation's financial security. Congress should be acting to improve the circumstances of the American people, not attempting to thwart the President's efforts to ease the financial pressure that so many are feeling.

For these reasons, we strongly oppose the efforts to overturn this relief through the Congressional Review Act (H.J. Res. 45/S.J. Res. 22) and we urge you to consider the harmful impact they would have on the millions of American people and families who are in need of student loan debt relief.

Signed,

1000 Women Strong, AACTE (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education), Accountable.US, Adasina Social Capital, Affordable Homeownership Foundation Inc., AFGE, AFL–CIO, AFT Michigan, AFT, AFL–CIO, AFT–Wisconsin, AFT, AFL–CIO, AKPIRG, Alabama State Association of Cooperatives, Alliance for Justice, Amazon Labor Union, American Association of University Professors, American Association of University Women, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), American Psychological Association, Americans for Financial Reform, Appleseed Foundation, Arkansas Community Organizations, Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (AFL–CIO), Associate Students of the University of California, Berkeley, Associated Students of the University of Nevada, Association of Flight Attendants–CWA.

Association of Latino Administrators and Superintendents (ALAS), ASUCM External office, Autistic Women & Nonbinary Network, Bend the Arc: Jewish Action, Blue Future, BPUF.org, CAARMA, Cabrini Green Legal Aid, California Association of Nonprofits (CalNonprofits), Campaign for College Opportunity, CASH Campaign of Maryland, CEA.org, Center for American Progress, Center for Economic Integrity, Center for LGBTQ Economic Advancement & Research (CLEAR), Center for Responsible Lending, CFPB Union NTEU 335, Chicago Foundation for Women, Church Women United in New York State, Citizen Action of Wisconsin, Clearinghouse on Women's Issues, Color Of Change, Colorado AFL–CIO, Colorado Fiscal Institute, Columbia Consumer Education Council Inc.

Communication Workers of America (CWA), Communications Workers of America District 7, Community Legal Aid Society, Inc. (Delaware), Community Service Society of New York, Consumer Action, Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Federation of California, Consumer Reports, Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, Council of Graduate Schools, Council on Social Work Education, Debt Collective, Delaware Community Reinvestment Action Council, Dream Defenders, Economic Action Maryland, EMPath: Economic Mobility Pathways, Empower our Future, End Citizens United/Let America Vote Action Fund, Equal Justice Works, External Vice President Office of the Associated Students of the University of California, Irvine, Faith Action for All, Faith in Action, Fayetteville Police Accountability Community Taskforce, Feminist Campus, Feminist Majority Foundation.

Formerly Incarcerated College Graduates Network, Forward Montana, Fosterus, Freedom BLOC, Fresno Building Healthy Communities, Friendship of Women, Inc., Hawaii State Teachers Association, HEAL Food Alliance, Hildreth Institute, Hispanic Federation, Housing and Economic Rights Advocates, Indivisible, Instituto de Avance Latino CDC, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), Jacksonville Area Legal Aid, Inc., Justice in Aging, La Raza Centro Legal, San Francisco, Latinos for Education, LCLAA, LeadMN—College Students Connecting for Change, League of United Latin American Citizens, Legal Action Chicago, Loan Repayment Assistance Program of Minnesota, Louisiana Budget Project.

Maine Center for Economic Policy, Maryland Center for Collegiate Financial Wellness, Maryland Volunteer Lawyers Service, Massachusetts Action for Justice, Massachusetts Affordable Housing Alliance, Miami Valley Fair Housing Center, Inc., Michigan Poverty Law Program, Minority Veterans of America, Montana Fair Housing, Mountain State Justice, MoveOn, NAACP, National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners, National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), National Association of Social Workers.

National Association of Social Workers DC Metro Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Alabama Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Alaska Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Arizona Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Arkansas Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Colorado Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Connecticut Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Delaware Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Florida Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Georgia Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Guam Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Hawaii Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Idaho Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Illinois Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Indiana Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Iowa Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Kansas Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Kentucky Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Louisiana Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Maine Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Maryland Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Massachusetts Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Michigan Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Minnesota Chapter.

National Association of Social Workers, Mississippi Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Missouri Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Montana Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Nebraska Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Nevada Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, New Hampshire Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, New Jersey Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, New Mexico Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, New York City Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, New York State Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, North Carolina Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, North Dakota Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Ohio Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Oklahoma Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Oregon Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Pennsylvania Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Puerto Rico Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Rhode Island Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, South Carolina Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, South Dakota Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Tennessee Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Texas Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Utah Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Vermont Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Virgin Islands Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Virginia Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Washington Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, West Virginia Chaptes National Association of Social Workers, Wisconsin Chapter; National Association of Social Workers, Wyoming Chapter.

National Association of Student Loan Lawyers, National Black Justice Coalition, National Center for Law and Economic Justice, National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low-income clients), National Consumers League, National Education Association (NEA), National Employment Law Project, National League for Nursing, National Legal Aid & Defender Association, National Nurses United (NNU), National Urban League, National Women's Law Center, National Young Farmers Coalition, New Era Colorado, New Georgia Project Action Fund, New Jersey Appleseed Public Interest Law Center, New Jersey Institute for Social Justice, New York Legal Assistance Group (NYLAG), NextGen California, Nine Star Enterprises, Inc., Nonprofit Professional Employees Union (NPEU), NTEU Independent Staff Union, Office & Professional Employees International Union (OPEIU), Office of the Nevada State Treasurer, Ohio Student Association, Oregon Student Association, Our Revolution, P Street.

Passengers United, People's Action, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, Protect All Children's Environment, Psycharmor, Public Advocacy for Kids (PAK), Public Citizen, Public Counsel, Public Good Law Center, Public Justice Center, Public Law Center, Quiet Creek Herb Farm, Rachel Carson Council, RAISE Texas, Red River Association of Educators, Rise, RootsAction.org, Rural Coalition, Rutgers University Student Assembly, School Social Work Association of America, Secular Student Alliance, SEIU Local 500, Service Employees International Union (SEIU), South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center, Stella's Girls Inc, Student Borrower Protection Center.

Student Debt Crisis, Center Student Loan Fund, Students First Consulting, Students United, Suncoast NORML, Superrnajority, Take on Wall Street, Texas Appleseed, Texas State Teachers Association, The Arizona Students' Association, The Bell Policy Center, The Education Trust, The Hope Center at Temple University, THE ONE LESS FOUNDATION, Towards Justice, UC-AFT, Local 1474, UCSB Associated Students Senate External Affairs Committee, UCSB Lobby Corps.

UFCW, UnidosUS, United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 400, United Way of Southern Cameron County, University of Wisconsin Law School Consumer Law Clinic, University of California Student Association, Vermont-NEA, Virginia Poverty Law Center, Washington Council of Lawyers, Washington Office of the Student Loan Advocate, We the 45 Million, Western Center on Law and Poverty, Wisconsin Education Association Council, Women Employed, Xavier

University of Louisiana Student Government, Young Invincibles, YWCA USA, Zero Debt Massachusetts.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Development.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to MAGA Republicans' attempts to override the President's veto and kill his student debt relief plan for millions of Americans. It is the height of hypocrisy.

Listen to this: We didn't hear a peep from the Republicans when we bailed out the auto industry. They even nicknamed Detroit ''Government Motors''.

We didn't hear a peep when they bailed out the airlines, or the farmers, and not a word when Members of Congress' PPP loans were forgiven.

We bailed out Silicon Valley Bank and Signature Bank just the other day. No one said a mumbling word.

When Republicans controlled both Chambers and the White House in 2017, they gave billionaires $1.7 trillion in tax breaks. Shameful.

But when we decide to bail out the students, the hardworking, want-to-besomebody college graduates who contribute to the economy, all hell breaks loose, and Republicans are outraged.

I know people in their sixties and seventies who still owe student loan debt, and the principal has never changed. But I will keep fighting because every American should have a fair chance to succeed. It is a shame where our country's priorities lie.

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

My colleagues have said that this is overdrawn in terms of the way the CRA was written, the Congressional Review Act was written, and that it does too much. It gets into too many other things other than simply turning back the President's proposal. It deals with the debt and repayment of debt and those kinds of things.

However, this CRA does not in any way tie the hands of Congress. It is up to us to pass the laws.

What it does do is stop unelected bureaucrats from writing laws in the form of rules to implement laws passed by Congress.

We didn't authorize the Department to do many of the things that it is doing. Congress did not do that, but it is doing many things.

The CRA will stop the President's actions and some of these other things that are happening. We have the authority to write legislation, to do whatever we want to. If we want to write legislation to take care of debt and to take care of interest rates, we can do that.

Forgive me, Mr. Speaker, for not crying crocodile tears along with my colleagues on the accessibility to college in this country. College in this country is accessible to anyone who has the capable skills to attend, or taxpayers covering the costs of college for many who can pay for themselves and many who simply take advantage of generous taxpayers by skipping out on their loans.

That is not what the help from taxpayers is supposed to do. It is supposed to help people gain a college education and go out there and be productive citizens, not renege on paying back their loans.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative of the courtesies of the chairwoman and the courtesies of the ranking member because I am a recipient of student loans.

As we proceed, the minimal amount that each person would get, in many instances, will be life-starting and life-igniting.

This is not about deadbeat persons. This is about the excessive overburdening of our students in the 21st century who have been enrolled in schools with excessive fees and tuition.

This was not bureaucrats making decisions. This was an analytic assessment of how heavy a burden it is on working persons with student debt. They were not able to make ends meet. Some were not able to purchase first homes. Some were not able to make payments on other necessities or raise their families.

I am disappointed that we are at this point of trying to undo the President's thoughtful effort at giving Americans, all Americans across this country, an opportunity to continue their economic growth, to use their education in the service of others. Many of these persons are teachers. Many of these persons are from middle-class working families who are simply trying not to be in debt, and to be responsible for the obligation that they had to make in order to be, in instances, the first person that ever went to college in their family.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask my colleagues to allow—in spite of court decisions, and this particular underlying motion—allow these people to begin their life and to contribute, contribute to the economic engine of this Nation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. These student loans were well invested because they are now, many of them, in the workforce.

I want to add another component. Sometimes in life there are hills and valleys. Many of these individuals may have had some difficulty, may have been unemployed for a period of time. If you talk to these young people, or individuals that have had this student debt who are not young people anymore, some crisis in their life prevented them from making these payments. Mr. Speaker, it topples them. It just doesn't give them a moment to breathe. It is not that they are trying to default on the United States of America or be a deadbeat. We will be better off to give them another lifeline so they can contribute to this society.

That is all this effort was. It was not frivolous. It was not selecting people who didn't want to pay. There was an application process, and it is a legitimate way of responding to the outcries of Americans and young people. Let us not approve this disapproval.

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

First, I include in the RECORD letters from the American Federation of Teachers, another letter from multiple unions including the National Education Association, the AFL–CIO and AFSCME, a letter from Minority Vets, a letter from UnidosUS and the National Urban League, a letter from Third Way, a letter from the National Council of Nonprofits, and a letter from 23 various medical organizations, all in opposition to the legislation.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
May 22, 2023.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.7 million members of the American Federation of Teachers, I strongly urge you to reject H.J. Res. 45/S.J. Res. 22, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the Biden administration actions to support student loan borrowers that were announced in August of last year.

This resolution would immediately force tens of millions of borrowers into abrupt and unplanned repayment with devastating effects, including adding thousands of dollars of interest onto their loan balances. Proponents of the resolution want you to believe that it is simply a method to stop President Joe Biden's student debt cancellation of up to $20,000 that would benefit 43 million borrowers, but the implications are more severe. Passage of this resolution would be particularly destructive for teachers, nurses, servicemembers and firefighters eligible for Public Service Loan Forgiveness.

This resolution would force the U.S. Department of Education to unwind loans forgiven under Public Service Loan Forgiveness for nurses, educators, servicemembers and hundreds of thousands of other public service workers across the country. Retroactively repealing months of the payment pause initially authorized by the Trump administration would have far greater implications than thwarting Biden's cancellation plan. It would force teachers, veterans and nurses who finally received Public Service Loan Forgiveness to write a check back to the Department of Education. This resolution would reinstate the debt of more than 150,000 public service workers. On the heels of the pandemic, forcing a nurse to pay back debt that was legally forgiven under a bipartisan law is cruel.

And the harm wouldn't stop there: More than 400,000 borrowers have received PSLF-qualifying payments under the last payment pause of 2022, but this resolution would claw back those benefits, setting back firefighters and educators' eligibility for PSLF for many months.

The COVID–19 pandemic had a devastating impact on American workers, many of whom were already struggling to make ends meet.

Those workers' precarity and risk of delinquency on their debt has severely worsened during the pandemic. Given the long-term economic impacts of the pandemic, which continue to drive workers out of public service, a permanent solution, rather than a temporary deferment, is necessary.

And the law is clear: Student debt cancellation falls squarely within the statutory authority Congress granted the secretaIy in the HEROES Act. Cancellation will help ensure that millions of people are not left in a ''worse position'' as to their loan payments due to the devastating COVID–19 pandemic.

Tens of millions of families are struggling under the yoke of $1.7 trillion in student debt. They eagerly await the breathing room that student debt relief would bring, and those struggling to get by will benefit the most. The extra consideration in debt cancellation for Pell recipients focuses like a laser on people in need. Taking away relief that has already been granted to borrowers—the moratorium on payments and interest—while the legal challenge wends its way through the courts, and retroactively making them pay what they cannot afford, is cruel. These borrowers are teachers, firefighters, nurses and so many other dedicated workers. Their current student debt is a far greater burden than the debt carried by those of us who went to college long ago. This means they have little or no wealth to start a family, buy a car or a house, or make other major life decisions, and it undermines plans they responsibly made based on the situation at the time.

Congress should be building on the Biden administration actions, not undermining those actions. Throwing tens of millions of student loan borrowers into chaos by retroactively adding interest and missed payments to their loan balances, while extending their student debt sentence, would upend lives. That's the wrong decision. Congress must oppose H.J. Res. 45/S.J. Res. 22.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President, American Federation of Teachers.

MAY 19, 2023.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our members, who strengthen, restore, and sustain communities across the nation, we urge you to vote against the Congressional Review Act resolution (H.J. Res. 45/S.J. Res. 22) to overturn President Biden's student-debt relief program.

For decades, our nation has strained under a student debt crisis that holds our economy back and steals the dreams of millions of Americans. This debt burden causes loan defaults and drives up balances, delays marriages and the start of families, and makes saving for the future impossible. Just as significant as the financial fallout is how crushing student loan debt is to the spirit. Nothing is quite as disheartening as looking at a loan balance month after month that never seems to diminish. For those who are closer than ever to a life free from the albatross of student loan debt, the CRA amounts to a direct attack on their hopes and dreams.

Overturning President Biden's debt relief program will lead to a dramatic spike in economic hardship—particularly for the most vulnerable borrowers. It would throw 43 million borrowers across every state and congressional district back into a fundamentally broken and chaotic student loan system when they can least afford it. The CRA is especially concerning because unwinding the payment pause—a pause which previously garnered bipartisan support—could force borrowers to repay tens of billions of dollars in payments and interest. It would even reinstate nearly 157,000 loans forgiven through the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program, because the payment pause provides accrual toward PSLF without borrowers having to pay.

The U.S. Department of Education's analysis indicates that resuming student loan payments without cancellation will lead to an unprecedented increase in delinquency and default for those who are most vulnerable. These include the borrowers that President Biden's plan targets: those who earn less than $75,000 a year. These borrowers make up 90 percent of the would-be beneficiaries of the President's cancellation program.

In the weeks before the debt relief plan was challenged in court, nearly 26 million borrowers applied or were deemed automatically eligible for the chance at debt relief and 16 million had their applications formally approved by the Department of Education. Using the CRA to overturn this life-changing debt relief is a cruel affront to everyone who was anticipating an economic fresh start; this tactic also adds another layer of worry just as borrowers await the U.S. Supreme Court's decision.

CRA efforts to overturn the payment pause and the President's debt relief plan are only the most recent attacks on student loan borrowers. They seem to be a convenient political pawn, in the midst of economic uncertainty and the expiration of other critical benefit expansions for families that were tied to the pandemic. At this difficult time, Congress should be improving families' circumstances, not thwarting the President's efforts to ease their financial pressures.

The millions of workers our unions represent are grateful for the difference that student loan relief has made in their lives. Because their work in education, health care, public safety, the Armed Forces, and every other public and private sector field reaches a broad swath of Americans, our members also know how much it has impacted everyday citizens. It has allowed hard-working people to finally start saving up for their first home or for the inevitable emergency they will face. It has given parents the breathing room for their first home or for the inevitable emergency they will face. It has given parents the breathing room to begin squirreling away a little money each month for retirement, or for their children's college fund. It has enabled retirees who are still repaying student loans to start planning the once-in-a-lifetime trip or family reunion they have dreamed of for years.

We know that most Americans understand the severity of the student debt crisis and how it affects the people they love. Even those without student debt do not want their children, grandchildren, or other loved ones to struggle with it. Please vote against the CRA to invigorate our economy, increase families' financial security, and restore their hope.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH H. SHULER,
President, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.
LEE SAUNDERS,
President, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.
RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President, American Federation of Teachers.
REBECCA S. PRINGLE,
President, National Education Association.
MARY KAY HENRY,
President, Service Employees International Union.
EVERETT B. KELLEY,
President, American Federation of Government Employees.
BONNIE CASTILLO, RN,
Executive Director, National Nurses United.
SHAWN FAIN,
President, United Auto Workers.
MARC PERRONE,
International President, United Food and Commercial Workers International Union.

[From Minorityvets]

MINORITY VETERANS OF AMERICA ESTIMATES THE SCALE OF HARM THAT THE REPUBLICAN CRA WILL IMPOSE ON SERVICE MEMBERS AND VETERANS

H.J. Res. 45, a resolution under the Congressional Review Act (CRA), would reverse the actions of the Department of Education (ED) related to student loan debt. If enacted, it would: (a) block President Biden's debt cancelation plan, (b) retroactively undo the 7th extension of the loan payment pause (Sept. 2022–Dec. 2022), causing millions of borrowers to fall behind on their student loans, and (c) also likely undo the 8th extension of the payment pause (which began in Jan. 2023). Service members and veterans would suffer adversely if the CRA were to pass.

Service members and veterans are disproportionately affected by student debt and related financial crises:

1. Due to ineligibility, structural administrative burdens, and awards inadequate to cover the full cost of education, millions of veterans have student-loan debt despite the GI Bill.

2. With regards to student loan debt, veterans are struggling significantly more than others:

Veterans borrow more, so have more student debt.

The proportion of veterans with student debt has grown while the overall proportion of borrowers in other demographic groups has decreased.

Veterans default at a higher rate than nonveterans: 46 percent, (compared to 29 percent) before the pandemic. According to the ED, default and delinquency rates increase after periods of forbearance, so that rate will likely be higher after the payment pause ends, leaving veterans particularly vulnerable.

3. For-profit institutions (FPIs) have aggressively targeted veterans, such that veterans attend FPIs at a higher rate than nonveterans. Higher costs and lower quality has left many veterans with debt and no degree.

4. Veterans have fared worse as a result of the pandemic (e.g., 11.8 percent unemployment rate at its peak, compared to an historic low of 3.1 percent before the pandemic).

5. Service members are laden by student loan debt too—entering service not just with loan debt but because of it, hoping for cancelation under the Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) program. Using GAO data, in 2017 the Consumer Finance Protection Board estimated that over 200,000 service members collectively owe more than $2.9 billion in student loan debt.

Passage of the student loan CRA would harm service members and veterans:

Under the CRA, progress toward debt cancelation under PSLF, including

cancelation itself that borrowers achieved during the pause, would be reversed. This outcome would be particularly devastating for service members and veterans.

An estimated 46,320 service members would have $4.1 billion of debt that was canceled through PSLF restored.

As many as 320,000 veterans could lose progress toward more than $28 billion in cancelation toward PSLF.

A GAO report found that over 94 percent of service members and Department of Defense employees who pursued PSLF were denied relief. The CRA would magnify that institutional failure.

Nearly 40 percent of veteran borrowers are Pell Grant recipients, almost all of whom would be eligible for $20,000 in cancelation.

Student-debt relief has widespread support among veteran's service organizations:

A broad coalition of veteran's advocacy groups submitted an amicus brief in support of the Administration's debt relief actions.

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE,
May 15, 2023.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the National Urban League and UnidosUS (formerly known as the National Council of La Raza), two historic civil rights organizations fighting for economic security for Black and Latino communities and other historically and systemically oppressed populations, we write to share our opposition to the Congressional Review Act resolutions H.J.Res. 45 and S.J.Res. 22, which would overturn President Biden's actions to pause student loan payments and provide student debt relief for low-income and working-class people in America. As the people in our country continue to recover from the deadly COVID–19 pandemic and its devastating economic fallout, it is vital that relief in the form of student debt cancellation be enacted.

Communities of color were hit hardest by both the COVID–19 virus and its associated economic challenges due to systemic barriers. Compared to their white counterparts, people of color are 1.5 times more likely to get the virus and 2 times more likely to require hospitalization. Economically, Black and Latino workers are overrepresented in front-line jobs that remained in person during shutdowns and that lacked adequate paid time off to recover from illness and care for sick family members. They continue to be overrepresented in the individuals without access to affordable healthcare and childcare. Following the start of the pandemic, 43 percent of Black adults experienced a pay cut due to reduced hours or work demand or were laid off either permanently or temporarily. The most impacted group, 1 in 5 Latinas were unemployed at the peak of shutdowns, not counting those who exited the workforce altogether to become caretakers out of necessity. Additionally, Black and Latino households were also more likely to have food and housing insecurity, face more adverse health issues related to COVID, and secure more debt in conjunction with already accrued student loan debt due to financial burden.

Meanwhile, at every level of educational attainment, Black students are more likely to borrow—and borrow at higher levels—than their white counterparts. Black college graduates owe an average of $52,000 in student loan debt, about $25,000 more debt than White college graduates. Cancellation provides substantial relief to those unable to repay debts because of inequalities in wealth and income that particularly impact Black borrowers. 66 percent of Black borrowers and 37 percent of Latinos owe more than originally borrowed 12 years after starting college, compared to 30 percent white borrowers.

72 percent of Latino students take out loans to attend college, and 67 percent carry educational debt. In a survey of Latino students who began but did not complete college, UnidosUS and the University of North Carolina's School of Law found that those Latino students who grew up in economically vulnerable communities see college debt as a financial burden that can affect their family's financial security and stability. Interviews with students revealed that the student loan debt burden is causing worry and stress, impacting sleep and quality of life.

The CRA Resolution introduced in March would overturn the pause of federal student loan payments and interest accrual, and President Biden's debt relief plan. This action would abruptly force tens of millions of borrowers into repayment and add thousands of dollars of interest onto their loan balances, causing perilous financial consequences. It would also require the Department of Education to unwind loans forgiven under Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) for nurses, educators, servicemembers, and public service workers across the country. This is a direct attack on millions of workers and families who are still reeling from the devastating impacts of COVID–19, and would most brutally harm communities of color, who not only have the highest amounts of student debt, but are also over indexed in careers in public service.

For these reasons, we strongly oppose the efforts to overturn this relief through the Congressional Review Act (H.J.Res. 45/S.J.Res. 22) and we urge you to consider the damage they would have on the millions of people and families in America who need student loan debt relief.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE,
UNIDOSUS.

THIRD WAY STATEMENT ON STUDENT LOAN PAUSE CRA

(By Lanae Erickson)

WASHINGTON, May 22, 2023.—Third Way released the following statement from Lanae Erickson, Senior Vice President for Social Policy, Education & Politics:

''This week, the House will vote on a Congressional Review Act (CRA) measure that would overturn the pause on student loan repayment and interest accrual dating back to October 2022. Regardless of your stance on the Administration's debt cancellation actions, voting in favor of this resolution would be a slap in the face to borrowers—blindsiding them by immediately rolling back eight months of interest benefits they've already received and sticking them with higher balances owed.

''There's plenty Congress can do to fix the system and prepare for a smooth return to repayment. This CRA does the exact opposite, increasing debt and setting borrowers up to fail. Members of the House should do right by borrowers and vote against it.''

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NONPROFITS,
May 12, 2023.

Re Adverse impacts on government and charitable nonprofits employees by using the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to roll back student loan payment pause.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY, AND LEADERS SCHUMER, JEFFRIES, AND MCCONNELL: The National Council of Nonprofits (NCN) writes to alert you to the unintended consequences to the Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) program of using the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to roll back the Department of Education's (Department) action to pause student loan payments and force the Department to immediately reinstate the monthly payment requirements for borrowers. While we take no position on the student debt cancellation program, NCN opposes S.J. Res. 22 and H.J. Res. 45 as currently written because the measures would abruptly and retroactively deprive PSLF participants of the benefits they have earned under the program.

The presumed intended target of the CRA, as introduced, may be President Biden's student debt cancellation plan; however, the effort to disapprove the debt cancellation plan is also coupled with the extended federal student loan payment pause.

Our concerns with the CRA as currently written can be summarized in three points:

1. By disapproving the debt cancellation plan, Congress effectively would be ending the payment pause retroactively to the end of last year as well.

2. Such a retroactive cancellation of the ongoing federal loan payment pause would automatically render all borrowers 90 days or more in arrears and render all borrowers out of compliance concerning payment obligations, including for PSLF purposes.

3. In passing the CRA, Congress would renege on its bipartisan promise since 2007 to public servants working at 501(c){3) charitable nonprofits and in government.

CLARIFYING TERMINOLOGY

Confusion surrounds the current debates about ending federal student loan debt because of the use of similar words with distinct meanings. Permit us to provide some clarity:

Debt cancellation. In August 2022, President Biden announced a one-time debt cancellation plan to cancel up to $10,000 of qualifying federal student loan debt per borrower with an additional $10,000 for Pell Grant recipients. Litigation ensued to block the plan, and a final decision in the case, now in the U.S. Supreme Court, is expected before the end of June. No debt has been cancelled yet under the plan.

Loan forgiveness. In 2007, Congress enacted the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program. PSLF provides an opportunity for borrowers to earn forgiveness after working for 10 years in public service as an employee of a federal, state, or local government or at a 501(c)(3) charitable nonprofit and making 120 qualifying payments on their loans. Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle and in both chambers have shown strong support over the years to continue the program, which was enacted under President Bush and administered under Presidents Obama, Trump, and Biden.

BIPARTISAN PAUSES ON FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PAYMENTS COUNT TOWARDS ELIGIBILITY FOR FORGIVENESS UNDER PSLF.

At the start of the pandemic, President Trump instituted a payment pause on all federal student loan payments to provide financial relief to borrowers. After President Trump renewed the pause several times, President Biden continued the practice. The last payment pause was set to expire on December 31, 2022. Because of the pending litigation, the student loan payment pause has been extended until either the Department is permitted to implement the debt cancellation program, or the litigation is resolved bt if the debt relief program has not been implemented and the litigation has not been resolved by June 30, 2023, then payments will resume 60 days after that.

Since President Trump first instituted the payment pause, borrowers who work in public service have continued to receive credit towards forgiveness for PSLF purposes, provided they remained employed at an eligible employer. President Biden has continued that policy and announced before the last payment pause was set to expire on December 31 that borrowers are receiving credit toward forgiveness under PSLF.

A RETROACTIVE CANCELLATION OF THE PAYMENT PAUSE WOULD IMPOSE SIGNIFICANT HARDSHIP ON NONPROFIT EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS.

Ongoing economic uncertainty and natural disasters plaguing the country exacerbate additional stresses on and demand for services by nonprofit staff. The student loan payment pause has provided critical relief for nonprofit workers who are often paid lower salaries and wages than for-profit businesses due to a variety of factors, including government grants and contracting restraints, the inability to increase prices or charges for services despite increased costs, and diminishing fund raising and private grant opportunities. Competition for qualified workers is acutely felt by nonprofits that cannot adjust salaries and wages as easily or as quickly as the for-profit sector. An estimated four out of five (79 percent) nonprofits identified salary competition as a factor preventing them from filling job openings. Relief from student loan payments and the promise of loan forgiveness for continued public service have served to keep many workers on the job in the face of these other challenges.

THE CRA WOULD ROLL BACK THE PAUSE IN STUDENT LOAN PAYMENTS AND HAVE THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCE OF DISRUPTING THE ACCUMULATION OF CREDITS TOWARDS PSLF FORGIVENESS.

The CRA states that Congress ''disapproves'' the debt cancellation plan. Because the current payment pause is an extension of one that was previously set to expire and is now tied to the ongoing lawsuit regarding the debt cancellation plan, what happens under the CRA affects the ongoing payment pause and, therefore, the accumulation of credits towards PSLF forgiveness. Passage of the CRA would automatically trigger payments that were paused beginning January 1, 2023, and would force the Department to begin demanding payments from millions of borrowers, including PSLF participants. Consequently, borrowers could be on the hook for payments due since December 31, 2022, possibly including interest. As a result, more than 37 million borrowers could see unexpected bills adding up to hundreds or thousands of dollars, plus interest. Further, the CRA could operate to vitiate credits towards forgiveness and any borrower who has earned forgiveness since the beginning of the year could see that forgiveness rescinded.

While NCN takes no position on the student debt cancellation plan, the unintended consequences of rolling back the student loan payment pause would have grave effects on nonprofit workers and others earning forgiveness under PSLF. At a time when nonprofits are facing a workforce shortage, increased demands on services, and added burdens caused by economic uncertainty and natural disasters, workers must receive every benefit possible under the PSLF program.

The payment pause has provided essential financial relief and reduced stress while allowing workers to continue to earn forgiveness. Any rollback, unexpected financial load, and confusion on PSLF status must be prevented.

We urge you to oppose the Senate Joint Resolution 22 and House Joint Resolution 45 in their current form and to insist that nonprofit workers and public servants receive the relief they have diligently earned.

We stand ready to work with Members of Congress to ensure that congressional promises to governmental and nonprofit workers under the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program are respected and fulfilled.

Sincerely,

TIFFANY GOURLEY CARTER,
Policy Counsel,
National Council of Nonprofits.

JUNE 21, 2023.

Re: Patient community concerns about the detrimental impact of policies included in HR 2868, the Association Health Plans Act; HR 2813, the Self-Insurance Protection Act, and HR 3799, the CHOICE Arrangement Act.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY AND LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of the millions of patients and consumers across the country with serious, acute and chronic health conditions, our organizations urge you to oppose HR 2868, HR 2813, and HR 3799, which threaten access to quality, affordable healthcare coverage.

The 23 undersigned organizations represent more than 120 million people living with a pre-existing condition in the US. Collectively, we have a unique perspective on what individuals and families need to prevent disease, cure illness, and manage chronic health conditions. The diversity of our organizations and the populations we serve enable us to draw upon a wealth of knowledge and expertise that are critical components of any discussion aimed at improving or reforming our healthcare system.

Our organizations share three principles that we use to help guide our work on healthcare to continue to develop, improve upon, or defend the programs and services our communities need to live longer, healthier lives. These principles state that healthcare must be adequate, affordable, and accessible.

With these principles at the forefront, we write to convey our concerns about three bills that have recently been moved out of the Rules Committee and will soon be considered on the House floor: HR 2868, the Association Health Plans Act; HR 2813, the Self-Insurance Protection Act, and HR 3799, the CHOICE Arrangement Act. In the report ''Under-covered: How 'Insurance-Like' Products Are Leaving Patients Exposed,'' many of our organizations documented our concerns with health insurance products that are not required to comply with the patient protections enacted in the Affordable Care Act. We are concerned that policies included in the legislation considered today would decrease the number of consumers enrolled in comprehensive health insurance plans and threaten access to quality, affordable healthcare for the patients and consumers we represent.

H.R. 2868, THE ASSOCIATION HEALTH PLANS ACT

Current law allows employers to work together to form a multiple employer welfare arrangement (MEWA) to provide certain benefits to their employees. An Association Health Plan (AHP)—a health benefit plan sponsored by an employer-based association—is one type of MEWA.

Some AHPs can be classified as large employers and are therefore not subject to critical patient protections and state insurance regulations. This can pose risks to employers and their employees. The track record of AHPs and MEWAs in reliably providing comprehensive coverage for consumers is quite poor. According to state insurance regulators, these entities have a long history of fraud and ''[making] money at the expense of their participants.'' State insurance regulators also say AHPs ''have been notoriously prone to insolvencies.''

AHPs are not required to provide comprehensive coverage or cover the Essential Health Benefits (EHB). AHPs may also charge higher premiums based on occupation (a loophole that allows discrimination based on gender and other factors) or even health status in some cases. As a result, these plans expose enrollees to high financial and health risks and exacerbate rural and/or regional health disparities. Meanwhile, marketing these products can be confusing or misleading and can cause individuals to enroll in plans that do not align with their medical needs or expectations.

AHPs also pose risks to the many consumers who do not enroll in them. AHPs can siphon away healthy individuals from state individual and small-group markets by leveraging the regulatory advantages they enjoy. This leaves the individual and small group markets smaller and with a larger proportion of individuals with pre-existing conditions, leading to higher premiums and fewer plan choices for those who depend on those markets to access comprehensive coverage.

Despite the harm AHPs can pose to those who enroll in them as well as those who remain in comprehensive insurance plans, the Association Health Plans Act would promote additional enrollment in AHPs for groups that cannot use them today. We believe additional enrollment in AHPs by small employers and the self-employed will weaken patient and consumer protections and lead to higher costs for consumers who rely on comprehensive insurance.

H.R. 2813, THE SELF-INSURANCE PROTECTION ACT

Stop-loss insurance is intended to be used as a tool to protect a health plan sponsor—typically an employer—from unpredictably high losses due to unexpected claims. As such, it can be an important tool to promote stability for sponsors of health insurance plans, particularly sponsors providing coverage for small numbers of insured individuals, whose unique health needs sometimes necessitate very expensive health services.

We are concerned that H.R. 2813 would remove an important level of consumer and patient protection by eliminating the ability of states to exercise oversight of stop-loss plans. State insurance commissioners play an important role in the health insurance marketplace. Removing states' ability to regulate stop-loss coverage would lead to less oversight of these plans, which would increase the likelihood of misleading marketing and other fraudulent practices that would prove harmful to employers purchasing stop-loss coverage as well as their employees.

H.R. 3799, THE CHOICE ARRANGEMENT ACT

In lieu of offering a traditional group health plan, employers may provide contributions, on a pre-tax basis, to their employees to subsidize the direct purchase of individual market health coverage.

The choice to offer these individual coverage health reimbursement arrangements (ICHRAs) is available to employers right now, and has been for several years. Yet interest appears to be modest. It is possible take-up has been limited simply because the arrangement is still relatively new, and enrollment may expand with time. It is also possible that, for employers, the value proposition of ICHRAs is less than some anticipated. We note that commonly cited benefits of ICHRAs—including predictable costs for employers and multiple plan options for employees—can be achieved through traditional employer coverage mechanisms and benefit designs.

Troublingly, however, ICHRAs have introduced new risks, both for workers with employer coverage and for consumers who rely on the individual market. ICHRAs provide employers an opportunity to reduce their costs by moving older and sicker workers off of job-based coverage and into the individual market. These shifts potentially disrupt access to care for employees and make the individual market risk pool more expensive to insure, raising premiums.

The regulatory framework governing ICHRAs recognizes these dangers and includes provisions to mitigate them. For example, to reduce the ability of employers to offer ICHRAs selectively to only their sicker employees, federal rules require employers to treat all members of a particular class of workers the same for purposes of ICHRA eligibility. Still, the leeway given to employers to tailor these classifications is substantial, and it allows employers to create subgroups of workers based on characteristics that are proxies for health status. The rules also lack safeguards that would prevent an employer from using administrative loopholes to segment its workforce for ICHRA purposes based on otherwise impermissible factors. For these reasons, we have encouraged federal regulators to collect and publish data that would shed light on how employers are using these arrangements and the effectiveness of the nondiscrimination guardrails.

Against this backdrop, H.R. 3799 would create ''custom health option and individual care expense'' (CHOICE) arrangements, a new tax-advantaged arrangement similar to but apparently legally distinct from ICHRAs. To the extent H.R. 3799 is intended merely to codify the established regulatory framework for ICHRAs, we believe doing so is unwarranted at this time. Moreover, the bill's convoluted approach is likely to increase confusion and uncertainty.

Of additional concern, it appears H.R. 3799 incorporates the ICHRA rules selectively, in a manner that could intensify the risks posed by these arrangements. As we observed above, the nondiscrimination provisions in the existing regulatory framework are essential but insufficient to prevent employers from using ICHRAs to shift higher-cost workers to the individual market. H.R. 3799 does nothing to address these shortcomings. On the contrary, it would omit from statute key protections designed to safeguard consumers and the individual insurance market from the downsides of these arrangements.

CONCLUSION

We urge lawmakers to reject the three bills referenced above and, instead, partner with organizations like ours to identify opportunities to expand affordable, accessible, and adequate healthcare coverage for patients. If you have questions or would like to discuss this further, please contact Brian Connell VP, Federal Affairs with The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society.

Sincerely,

American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, American Heart Association, American Kidney Fund, American Lung Association, Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America, CancerCare, Child Neurology Foundation, Crohn's & Colitis Foundation, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Epilepsy Foundation, Hemophilia Federation of America, Lupus Foundation of America.

Muscular Dystrophy Association, National Eczema Association, National Health Council, National Hemophilia Foundation, National Kidney Foundation, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, National Organization for Rare Disorders, National Patient Advocate Foundation, Susan G. Komen, The AIDS Institute, The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society.

□ 1730

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there are many challenges we have in higher education that demand our attention: the rising cost of college, student debt crisis, the eroded value of the Pell grant, student mental health issues, and the list goes on.

Instead, we are addressing this resolution which will hurt millions of student borrowers and their families; an average of about 100,000 in each of our districts.

Many of our colleagues on the other side have justified the resolution by arguing that we cannot afford the plan, yet ignoring that we were willing to charge taxpayers $1.9 trillion for a tax package a few years ago that overwhelmingly benefited the top 1 percent and corporations. Now they are unwilling to spend much less than that to help students pay for their education.

We should be passing proposals that meaningfully support borrowers and make college more affordable for current and future students. The bottom line is that we have a responsibility to strengthen support for those seeking college degrees. Those who want a degree should be able to access that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the proposal, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration is destroying the Federal student aid system that has balanced providing millions of students access to opportunities for post-secondary education while respecting the interest of taxpayers who fund these opportunities.

Democrats know their radical free college agenda won't make it through Congress, so instead they are forcing it down Americans' throats by executive fiat through the student loan program. Obfuscation about the details has allowed the department to tout alleged benefits without facing any scrutiny over the implications of these radical changes; however, the facts, which this administration has tried to push under the rug, prove its agenda is nothing more than an attempt to skirt the law and enact policies that would never pass Congress.

These actions will leave colleges free to continue increasing costs that greatly impact all American taxpayers. These policies deny any accountability to borrowers and evade any responsibility to help those students turn their degrees into a job.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the override of the President's veto, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 206, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—221

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

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—206

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

NOT VOTING—7

Kilmer
Loudermilk
Meng
Posey
Pressley
Sewell
Williams (TX)

□ 1800

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the joint resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The veto message and the joint resolution are referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

CUSTOM HEALTH OPTION AND INDIVIDUAL CARE EXPENSE ARRANGEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 524 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3799.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) kindly take the chair.

□ 1805

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3799) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for health reimbursement arrangements integrated with individual health insurance coverage, with Mr. SELF (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part D of House Report 118–115 by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in Part D of House Report 118–115, on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mrs. HAYES of Connecticut;

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MOLINARO of New York; and

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. ROY of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. HAYES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1, printed in part D of House Report 118–115 offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 220, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—211

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

NOES—220

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick

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

NOT VOTING—9

Estes
Grothman
Kilmer
McCollum
Meng
Meuser
Posey
Pressley
Williams (TX)

□ 1807

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall no. 278.

Stated against:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I missed roll call 278—I used an old card. Had I been present, I would have voted "NO" on rollcall No. 278.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2, printed in part D of House Report 118–115 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 281, noes 151, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—281

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carbajal
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Deluzio
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
González-Colón
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landsman
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClellan
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Moskowitz
Moylan
Mrvan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pence
Perez
Perry
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Plaskett
Radewagen
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Santos
Scalise
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Swalwell
Sykes
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tonko
Trone
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Vasquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams (NY)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—151

Adams
Aguilar
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Crockett
Crow
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gaetz
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (PA)
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Peters
Pingree
Porter
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sablan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Smith (WA)
Stansbury
Stevens
Strickland
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tlaib
Tokuda
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Estes
Kilmer
Meng
Pocan
Posey
Pressley
Williams (TX)

□ 1813

Mr. PETERS and Ms. ADAMS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. BOEBERT changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part D of House Report 118–115 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—228

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

NOES—206

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

NOT VOTING—6

Estes
Kilmer
Meng
Posey
Pressley
Williams (TX)

□ 1819

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SELF) having assumed the chair, Mr. AMODEI, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3799) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for health reimbursement arrangements integrated with individual health insurance coverage, and, pursuant to House Resolution 524, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Doggett of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3799 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. 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 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 3799, if ordered; and adoption of H. Res. 521.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 220, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

YEAS—209

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

Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—220

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

NOT VOTING—5

Kilmer
Meng
Posey
Pressley
Williams (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1829

Mr. NUNN of Iowa changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 209, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

YEAS—220

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

NAYS—209

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

NOT VOTING—5

Kilmer
Meng
Posey
Pressley
Williams (TX)

□ 1835

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENSURING ADAM SCHIFF, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE 30TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 521) censuring ADAM SCHIFF, Representative of the 30th Congressional District of California, 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 passage of the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 209, answered ''present'' 6, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

YEAS—213

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

NAYS—209

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—6

Buck	Garbarino	Joyce (OH)
Fischbach	Guest	Rutherford

NOT VOTING—6

Buchanan	Meng	Pressley
Kilmer	Posey	Williams (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1843

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.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) present himself in the well.

By its adoption of H. Res. 521, the House has resolved that the House of Representatives censures ADAM SCHIFF, Representative of the 30th Congressional District of California, for misleading the American public and for conduct unbecoming of an elected Member of the House of Representatives; that Representative ADAM SCHIFF will forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; that Representative ADAM SCHIFF will be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker; and that the Committee on Ethics shall conduct an investigation into Representative ADAM SCHIFF's falsehoods, misrepresentations, and abuse of sensitive information.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

□ 1900

EMPLOYER REPORTING IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3801) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to streamline and improve the employer reporting process relating to health insurance coverage and to protect dependent privacy, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3801

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 ''Employer Reporting Improvement Act''.

SEC. 2. TIN REPORTING FLEXIBILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6055(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

''For purposes of subparagraph (B)(i), in the case of any individual whose name is required to be set forth in a return under subsection (a), if the person required to make a return under such subsection is unable to collect information on the TINs of such individuals, the Secretary may allow the individual's full name and date of birth to be substituted for the name and TIN.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to returns the due date for which is after December 31, 2024.

SEC. 3. ELECTRONIC STATEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6056(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.—An individual shall be deemed to have consented to receive the statement under this subsection in electronic form if such individual has affirmatively consented at any prior time, to the person who is the employer of the individual during the calendar year to which the statement relates, to receive such statement in electronic form. The preceding sentence shall not apply if the individual revokes such consent in writing.''.

(b) STATEMENTS RELATING TO HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.—Section 6055(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.—An individual shall be deemed to have consented to receive the statement under this subsection in electronic form if such individual has affirmatively consented at any prior time, to the person required to make such statement, to receive such statement in electronic form. The preceding sentence shall not apply if the individual revokes such consent in writing.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to statements the due date for which is after December 31, 2024.

SEC. 4. TIME FOR RESPONSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980H(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) TIME FOR RESPONSE.—The Secretary shall allow an applicable large employer at least 90 days from the date of the first letter which informs the employer of a proposed assessment of the employer shared responsibility payment under this section to respond to the proposed assessment before taking any further action with respect to such proposed assessment.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to assessments proposed in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON PENALTY ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

''(n) ASSESSABLE PAYMENT OF EMPLOYER SHARED RESPONSIBILITY.—In the case of any assessable payment under section 4980H, the period for assessment shall expire at the end of the 6-year period beginning on the due date for filing the return under section 6056 (or, if later, the date such return was filed) for the calendar year with respect to which such payment is determined.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to returns which are due after December 31, 2024.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

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.

I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words about the Employer Reporting Improvement Act before us today, introduced by my good friends, Ways and Means colleagues, Representatives ADRIAN SMITH and MIKE THOMPSON. This is a straightforward and effective bipartisan solution to provide small businesses with relief from cumbersome Affordable Care Act reporting requirements.

Under current law, every year, to determine compliance with ACA requirements, employers have to report to the IRS information about the health insurance coverage they have provided for their employees.

As part of that process, employers are required to submit their employee and their spouse or dependents' personal tax identification numbers or Social Security numbers. However, here is the catch: If, during this process, the employer unknowingly submits incorrect information, or if the IRS believes that an employee is wrongfully claiming a premium tax credit, the employer faces a significant financial penalty.

Making matters worse, the window of opportunity that employer has to appeal is short, while the statute of limitations on that violation is limitless.

On average, the IRS takes anywhere between 18 to 24 months, 2 years, to crunch the numbers on all this data they receive. That means the small business is left in limbo waiting to hear whether the government will find them in violation of the law.

The bill before us today gives employers flexibility about what personal information they have to provide on behalf of their employees and their families. It extends the appeal window for any potential violation and establishes a statute of limitations so those small businesses, who have limited resources to begin with, can navigate these waters with less of a burden.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of this aisle for supporting this measure to provide relief to our small business job creators.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of this legislation. I thank my colleague from Nebraska and my friend, Mr. SMITH, for working with me on this important bill.

This legislation before us today simplifies the ACA reporting process for employers and businesses across our country. The bill allows employers to submit required information electronically and improves privacy protections by eliminating the unnecessary requirement that employers collect dependents' Social Security numbers.

In addition, the bill ensures that employers have a reasonable opportunity to respond to the IRS before being assessed penalties, while simultaneously ensuring the IRS has the time and tools it needs to assess penalties to bad actors.

I share my colleagues' disappointment that prospective reporting provisions of the bill were removed. I understand the challenges facing the Treasury Department, and I look forward to working with my colleagues toward a resolution on that front.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), one of the sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our bill, the Employer Reporting Improvement Act. As was mentioned, the bill was adapted from legislation that my colleague, Mr. THOMPSON, and I have been working on for years, the Commonsense Reporting Act.

The Employer Reporting Improvement Act is a strong step toward cleaning up the complicated process employers use to report data required by the IRS and providing employers relief.

This data is used to determine if an employee's health coverage is considered affordable. Unfortunately, an inadvertent mistake or omission in reporting this data can result in a financial penalty for the employer long after the original submission. The potential financial penalty can put a serious strain on small businesses who are already struggling with workforce shortages and persistently high inflation.

While the vast majority of these mistakes are ultimately corrected without a financial penalty being enforced, employers are still forced to navigate a complicated maze of bureaucracy to clear up these unintentional mistakes.

The Employer Reporting Improvement Act makes simple, yet effective changes, including codifying actions previously taken to create more safeguards and flexibilities, improving the reporting process, and making it less likely employers are faced with resolving reporting problems several years after the fact.

In fact, one of the most important pieces of the bill is the creation of a reasonable statute of limitations, 6 years, for penalties resulting from reporting errors.

As we continue our work to improve employer reporting requirements, I hope we can work with the Treasury Department to find a path forward on prospective reporting, as Mr. THOMPSON also elaborated on.

I am glad to support the Employer Reporting Improvement Act. I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I reiterate my thanks to my partner on this bill, Mr. SMITH from Nebraska. This is a bill that I have worked on for the last four Congresses. It will make life easier for businesses, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

America's small businesses have had it pretty tough these past few years. They are asking that Congress do its part to bring a measure of relief.

The Employer Reporting Improvement Act is one step we can easily take to shrink the burden Washington imposes on them and their employees.

The mom-and-pop shops that line America's Main Streets should not have to operate under fear that Washington is going to come after them for a clerical error. When they are faced with a potential penalty, they ought to have the time to make their case. It is a simple matter of fairness.

This measure has strong bipartisan support. It sailed out of the Ways and Means Committee on a vote of 37–0.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUNN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3801, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAPERWORK BURDEN REDUCTION ACT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3797) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an alternative manner of furnishing certain health insurance coverage statements to individuals, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3797

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 ''Paperwork Burden Reduction Act''.

SEC. 2. ALTERNATIVE MANNER OF FURNISHING CERTAIN HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE STATEMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS.

(a) REPORTING OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.—Section 6055(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ALTERNATIVE MANNER OF FURNISHING STATEMENTS.—For purposes of this subsection, any person required to make a return under subsection (a) shall be treated as timely furnishing the written statement required under paragraph (1) if—

''(A) such person provides clear, conspicuous, and accessible notice (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) that any individual to whom a statement would otherwise be required to be furnished under paragraph (1) may request a copy of such statement, and

''(B) such person, on request of any such individual, furnishes a copy of such statement to such individual not later than the later of—

''(i) January 31 of the year following the calendar year for which the return under subsection (a) was required to be made, or

''(ii) 30 days after the date of such request.''.

(b) CERTAIN EMPLOYERS REQUIRED TO REPORT ON HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.—Section 6056(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ALTERNATIVE MANNER OF FURNISHING STATEMENTS.—For purposes of this subsection, any person required to make a return under subsection (a) shall be treated as timely furnishing the written statement required under paragraph (1) if—

''(A) such person provides clear, conspicuous, and accessible notice (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) that any individual to whom a statement would otherwise be required to be furnished under paragraph (1) may request a copy of such statement, and

''(B) such person, on request of any such individual, furnishes a copy of such statement to such individual not later than the later of—

''(i) January 31 of the year following the calendar year for which the return under subsection (a) was required to be made, or

''(ii) 30 days after the date of such request.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to statements with respect to returns for calendar years after 2023.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

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.

If you visit any Main Street in America, you will see that small businesses are struggling. Today's cost of living crisis has made everything from supplies to labor more expensive for mom-and-pop stores all across America.

Not only are small businesses struggling because of high prices, but Washington mandates are forcing small businesses to waste precious time processing paperwork instead of serving their workers and customers.

Right now, small businesses are forced to send millions of Americans paper copies of health insurance reporting forms every year, when the vast majority of individuals don't use this form.

Every taxpayer knows this form I am talking about. While it is known as a Form 1095–C, it is one that you get in the mail and have absolutely no idea what to do with. It looks like this, and you put it in the pile with your other tax forms and then realize when it comes time to file your taxes, you don't actually even need it.

In fact, only 1.4 percent of American workers and their families may need to use this form. The Paperwork Burden Reduction Act is a bipartisan bill, introduced by Representative PANETTA and myself, that will put an end to this wasteful practice.

This bill saves small business owners time and money by relieving them of mailing outdated paperwork that only exists because Congress mandates it.

This mandate doesn't even make sense anymore. The origins of this paperwork were to prove compliance with the individual mandate of the Affordable Care Act, a mandate whose enforcement was zeroed out years ago.

Not only will small businesses have more time to focus on running a business, but this bill also recognizes how Americans actually file taxes. Now more than ever, Americans fill out their tax returns online. There is no reason that American workers should not be able to access this health insurance tax form online, as well.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting this measure that will eliminate needless paperwork for working Americans and small business job creators.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Chairman SMITH, not only for articulating the exact reasons as to why we must support the Paperwork Burden Reduction Act, but for sharing this opportunity to co-lead on such a commonsense measure that will benefit taxpayers, not just in my Congressional District, the 19th District in California, but so many people all across this country.

The bipartisan Paperwork Burden Reduction Act will ease confusion for taxpayers by reducing the paperwork that is necessary for filing taxes for small business employers and their employees.

Under current law, employers must send a 1095 tax form to employees to verify their health coverage for the previous year. However, for many employees, the IRS no longer requires this form for them to complete their taxes. So the Paperwork Burden Reduction Act would allow employers to provide a 1095–B or a 1095–C form upon request from employees, rather than mandating it and wasting time, wasting money, and wasting paper.

It is a bill that is popular, not just among taxpayers, but Democrats and

Republicans alike, as demonstrated by its passage out of the Ways and Means Committee without a single vote in opposition.

It is understandable why it is so popular because the one thing that we can all agree on is that we need to reduce unnecessary burdens on taxpayers and small businesses.

Now, although the Biden administration has already ordered this, I am proud to join Chairman SMITH and put that order into statute, and I would urge my colleagues to vote for the Paperwork Burden Reduction Act.

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

□ 1915

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that we can come together on such a straightforward issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation, the Paperwork Burden Reduction Act.

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, back home in our districts, we have heard from workers and small business owners about the struggles they face in today's economy. Today, with this legislation before us, we finally have a chance to give them a bit of a break.

The Paperwork Burden Reduction Act will get rid of a Washington mandate that requires small businesses to waste time mailing unnecessary paperwork instead of serving their employees and customers. Not only will it save small business owners time, but it will also help them modernize their operations by letting workers access their health insurance tax forms online.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and help us deliver relief to workers and small business owners across America.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3797, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES-TAIWAN INITIATIVE ON 21ST-CENTURY TRADE FIRST AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4004) to approve and implement the Agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States regarding Trade between the United States of America and Taiwan, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4004

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 ''United States-Taiwan Initiative on 21st-Century Trade First Agreement Implementation Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) As a leading democracy, Taiwan is a key partner of the United States in the Indo-Pacific region.

(2) The United States and Taiwan share democratic values, deep commercial and economic ties, and strong people-to-people connections. Those links serve as the impetus for expanding engagement by the United States with Taiwan.

(3) Taiwan is the eighth-largest trading partner of the United States and the United States is the second-largest trading partner of Taiwan.

(4) Since 2020, the United States and Taiwan, under the auspices of the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO), have held an economic prosperity partnership dialogue to enhance economic and commercial ties between the United States and Taiwan, including with respect to supply chain security and resiliency, investment screening, health, science, and technology, and the digital economy.

(5) On June 1, 2022, the United States and Taiwan launched the United States-Taiwan Initiative on 21st-Century Trade to deepen our economic and trade relationship, advance mutual trade priorities based on shared values, promote innovation, and support inclusive economic growth for workers and businesses.

(6) On August 17, 2022, the United States and Taiwan announced the negotiating mandate for formal trade negotiations under the United States-Taiwan Initiative on 21st-Century Trade and agreed to seek high-standard commitments.

(7) Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress authority over international trade. The President lacks the authority to enter into binding trade agreements absent approval from Congress.

(8) Congressional approval of the United States-Taiwan Initiative on 21st-Century Trade First Agreement will ensure that the agreement, and the trade relationship between the United States and Taiwan more broadly, will be durable. A durable trade agreement will foster sustained economic growth and give workers, consumers, businesses, farmers, ranchers, and other stakeholders assurance that commercial ties between the United States and Taiwan will be long-lasting and reliable.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is—

(1) to approve and implement the Agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States regarding Trade between the United States of America and Taiwan, done on June 1, 2023;

(2) to strengthen and develop economic relations between the United States and Taiwan for our mutual benefit;

(3) to lay the foundation for further cooperation to expand and enhance the benefits of the Agreement; and

(4) to establish transparency and consultation requirements with respect to Further Agreements.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term ''Agreement'' means the Agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States regarding Trade between the United States of America and Taiwan approved by Congress under section 5.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(3) FURTHER AGREEMENT.—The term ''Further Agreement'' means—

(A) any trade agreement, other than the Agreement approved by Congress under section 5, arising from or relating to the August 17, 2022, negotiating mandate relating to the United States-Taiwan Initiative on 21st-Century Trade; or

(B) any nonministerial modification or nonministerial amendment to the Agreement.

(4) NEGOTIATING TEXT.—The term ''negotiating text'' means any document that proposes the consideration, examination, or adoption of a particular element or language in an international instrument.

(5) STATE LAW.—The term ''State law'' includes—

(A) any law of a political subdivision of a State; and

(B) any State law regulating or taxing the business of insurance.

(6) TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—The term ''Trade Representative'' means the United States Trade Representative.

SEC. 5. APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT.

Congress approves the Agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States regarding Trade between the United States of America and Taiwan, done on June 1, 2023.

SEC. 6. ENTRY INTO FORCE OF AGREEMENT.

(a) CONDITIONS FOR ENTRY INTO FORCE OF AGREEMENT.—The President may provide for the Agreement to enter into force not earlier than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress a certification under subsection (c).

(b) CONSULTATION AND REPORT.—The President, not later than 30 days before submitting a certification under subsection (c), shall—

(1) consult with the appropriate congressional committees;

(2) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(A) explains the basis of the determination of the President contained in that certification, including by providing specific reference to the measures the parties to the Agreement intend to use to comply with the obligations in the Agreement; and

(B) describes, including through the use of economic estimates and analyses, how entry into force of the Agreement will further trade relations between the United States and Taiwan and advance the interests of workers, consumers, businesses, farmers, ranchers, and other stakeholders in the United States; and

(3) answer in writing any questions that relate to potential compliance and implementation of the Agreement that are submitted by the appropriate congressional committees during the 15-day period beginning on the date of the submission of the report under paragraph (2).

(c) CERTIFICATION.—A certification under this subsection is a certification in writing that—

(1) indicates the President has determined Taiwan has taken measures necessary to comply with the provisions of the Agreement that are to take effect not later than the date on which the Agreement enters into force; and

(2) identifies the anticipated date the President intends to exchange notes or take any other action to notify Taiwan that the United States has completed all procedures necessary to bring the Agreement into force.

(d) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after entry into force of the Agreement, the Trade Representative shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report providing an assessment of the implementation of the Agreement, including by identifying any provisions for which further progress is necessary to secure compliance.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted with any confidential business information clearly identified or contained in a separate annex.

(3) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 5 days after the report required by paragraph (1) is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees, the Trade Representative shall publish the report, with any confidential business information redacted, on a publicly available website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

SEC. 7. TRANSPARENCY AND CONSULTATION WITH RESPECT TO FURTHER AGREEMENTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DEEPENING RELATIONSHIP WITH TAIWAN.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should continue to deepen its relationship with Taiwan; and

(2) any Further Agreements should be high-standard, enforceable, and meaningful to both the United States and Taiwan, as well as subject to robust requirements on public transparency and congressional consultation.

(b) ACCESS TO TEXTS OF FURTHER AGREEMENTS.—The Trade Representative shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees the following with respect to a Further Agreement:

(1) Negotiating text drafted by the United States prior to sharing the negotiating text with Taiwan or otherwise sharing the text outside the executive branch.

(2) Negotiating text drafted by Taiwan not later than 3 days after receiving the text from Taiwan.

(3) Any consolidated negotiating texts that the United States and Taiwan are considering, which shall include an attribution of the source of each provision contained in those texts to either the United States or Taiwan.

(4) The final text not later than 45 days before the Trade Representative makes the text public or otherwise shares the text outside the executive branch.

(c) REVIEW OF TEXTS.—

(1) BRIEFING.—The Trade Representative shall schedule a briefing with the appropriate congressional committees to discuss the texts provided under subsection (b).

(2) REVIEW.—The appropriate congressional committees shall have not less than—

(A) 2 business days prior to the briefing under paragraph (1) to review the texts provided under subsection (b); and

(B) 4 business days after the briefing to provide comments with respect to the texts before the Trade Representative transmits any such texts to Taiwan.

(3) ADDITIONAL TIME TO REVIEW UNITED STATES NEGOTIATING TEXT.—If, during the period specified in paragraph (2)(B), two Members of Congress who are not of the same political party and each of whom is the Chair or Ranking Member of one of the appropriate congressional committees jointly request additional time to review the negotiating text provided under subsection (b)(1), the Trade Representative shall not transmit the text to Taiwan for a period of 15 business days following the request, unless the request indicates less time is necessary or such Members issue a subsequent joint notification to the Trade Representative that they have concluded their review sooner.

(d) NOTIFICATION AND BRIEFING DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—The Trade Representative shall—

(1) not later than one business day after scheduling any negotiating round with respect to a Further Agreement, promptly notify the appropriate congressional committees and provide those committees with the dates and locations for the negotiating round;

(2) ensure that any individual described in section 104(c)(2)(C) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4203(c)(2)(C)) that attends a negotiating round is accredited as a member of the United States delegation during any such negotiating round; and

(3) provide daily briefings to the individuals described in paragraph (2) during any such negotiating round regarding the status of those negotiations, including any tentative agreement to accept any aspect of negotiating text.

(e) APPROVAL.—A Further Agreement shall not take effect unless—

(1) the President, at least 60 days before the day on which the President enters into the Further Agreement, publishes the text of the Further Agreement on a publicly available website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative; and

(2) a bill is enacted into law expressly approving the Further Agreement and, if necessary, making any required changes to United States law.

SEC. 8. RELATIONSHIP OF THE AGREEMENT TO UNITED STATES AND STATE LAW.

(a) RELATIONSHIP OF THE AGREEMENT TO UNITED STATES LAW.—

(1) UNITED STATES LAW TO PREVAIL IN CONFLICT.—No provision of the Agreement, nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, which is inconsistent with any law of the United States, shall have effect.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—The Agreement does not constitute a free trade agreement for purposes of section 30D(e)(1)(A)(i)(II) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Unless specifically provided for in this Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(A) to amend or modify any law of the United States; or

(B) to limit any authority conferred under any law of the United States.

(b) RELATIONSHIP OF THE AGREEMENT TO STATE LAW.—No State law, or the application thereof, may be declared invalid as to any person or circumstance on the ground that the provision or application is inconsistent with the Agreement, except in an action brought by the United States for the purpose of declaring such law or application invalid.

(c) EFFECT OF THE AGREEMENT WITH RESPECT TO PRIVATE REMEDIES.—No person other than the United States—

(1) shall have any cause of action or defense under the Agreement or by virtue of congressional approval thereof; or

(2) may challenge, in any action brought under any provision of law, any action or inaction by any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the United States, any State, or any political subdivision of a State, on the ground that such action or inaction is inconsistent with the Agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which 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, Congress is sending a bipartisan message to President Biden today that we will not sit idly by as the administration ignores our constitutional role in developing U.S. trade policy.

The relationship between the United States and Taiwan is vital to U.S. interests in the Indo-Pacific. This initial trade agreement negotiated by the Biden administration is a good step. It builds on successful provisions that were included in the USMCA that was negotiated by President Trump, and it shows the world that the Chinese Communist Party will not intimidate the United States from deepening our relationship with Taiwan.

While Congress supports the early agreement that came from these negotiations, we will not stand by passively as the Biden administration, or any administration, attempts to bind the United States in a trade agreement without approval from Congress. Congress must be in the driver's seat on trade policy, not a passenger along for the ride.

Trade impacts every American. When done right, trade can boost small businesses, help American workers, and open up new markets for American farmers. Bad trade policy, on the other hand, can kill American jobs and give other nations unfair advantages over U.S. manufacturers, workers, and agriculture.

Every American deserves a voice in the outcome of these negotiations that impact their lives so much, which is why Congress, as their voice in Washington, must be involved in the development and approval of these agreements.

The Taiwan trade bill before us today restores congressional authority on

trade policy. It celebrates this agreement, but it also makes it clear that it cannot take effect unless this legislation is signed into law. It forces the administration to consult with Congress in a meaningful way moving forward, something that has not occurred to date. It requires any future agreements with Taiwan to be subject to a vote in Congress.

Without a vote on trade agreements, Congress can be ignored. This will ensure trade agreements are in the best interest of American workers, families, farmers, and small businesses. This bill has broad bipartisan support in both the House and in the Senate. Democrats and Republicans agree that U.S. trade policy must come through Congress, and the President will no longer be allowed to sidestep our constitutional authority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for the voice of the American people and vote to pass this bill. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my Republican and Democratic colleagues in both the House and the Senate in this effort to demonstrate our commitment to the people of Taiwan and to affirm Congress' constitutional authority on trade.

Every Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee has cosponsored this bill, and just last week, this legislation passed out of the Ways and Means Committee unanimously. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Before turning to the substance of the bill today, I remind my colleagues that the House Democrats improved the USMCA. Congress improved both the substance of the trade agreement, especially on matters related to labor, environment, and enforcement, and also the process.

Our commitment to building a modern, proworker deal led to a trade agreement that was endorsed by labor, the business community, and, most importantly, the American people.

Congress' fierce leadership on the USMCA brought about an agreement that reflects the priorities of House Democrats. For instance, we fought hard to establish new structure for aggressive enforcement of the USMCA and to back it up with funding for enforcement actions.

USMCA now stands as a powerful beacon for what is possible when it comes to durable, enforceable trade agreements. I credit that to the work and consensus building of Congress. It is the collaboration between Congress and the executive branch that allows trade policy to live up to its fullest potential and, in this critical moment, that cannot be forgotten. This brings us to the legislation before us today, the Taiwan Implementation Act.

This is a matter of standing up for the prerogatives of the Ways and Means Committee. Congress is charged with trade responsibilities, and trade falls to the Ways and Means Committee. I believe that you get better outcomes when Congress is included in the trade negotiations, and I believe that going forward making sure Congress is fully included is not only sensible but will lead to a better outcome.

In short, Congress, and within Congress the Ways and Means Committee, oversees trade policy. We should continue to defend that position.

I will now turn to our strong support for the people of Taiwan. Congressional Democrats are unwavering in their support for the people of Taiwan, a people who have built a robust and thriving democracy that serves as a beacon in the region. As Taiwan faces incredible pressure from its authoritarian neighbor, it is vital that this institution stand and support our Democratic partner.

Strengthening bilateral trade relations with Taiwan also strengthens our shared determination to preserve democracy at home and abroad. As we see growing aggression by certain countries toward Democratic values and troubling erosions of the rule of law, it is critical that American trade policy reflect our global commitment to promoting democracy and peace.

The Biden administration has reflected this commitment by prioritizing America's economic and trade relationship with Taiwan, a priority undoubtedly shared by Congress.

The Taiwan Implementation Act demonstrates Congress' strong support for strengthening our bilateral trade relationship with Taiwan and our commitment to ensure trade agreements are durable.

The U.S. Constitution gives Congress exclusive authority to regulate foreign commerce. This legislation approves what the administration has negotiated with Taiwan and sets forth strong consultation and transparency requirements that ensure future trade agreements with Taiwan carry the will of the American people behind them.

Trade impacts every part of people's lives; from the food we eat, to the clothes we buy, to the cars we drive. It is critical that Congress act to support this first trade agreement with Taiwan and ensure that future trade agreements are subject to a congressional approval process. The Ways and Means Committee is an important gatekeeper of our trade priorities and the American people expect us to lead on these matters.

The Taiwan Implementation Act affirms our authority to do just that, while underscoring our shared commitment to furthering the deep, economic, and people-to-people ties America enjoys with Taiwan.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I recognize the importance of our engagement with Taiwan economically, as well as our military presence to deter conflict and to maintain safe passage through the Taiwan Strait and the South China Sea. These are international waters.

This incomplete trade agreement that we take up is a modest first step and can only be enforced after the approval by this Congress. The work that we are already doing with Taiwan benefits businesses across America. Taiwan is already our ninth largest goods trading partner with over $90 billion in two-way trade during 2020.

We have seen the People's Republic of China, unfortunately, violently suppress democracy in Hong Kong, breaching its claim that it would support one country and two systems. We have seen, apparently, over a million Uyghurs who have been placed in concentration camps. There is every reason to be concerned by the threats the PRC has made about the future of democracy in Taiwan.

The opportunity tonight is not only to speak up for Taiwan, but as Chairman SMITH indicated, to reaffirm the role that Congress plays not only with Taiwan, but with all of our trading partners.

No administration, neither Democratic nor Republican, can adopt trading agreements that are enforceable without Congress exercising its constitutional responsibility for international trade. We will not yield that authority. It applies not only here, but to every trading partner.

We do, as we move forward in supporting Taiwan economically and militarily, need to recognize as well that it is not a matter of abandoning Taiwan to talk with China, to seek to avoid war with the People's Republic of China, which would be disastrous for the entire world. While effective military deterrence, strong deterrence is essential, this trading engagement is important. Our diplomatic power is also important, and, in that regard, the recent Republican attacks on Secretary of State Blinken for attempting to normalize diplomatic relations in Beijing are outrageous and totally counterproductive.

As a member of the Taiwan Caucus here in the House, I salute Taiwanese Americans, particularly their contribution to my hometown of Austin, and to the valuable insights that they have given me about the importance of our relationship with Taiwan.

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I emphasize this bicameral, bipartisan legislation affirms Congress' constitutional authority on trade and will not only support Taiwan's democracy but strengthen our bilateral trade relations.

I thank my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, on the Ways and Means Committee for supporting this legislation. I thank Senator WYDEN and Senator CRAPO for working with the committee on this bill. The people of Taiwan have built a robust, thriving democracy, and both the Biden administration and Congress have recognized that deepening our economic connection is a top priority.

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

□ 1930

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

The legislation before us today is an important first step in pushing back against executive overreach on trade. It also reinforces our support for a stronger relationship with our close partner, Taiwan.

I appreciate that my colleagues across the aisle agree that protecting Congress' constitutional powers is vital and that allowing any administration to continue unchecked would only dilute the voices of millions of Americans in Washington and embolden the executive branch to step on more of our Article I powers.

I am especially appreciative of the strong partnership in this effort of Ranking Member NEAL in the House and Senators WYDEN and CRAPO in the Senate.

U.S. trade policy must first and foremost protect American workers, farmers, families, and small businesses. We have a duty today to ensure the American people maintain a say in what those policies look like.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4004, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING MIKE MULLINS

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

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mike Mullins for his service to the citizens of D'Iberville, Mississippi, for the last 23 years.

Mike moved to D'Iberville in 1969 with his family. Mike was named the first parks and recreation director for the city of D'Iberville in 2001 before taking over public works. He later became a member of the American Public Works Association, serving as a delegate in 2011 and 2012 and then serving as vice president of the local branch in 2013 and 2014 before serving as president in 2014 and 2015.

Mike is retiring with his fiancee, Anne Mikish; his daughter, Michelle; two grandchildren; and Anne's children and grandchildren.

Mike Mullins' dedication to serving his community in so many capacities is inspiring to me, his family, and the entire Mississippi Gulf Coast community.

STAND UP TO SAVE LIVES

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

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, on Father's Day, 23 people were shot and 1 person was killed at a Juneteenth celebration in Willowbrook, Illinois.

Law enforcement has not yet identified a suspect or a motive, but preliminary reports have indicated there were multiple guns and multiple shooters.

In 2 weeks, Highland Park, Illinois, will recognize the 1-year anniversary of its July Fourth parade that killed 7 people and wounded 48 others. In that case, the parade route was lined with armed police officers.

Here is what we know. Having lots of guns around, whether at a parade, a Juneteenth party, a temple, or a school, does not make anyone safer. It just makes it more likely that yet another family is going to get a call to come down and identify yet another bullet-ridden corpse.

Yet, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to walk through this Chamber with AR–15 lapel pins, proudly announcing their service as foot soldiers in the NRA's war on the living.

I don't want a moment of silence. I don't want thoughts. I don't want prayers. They are all far too quiet, and they don't do a damn thing.

Mr. Speaker, I need my colleagues to be brave. I need them to be loud. I need them to stand up and act like saving lives matters.

CONGRATULATING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALISTS NAMIT KAPOOR AND ARMAAN SINGH

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

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two of the best and brightest of New York's Third Congressional District.

This week, hundreds of youth, ages 14 to 24, will gather in the Capitol to celebrate their achievement of being Congressional Award gold medalists.

Each gold medalist must complete over 400 hours of community service, dedicate 200 hours to a personal development activity, 200 hours to a physical fitness activity, and complete a 5-day, 4-night expedition or exploration over at least 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize two from my district who rose to meet this challenge: Namit Kapoor and Armaan Singh.

As a participant in the prestigious Senate Page Program, Mr. Kapoor completed many of his requirements while balancing a workload of courses beginning at 6:15 a.m. and long days on the Senate floor.

Singh is graduating next year and is looking to attend medical school to give back to the community. His gold medal journey took him far and wide, from a tae kwon do studio in Levittown to a glacier to the depths of his own soul as he found his voice for writing poetry.

Both young men have bright futures, and they are stellar examples of fine leadership in New York–03. I am proud to recognize them today.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I feel like a broken record talking about the invasion of our southern border over and over again, but it continues to get worse day by day.

When we have a President and an administration that do not take the crisis seriously, someone has to talk about it. We need to talk about it. We need to speak about it until we get it fixed.

From day one, Joe Biden has completely and utterly neglected his duties as President of the United States to enforce our rule of law and protect the national security of our great Nation. It is truly shameful.

From day one, Joe Biden abandoned strong and effective border policies put in place by President Trump that had our border nearly totally under control.

From day one, Joe Biden and his administration created this crisis. This is a crisis of their own doing, and Democrats have no one to blame other than themselves as to why thousands of illegal migrants come to our border daily. Ironically, some of them actually wear Biden T-shirts.

To make the border crisis even worse, and it is hard to believe that you could make it even worse, the radical Democrats are now using elementary and secondary schools to house these illegal immigrants. It is shameful.

There is absolutely no way to know the backgrounds of the individuals, yet Democrats find it appropriate to provide shelter for these migrants in children's gyms, auditoriums, and school spaces. Why do Democrats continue to put our children at risk?

As if trying to indoctrinate our children in the classroom isn't enough, as if it is not enough to see what they are doing in trying to affect the relationship of parents and their children in the school when parents are concerned about education, God knows how long they will be sheltered at these school campuses.

Democrats show time and time again they are not committed to protecting the American public and that they care more about the illusion of appearing compassionate when in reality they are neither compassionate nor competent.

Democrats cry that it is a political stunt when 40 migrants get flown to a sanctuary city or their luxury vacation island, yet when our border States and towns are overrun by this engineered crisis, there is no concern on their part. It is completely okay. It is okay for you. It just isn't okay for us.

It is also okay to Democrats that migrants are being held in places where there are virtually no bathrooms or sanitation facilities—so much for compassion, so much for caring, so much for the good of the country. This is hypocrisy at an astronomical level.

Unlike Democrats, Republicans are committed to protecting your children and will be voting this week to highlight and condemn this insanity. Once again, we will fight the fight.

Enough is enough. It is time to protect our children. It is time to take our country back.

I thank my fellow colleagues for being here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE).

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, this week, our House Armed Services Committee is continuing the critical process of crafting the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024.

This important piece of legislation will give our servicemen and servicewomen the resources they need to protect our national security. That is particularly important to my district.

I represent five major military installations: the Naval Weapons Center at China Lake, Edwards Air Force Base, the Air Ground Combat Center in Twentynine Palms, the Army's National Training Center at Fort Irwin, and the Marine Corps Logistics Base at Barstow. These five bases are unique because they are classified by the Department of Defense as remote or isolated.

Service for our servicemen and servicewomen in uniform is particularly difficult at remote or isolated bases because they are located so far away from urban centers of population. That is why we rely on an army of civilian contractors to provide the services that we need to house our men and women in uniform at these bases.

These civilian contractors provide services such as teaching their children, preparing their food, cleaning their barracks, and providing them with the medical care that they need.

Unfortunately, reports by the Department of Defense indicate that all 43 of the remote or isolated bases in the United States suffer from severe shortages of the civilian contractors needed to provide these services.

That is why, in committee today, I offered an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act that requires the Comptroller General to conduct a study quantifying the scope of this problem and to make recommendations to the Department of Defense as to how to better incentivize civilian contractors to serve our military men and women at these remote bases.

I am delighted that my amendment was unanimously adopted in committee today, and I am looking forward to working with my colleagues on the House floor and my colleagues in the Senate to ensure that it is included in the NDAA this year.

I thank all of our colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee for their hard work on this issue and for their work protecting our men and women in uniform.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. OBERNOLTE for his concern and his commitment to our veterans and his concern and commitment to all those who serve our country.

□ 1945

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me time tonight.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend, on June 24, marks one whole year since the landmark Supreme Court decision that overturned Roe v. Wade. As we look back and celebrate this occasion as a win for all those that believe in the sanctity of life from the moment of conception, I can't help but wonder how many lives have been saved just since this decision.

Of course, there is still more work to be done, but I am forever thankful for those across our great country, including in my home State of Tennessee, who helped achieve this victory. From those who have traveled and continued to travel to our Nation's Capital every year since 1974 to march for life, to the many volunteers and professional counselors who provide caring services to mothers at crisis pregnancy centers all across the country, this was truly a national movement.

Showing great insight at the time, our Tennessee State legislature took decisive action prior to the Dobbs v. Jackson decision to outlaw most abortions the moment this decision was returned to the States.

I couldn't be prouder of our State of Tennessee, which has become a leader in the pro-life movement in recent years.

Now innocent, unborn children have the legal protection they so desperately needed. I believe we must continue our efforts to protect children from gender mutilating surgeries, the horrid sexualization of our children's classrooms and libraries by drag queen performances on public property, and to protect the ability of women to play sports against other women.

As a Christian, a father, and a husband I will always stand up for what is right for our families and fight back against the left's attack against our conservative Christian beliefs. Just like with Roe v. Wade, I believe we will be victorious.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members present in the Chamber to join me in a moment of silence for those millions of unborn babies who lost their chance to live out the life God meant them to have to the horrid practice of abortion.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROSE for his care and love for our children, both born and unborn.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative VAN DREW, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3799, the CHOICE Arrangement Act, which we just voted on tonight.

According to the National Federation of Independent Business, small businesses have ranked the cost of health insurance as their number one problem for 32 years straight. Even our largest employers rank the cost of health insurance and healthcare as a tremendous issue.

Offer rates from small employers with under 50 workers dropped from 39 to 31 percent from 2010 to 2021. This is both unfortunate and alarming because small business owners and employees who drive the American economy with their skills deserve better.

As a physician and a former small business owner myself and a supporter of small businesses, I understand the importance of quality healthcare. I am all for innovative solutions that bring down costs without expanding the power of the Federal Government.

The inaptly named Affordable Care Act doubled down on a broken individual health market that now costs taxpayers more than a trillion a year. The CHOICE Arrangement Act eliminates the need for small businesses to choose between expensive, unaffordable ACA-compliant coverage or no coverage at all.

Furthermore, any business size can offer this type of coverage and employers can offer coverage so that their employees can obtain health insurance. The benefit to employees is—let me say it in three words: portability, cost, and choice.

Of these three, the most important, especially as a physician delivering care, is for patients to have choice. We

know with the innovation that has come about through technology that patients want choice now more than ever.

Imagine having an arrangement where you can use your healthcare dollars to get devices that measure your blood sugar rather than having to prick your finger every day, or other things that are not covered necessarily by health insurance or Federal health insurance.

Furthermore, this Act codifies a rule created by President Trump that makes it easier for businesses and self-employed individuals to band together or pool together across State lines to purchase association health plans and expanded health reimbursements.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the CHOICE Arrangement Act, and I look forward to the Senate's swift consideration of this measure.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS for the work she does and the difference that she makes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), my friend.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, talking on the issue of a campaign being used for buying votes, the President back in his 2020 campaign promised to cancel up to $10,000 of Federal student loan debt per borrower. Of course, after his election he called for the 117th Congress to pass a bill to facilitate $10,000 in student loan forgiveness.

When he first announced his attempt by his administration to forgive the debt for those who need it most was in August of 2022. Since that announcement, the plan has been mired in pushback from the judiciary and legislative branches of the government. It isn't even seen as legal or constitutional is the charge.

The Administration's main legal argument for its ability to forgive student loan debt is that the 2003 HEROES Act, a bill that provides reservists and their families relief from making student loan payments, also allows, theoretically, the executive branch to cancel student debt for anyone they wish to. This theory has faced severe pushback from many legal experts.

The administration's argument is that because of the language of the HEROES Act of 2003, the President would somehow have the authority to unilaterally transfer up to $500 billion in student loan debt from those who are contractually required to repay it to taxpayers who never borrowed the money.

The plan would cancel up to $20,000 in Federal student loan debt for more than 40 million borrowers. Republicans and Democrats have voted for legislation that prevents the administration's bailout from taking effect.

Many Republicans see the bailout as a wealth distribution scam because it in effect forces working-class Americans to subsidize the college tuition of wealthier Americans.

Nearly all borrowers who today obtain Federal student loans do so under the William D. Ford Direct Loan Program authorized by Congress in 1993. The designation of this Federal program as a direct loan program means that when making an FDLP loan, the Federal Government disburses funds to a non-Federal borrower under a contract with the borrower that requires repayment.

Since September of last year, multiple lawsuits have resulted in the administration's scheme being put on hold. A Federal judge in Texas declared the entire plan to be unlawful. The Department of Education stopped taking applications from student loan borrowers who would have been forgiven under the plan, but the DOJ is currently appealing that decision.

The U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals rejected an appeal from the Biden administration asking to allow the scheme to continue while the Supreme Court took up the case.

Lawsuits against the Biden administration have been filed in the U.S. Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals. In a case known as Biden v. Nebraska, the U.S. Supreme Court is set to weigh in on the constitutionality of the plan. Oral arguments were heard in February. A decision has not been announced, but many legal experts expect the Court to overturn the program.

Congress itself has also reacted negatively to the plan. H.J. Res 45, a bipartisan resolution which uses the Congressional Review Act to overturn the administration's student loan forgiveness plan, was vetoed by the President earlier in June.

Republicans in Congress have likened the President's plan to a vote-buying scheme, claiming it is an attempt to buy college graduate votes in exchange for the possibility of financial reward in the form of debt forgiveness.

Concerns have been raised that if the President's scheme is successful, there is the possibility a future President may forgive large sections of the country's debts and use the Biden student loan cancellation as a precedent to justify it.

The bottom line is that for the people who took the loans out, they need to pay their own loans back. Hardworking people in this country that chose not to take student loans for college, or just went immediately to work or went into a trade or other aspects of that, should not be footing the bill for those that agreed to do it when they signed up as adults to take on these loans.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need to have an administration somehow intervene and buy votes on that and promise things that it cannot deliver for folks that really don't deserve it when they incurred the debt and were making a free decision to do so.

This is a scam, a scheme, and it needs to be prevented. I hope the Supreme Court rules that way and Congress needs to act to make sure that isn't carried out.

Mr. Speaker, let's reward the people that work hard and pay their debts and not have a giveaway program that the Federal Government does in order to buy votes.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. LAMALFA's focus on what is a very important issue and it is a fairness issue. I appreciate the time and trouble he put into that. Well done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), my friend.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 461, condemning the use of elementary and secondary school facilities to provide shelter for illegal immigrants.

Under the policies of the Biden administration, every State is a border State. The communities across my district are feeling this burden.

Five counties in my district declared a state of emergency because they simply do not have the resources to handle the flood of illegal immigration that this administration has allowed unchecked.

This crisis is exacerbated by the radical sanctuary city policies of New York Democrats. They have turned their back on hardworking Americans, forcing small towns to manage illegal immigrants that overflow out of these Democrat-run cities. Now they want to take resources away from our students.

By turning taxpayer-funded schools into housing, we steal critical resources from student achievement, impede the learning process, and jeopardize the safety of our schools.

Let me be clear: the radical open border policies of Democrats in Washington, Albany, and New York City have created these problems. It is our duty to protect our borders, secure our schools, and uphold the rights and the safety of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be cosponsor of H. Res. 461, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure and join us in our commitment to securing our borders and enforcing our immigration laws. Together, we can put an end to this crisis and ensure the well-being of our communities and the future of our Nation.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LANGWORTHY for his focus on this. I spoke about it earlier. We need to talk about it over and over and over again until we have policies that make sure our American people are number one and are safe.

Certainly, we can have immigration but in a legal and appropriate way. Our President has been shameful in this.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that concludes my Special Order, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2000

MY 40-YEAR ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from

Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I am calling this Special Order hour the 40-year address, not to self-aggrandize, although I am marking that milestone year on Saturday when the House Chamber is not open and I will not be able to make such an address, but more so to reflect, to look back, to comment on how we got here, and on what it means as Michigan's 11th District has only had in the 187 years of our State's existence 25 Members of Congress.

I happen to be the 25th Member of Congress to hold Michigan's 11th District, and I happen to be the first woman to ever represent Michigan's 11th District and, therefore, the first woman to ever turn 40 in Michigan's 11th Congressional District.

By right, I also claim that I am the first millennial whom Michigan ever sent to Congress in the year 2018. It was that magnificent year when many men and women stood up to run for Congress. A lot of us called ourselves the never evers. We had never ever run for office before, but we felt a call to serve in the face of what we saw as leadership taking this country backwards, leadership in the Oval Office, leadership that was putting forward terminology that was dubbed the Muslim ban in the early 21st century which was almost inconceivable particularly for me representing and coming from southeastern Michigan, a place of great Arab-American presence and all the frustration that we felt with governance by Twitter and anti-democratic principles, but more so because of love of country.

I could start with when I got to Congress, but I don't think that would be totally appropriate because there was a journey to getting here, and it is a journey we are sharing in this largely empty Chamber before the C–SPAN cameras and before the folks watching at home of what brought us here and what brought me here.

I did not come from a family that was preordained to send a daughter to Congress. I was born in the eighties, a decade I barely remember, partly because a person doesn't gain full consciousness as a human being until age 5, so largely the eighties were not that memorable. Of course, my parents have great memories of that decade and the decade prior to it.

My parents are surely incredible people, incredibly hardworking Michiganders. My mom came to Michigan by way of Oakland University. She graduated a year early. She was always ahead of her time. She worked her way through school. In the school cafeteria she was washing dishes. I think she finished school 3 years early.

She probably wanted to do something in the STEM field but, interestingly, the woman who went on to Congress and founded the Women and STEM Caucus is the daughter of a woman who was told the only thing she could study in school was either education or art history. So she studied art history, and she is to this day, obviously, a masterful painter.

More than that, my mother's life is determined by very hard work and exceptional brilliance, tinkering around with electronics and masterful woodcarving. I have one of the lifelike carved eagles that she did in the nineties in my office in the Rayburn House Office Building.

She met my father at Oakland University. He was still working on school, and my dad had started a landscaping business right when he was out of high school. Again, he was so dogged at that practice of working with the earth and working with the soil and planting the trees and knowing every type of plant, bush, and shrub out there, how to design it and make it look good.

Of course, my parents ended up going into business together. They were just kids in the seventies. Oh, gosh, they were hippies. I know my mom has stories, of course, of hitchhiking the country. We do not do that really today; there is Uber.

She hitchhiked the country. She also marched for women's rights and protested against the Vietnam war and went on to this endeavor called Nitro Feed with my father.

They had multiple acres of land out in Macomb County in Utica for this endeavor of theirs, this landscaping business that became the first tree spray company in Michigan.

In the winter when we couldn't landscape in Michigan, they would plow snow. My dad would plow the snow. The inside joke in my family was that my dad would wake up at any hour to the sound of the snow falling to make sure that people could get to work and that they could park in their parking lots. They employed a lot of people, and they had a lot of fun. Like folks were doing in the eighties and nineties, they were making a little bit of money.

Of course, my mom went into business with her sister. These are two female trailblazers. We always say that my Aunt Marcie is sort of the third parent and matriarch of our family. These two sisters are daughters of a woman who had four sisters and Italian roots that trace back to Cleveland, Ohio.

Interestingly, as I am making this address on the eve of my personal anniversary, my colleague, Congresswoman SHONTEL BROWN who hails from Cleveland, Ohio, and represents the 11th District of Ohio, and we call ourselves twin sisters because we share a birthday and we share a district number.

Then I say: My family came from Cleveland, in Mayfield Heights, in an old Italian neighborhood. Of course, this is something that sisters from the Midwest know about hard work and communication.

The business that my aunt and mother got into was communications. They were in advertising. And, again, a lot of hard work and trials and tribulations but a whole heck of a lot of fun transforming our State and the dialogue of healthcare and how women talk about healthcare, talking about menopause, mammograms, and things that were taboo in the nineties and that great awakening that we had around mental health.

So some of these life reflections of my family and the things that they exposed me to are something that is very humbling to share on this House floor.

I was born in Rochester Hills, Michigan. I like to say that I took my first breath of air from ZIP Code 48309 at the old Crittenton Hospital.

Of course, Rochester Hills' claim to fame is that is where Madonna, the singer, the 1980s phenomenon, was from. Her mother, Joan Ciccone, ran a small daycare that I attended as a toddler and a little bit into elementary school.

Again, family business, good Italian family business, and there are stories from the neighborhoods of friends, mothers, or parents who knew Madonna in high school. We, of course, remember Mrs. Ciccone picking up the phone and saying: Hello, Madonna. My brother, who doesn't like any attention, remembers one time that Madonna came to visit. He swears Madonna came to visit.

That was growing up in Rochester Hills, what was largely known as exurban, the suburbs outside of the suburbs. Now it is a little more populated and built up. My mother can certainly remember stories of sledding down Rochester Road before all the businesses moved in. Of course, I remember walking down Alston Street with my good friend, Rachel, to elementary school. She is my dearest—I like to call her my oldest friend but sometimes oldest feels disparaging, but she is my longest friend in life.

We would walk down Alston together, and there are a lot of funny stories about me being fearful of her family dog who barely could move and me not wanting to ring her doorbell.

The reason I share these personal reflections and these stories is that I certainly was not afraid to put my hand up and get involved in student activities and student governments or theater or performances or things like that, but I also share these stories because nothing in life is fully ever determined.

We know that we make our own destiny. My running for office eventually one day in life was not something preordained. It was not a given that I was going to come to Congress. I know so many of my colleagues through so many of their personal trials and tribulations join me in sharing this message to the next generation which is that life is uncertain and growing up is tough.

This new generation, our Generation Z, who is racked with the unique challenges of this century, a global pandemic—we just saw the headline this morning about test scores still being

behind—and certainly the challenges of climate change and gun violence, that compels us. When you are young and you are still dependent and you are maybe just getting out of those teenage years, Mr. Speaker, into early adulthood and wondering how you are going to make your way in the world, it is important to recall and to look to those who have done what no one called to ask them to do, but just what they felt compelled to do and to make a difference.

I firmly believe that we still need to believe in this place. We still need to believe in this institution. I could be doing something else this evening, but I have really believed and thought that it would be important to give this address in the House CONGRESSIONAL RECORD spoken verbally. Sometimes you can write these addresses and just submit them for the RECORD, but I wanted to take the time to speak these words.

It just so happens that speaking these words on this day, June 21—the solstice—is really actually quite remarkable. The solstice is a day that comes twice a year. It either comes when it is today when the sun is reaching its maximum destination or its maximum declining and the longest or shortest day of the year. My mother was actually born on the shortest day of the year. Today is the longest day of the year, and, of course, then it begins the reaching toward the shortest day. It also marks summer.

I haven't spent too much time outside today here in Washington, D.C., in the Nation's Capital. It has been a very unusual late spring, now first day of summer. It is cold in Washington. It is 60-some degrees and raining. One reaches for a shawl on weather like today.

I have a friend back home in Michigan whom I asked: What is the weather like at home?

He shared that it is 80 degrees in my beloved Michigan, and it is the perfect ringing day to summer.

It is, of course, also unique and special in all of these hyper-partisan times to reflect on the solstice and the marking of summer because it is man's and human's experience in nature and this recognition that something exists beyond us and something that got done right in Washington a long time ago is the House on the hill, the Capitol on the hill, it is surrounded by nature. It is surrounded by beautiful trees and green and the Mall that you can walk out on, Mr. Speaker, and go see the monuments.

Of course, some of us remember the wild fox that was scampering around. That was last term. We can see some wildlife.

I believe just as many who have been in this Chamber from centuries ago likely recognize the importance of the role that nature plays in our life.

The words of the poet William Wordsworth who was not an American but an English poet speak out:

I wandered lonely as a cloud
That floats on high o'er vales and hills,
When all at once I saw a crowd,
A host, of golden daffodils;
Beside the lake, beneath the trees,
Fluttering and dancing in the breeze.

I am not the only one who speaks poetry in this Chamber, of course. Mr. STENY HOYER, our former majority leader emeritus is one to quote Tennyson on occasion.

It is certainly quite grounding as people of this great country, and it is elected officials who use our words, who use our words to move, make change, and bring this Nation to a new place. Sometimes those words can feel contentious or bottled up on competition or trying to win something. In other times, the words can bring us together, the words can call upon us to reflect. The words can call upon us to look above and look at the beauty all around us even on a cloudy solstice-beginning summer day here in Washington, D.C.

□ 2015

As I have taken some time to reflect a little bit on my life—and I really can't tell you all how deeply humbling and somewhat uncomfortable it is to even talk about yourself in this body, this well of democracy.

I purposely chose to come to the center, the floor of the House, what I believe is the House floor, the center of gravity of our democracy.

When we have been waging great debates in the Congress over many years, I have long implored my colleagues to take it off cable news because that is somewhat filtered, and, of course, doctored.

Our journalists play a great role, but take your discourse to the well, to the floor of the House, to the center of democracy.

Engage in the great debate of this institution for Americans to see unfiltered. Somebody at the Juneteenth event in Huntington Woods pulled me aside, and they said, I am just so exhausted with how polarized it feels, with how partisan it feels. I can't take it.

I said, well, are you watching the news?

And she said, no, I am not watching the news.

I said, well, tune in to C–SPAN because maybe you can't come to Washington and join us in the gallery, but come to C–SPAN and watch your government in action.

Of course, sometimes there is tough debate. As we just saw with my colleagues passing the suspension bills, one that just passed unanimously, it is bipartisan. It is coming together to solve problems and coming together to make a difference.

I certainly do not ever seek to undermine or doubt the intentions of any of my colleagues, although on occasion, their approach may frustrate me.

We are all equal as duly elected Members of this Chamber when we come here to vote. Our Founding Fathers in the era of the Founders and those who maintained this institution, America, as a fledgling—and we are still a fledgling democracy, in my opinion.

Our country is about to turn 247 years old. We can look to some of the most ancient societies, the longest-standing countries in this world, this world that is also 4½ million years old, and wonder what they think and how they are looking to us.

Yet, we can look inward. We shouldn't exclusively look inward, but we can look inward and reflect that we have accomplished a lot in these 246 years; the governing doctrine of this very Nation that still determines how an individual like HALEY STEVENS can get to Congress every other year.

The incredible voting electorate of Michigan's 11th District, that is now comprised exclusively of the great Oakland County, in Michigan takes a vote. They take a vote, and they determine who is going to be their representative voice in the Congress.

That is why when we have the privilege of being here in Washington, and, of course, people come and visit—we had a great day, which I will share a little bit about our day in a moment.

When people come to Washington, and they share their needs, or when I am home in Michigan, so joyfully visiting the farmers' markets, visiting the small businesses, doing the manufacturing Mondays—I call them manufacturing Mondays, by the way.

I visit our manufacturers. I see the innovation, the continued hard work of our small businesses; men and women who are dedicated to the production value of this Nation, made in the USA, something that is demanded and called for throughout the world.

It is something that I am so ever committed to as an elected Representative and as a former Obama administration official and as somebody who once worked in a manufacturing research and development institute.

Today, to share with anyone who might be watching, and to just give a glimmer of what happens in a day for a Member of Congress, but there's so much jammed in a day that it is, again, a real privilege to be able to share and speak from this well of the House floor about what occurred today.

I went to my beloved Committee on Science, Space & Technology markup. We marked up three great bills on fire safety, on the utilization of a mist for fire safety, and construction and management standards for rebuilding after fires.

We are saying the words climate change in the hearing, in the markup. We are saying the words climate change. We are recognizing. These are bipartisan bills.

Again, you might recall that I am a Democrat, and I am in the minority party, so I am at the whim of the chairman from the Republican Party for the Committee on Science and Technology.

Yet, there we sit, chairman and ranking member and participating members of the committee marking up bipartisan bills.

Of course, I spoke exuberantly on behalf of the bills and am looking forward to their being passed through committee tomorrow.

We take our votes in committee, and then we are going to have a hearing on artificial intelligence, which is certainly a topic that has motivated and compelled the work of the Committee on Science and Technology ever since I joined the Committee on Science and Technology in my first term in Congress.

I am very fortunate to have served as the vice chair of the committee when we were in the majority and the chair for the Subcommittee on Research and Technology.

Folks might recall that when I helped lead the Congress through the passage of the CHIPS and Science Act, industrial policy for this great Nation. Let's make semiconductor microchips in this Nation again because we innovated these things, and we let some people beat us at our own game for a little bit.

Then the pandemic hit, the tide rolls out, and we don't have enough chips. We decided to make chips in this country again by investing $50 billion that since the passage and signing of the bill in August of last year, $50 billion has already beget $200 billion of private sector invest.

Astronomical job creation, supply chain value for my State of Michigan, and it is enormously exciting that we got that bill done.

I am so thrilled to have been a part of that committee, but that was last year's activity. Of course, we carry the words of the things that we have done into today.

As I was marking up the bills in committee, I was reflecting on the bipartisan achievement of the CHIPS and Science Act last term, and we have more to do on that. I will certainly get to that in a moment.

I also had the privilege of sitting down with a—I believe he calls himself a president of a company. I don't know if he would want me sharing this, but of course, I am sharing it. He did come to visit me.

He runs this company called Qualcomm. They are in this chips business. I think this executive was in Washington today.

Well, he knew I was involved with this CHIPS Act, but they wanted to share about this competition that we are in with China and the Chinese Communist Party. This is something that I am very keen to as a Representative of Michigan and as someone who served in President Obama's administration as the chief of staff on the U.S. auto rescue, the initiative that was responsible for saving General Motors and Chrysler from liquidation and countless, hundreds of thousands of Michigan jobs and certainly millions throughout this country.

We know the meaning of being able to make products here in the United States of America and sell them all over the world.

That is the deal, right. That is why the day after the first impeachment of President Trump in the year 2019, before the word COVID ever entered our verbiage—true story—we impeached President Trump.

It was really kind of a sad day in this country, and we didn't get justice that day. The following day we came back into this very Chamber after it being so contentious and so divisive and so emotional.

Democrats and Republicans came back into this Chamber and passed the trade deal, USMCA, a renegotiated NAFTA so that we could have a framework for competing in the 21st century with the rest of the world; strengthening by American content, plussing up our production value in a State like Michigan.

By the way, it was endorsed by the critical stakeholders from both organized labor, AFL–CIO, and UAW, to the automakers because 21st century challenges beget 21st century solutions of coming together.

Of course, I am still talking about today. I am still talking about why Qualcomm and maybe some other chip manufacturers are saying, hey, we need to be able to sell to the world, all right, and we can't cut ourselves off because some are chest thumping as we have done throughout this century and the century prior for war.

We can call ourselves hawks. I don't call myself a hawk on China. I am serious about the competition and the consideration and the frustrations with the CCP.

I know that the Biden administration is attempting to lead just as the administration prior and the administration prior did.

Of course, the dynamic has changed in the year 2023, but America has got to be in the business of de-risking, and America has got to be in the business of leading through smart power and strong power as an open, democratic, capitalist society that says every person can succeed and that we are working toward a more perfect union and the plight of equality and justice.

I founded the Women in STEM Caucus because we want to bring more people into the STEM field. It can't be acceptable that 5 percent of women in STEM careers are Black and Brown.

It needs to be more. It cannot just be a talking point. It needs to be a way of life. When we talk about expanding and when we work on expanding the middle class, which had been shrinking, we talk about uplifting people out of poverty.

It is not because anyone is looking to be endemically poor. That is not the case. My great mother has shared many times over her thoughts on this to me, which is that it is expensive to be poor.

It certainly is expensive in this day and age when you go to the grocery store and when you pay your insurance bill and when you pay your housing bill and when you pay to clothe and feed the kids and all of this and that.

It is like you can't catch a breath. We are being squeezed. Instead of finger-pointing, we need to be committed to the creation of good jobs.

Good jobs means selling American-built, made, innovated, shipped products to the world. You can't cut us off. It is not going to work, right. The automakers will tell you that as well. The suppliers will tell you that.

We need to be realistic. I am not going to overlook what has gone on with Russia and Ukraine because I have been battling Putin since I got into Congress, before I was sworn in.

Paul Whelan, the Novi resident in his fifth year in a Russian prison, the canary in the coal mine for the lawlessness that Putin has pursued on a global scale with this unbelievably outrageous, illegal, ongoing war in Ukraine.

Russia isn't China. We were able to decouple. We brought the West along with us. We are having the conversation on energy security and what we need to do.

I am pragmatic and I am realistic about that. I am proud to have voted for the Inflation Reduction Act, otherwise known as the largest climate bill in history, clean energy incentives, which are unbelievably impacting Michigan's economy right now; making batteries, seeing our manufacturers rise as they do over and over again to the charge of our time.

□ 2030

I mention Mr. Whelan today because his beloved dog Flora, 15 years old, as announced by his brother, has passed. So as Whelan is in prison, we just passed the resolution calling on the Russian Federation to release Whelan, condemning it. He will come home. I will not lose hope. I stand by his family every day on this. He will come home, but he is not coming home to his dog.

These are some of the things that have happened today.

The other thing that happened, which was really quite profound, and I think I am allowed to show a prop, is that we held a ceremony honoring the debut of the postage stamp of the Honorable John Lewis. It was incredibly moving.

Speaker MCCARTHY had a reception afterward in the Rayburn Room. We had biscuits and conversation. The minority leader of the Democrats, the very eloquent and brave leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES, spoke, as well. Mr. Lewis' former chief of staff remembered him.

It was such an honor to be in one of his favorite places in the Capitol, Statuary Hall, seeing the new postage stamp for John Lewis, a man I was so privileged to serve with in his final term in office in the 116th Congress and to be there with so many of my colleagues.

Of course, some other things happened today. We took more votes on

the House floor. Bizarrely, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle censured—we are still trying to figure out what censuring means—but they have condemned my colleague from California, Mr. SCHIFF. It was really quite emotional for some. I mean, I don't think people were tearing up, but it was emotional because a good portion of us serving in the 118th Congress were here on January 6, 2021, and we would just like to have some basic agreement about facts, right?

Look, you can't dwell and dwell, but we have to have some basic agreement of facts that those who are seeking to censure, many of them—and I do not speak disparagingly—I don't think any of them really joined in the effort to condemn a man in the Oval Office who, as Commander in Chief, watched this Capitol, a branch of his government, be attacked.

You take an oath as the Commander in Chief to protect and serve. I am not out here on what to some is known as or dubbed a witch hunt. I am here for the truth. I am here for an honest conversation.

Of course, I am also here to make sure that we put into place the policies that lead to good and great job creation, good and great futures, because one thing that I have seen campaigning out in the field in these incredible neighborhoods that comprise Michigan's 11th District is that people are busy, and they often do not have time for the blood sport of politics. They are relying on a government that needs to make sure that they are succeeding and getting out of the way to make sure that they are succeeding by putting into place policies that build toward a more perfect Union.

This is what fires me up. This is what motivates me in the charges of our times. I know so many who do engage in the civil discourse and the public discourse and show up at townhalls and show up at community meetings, those who have become a part of the activist organization Moms Demand Action, calling for more commonsense gun safety legislation.

Outside my office in the Rayburn Building, I have decided because of my frustration over and outrage of gun violence in this country that I have known my whole life, and even my parents have known in ways that have been unimaginable—and I say ''my parents'' as in their generation. Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated. My father, who was also an educator, was doing his student teaching in Pontiac, Michigan, at Bethune Elementary when Martin Luther King, Jr., was taken from us, as were John Lennon, JOHN KENNEDY, RFK. President Reagan was shot.

Is this part of some sort of dramatic story of our Nation, or is this a problem that we must fix?

Outside of my office are now the orange ribbons that have marked every mass shooting just this year alone, and I am running out of space on the wall for the ribbons. I am running out of space. We are almost at 300. If you choose to feel, it is unimaginable.

I am on the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party, and I don't want America to appear weak, but this is not happening in China.

When we met with our counterparts in the British Parliament, they looked at us and said: We had 40 people die from guns—4–0, not 40,000, 4–0 in the last year. We are at tens of thousands. This is human capital.

We can talk about gun violence and talk about the opioid epidemic, and we can talk about people dying from auto accidents, and certainly the million people we lost from COVID–19, and say every life matters, and we have to be committed to preserving life's existence. We have to be committed not from a place of despair or frustration, but from a place of motivation and dogged determination that we will address and fix the scourge of gun violence in America.

It is clear that shame is not working. Calling out and calling out is not working. Presenting the facts isn't working, but what will work, in my opinion, is the arc of time.

Standing here as a woman, as I mentioned at the beginning of this address, the first woman to represent Michigan's 11th District, it took 100 years to get suffrage achieved, to address the enfranchisement, enfranchising women to be able to vote, when Congress had the most number of women ever in history serving in its Chambers, both the House and Senate.

Now, mind you, I want to concede this: We haven't even ever had 500 women total yet in the whole history of the body. In the 247 years of America's existence, we have not had 500 women yet serving in the Chamber, but we had over 100 in the year 2019, for that term, 2019 to 2020, marking 100 years of women's suffrage.

Of course, in 1920, when women's suffrage was achieved, you look back and squint because 1848 was Seneca Falls. How many women who were at Seneca Falls got to live to see their right to vote?

I reflected on my colleague who we honored today, Mr. Lewis. His words that we go back to so many times as a Democratic Caucus ring forward in this plight to ban assault weapons, to pass universal background checks, to stop gun violence in America, to change our culture, which I firmly believe we do by passing laws, not by seeing children in Sandy Hook taken from us and not doing anything.

Mr. Lewis' words ring out: ''Do not get lost in a sea of despair.'' Let me say that again: ''Do not get lost in a sea of despair. Be hopeful. Be optimistic. Our struggle is not the struggle of a day, a week, a month, or a year. It is the struggle of a lifetime.''

Think of the women at Seneca Falls. Think of our country recognizing and celebrating the second anniversary of the now-official Federal holiday of Juneteenth that marked the end of slavery in this Nation. Think of these long trials and tribulations that our young country has gone through.

Before we were even erected as a nation, 400 years of slavery, and only 158 years since it ended, something that was debated in this Chamber.

Can you even imagine today? Then think of in the 21st century Mr. Lewis' words. ''It is the struggle of a lifetime. Never, ever be afraid to make some noise and get in good trouble, necessary trouble.''

Why take to the floor of the House to speak these words? Why take to the floor of the House in recognition of a personal milestone and the achievements that we have made on behalf of Michigan's 11th District? Why take to the House floor during Pride Month, Equality Month?

I remember coming here in one of the first floor speeches I made for marriage equality and fairness, letting people just love who they want to love and be who they are. We have made so much progress that now it has become another targeted issue for those who do not agree. They are trying to twist it on its head.

I have so many colleagues this evening at the Equality PAC celebration honoring Speaker Emeritus NANCY PELOSI, one of the original trailblazers in this body for LGBTQ rights, and we are still going to have the joy and the pride that comes with Pride Month because love is louder and joy is more inclusive.

Of course, in Michigan, we are delightfully blessed with the first statewide elected openly gay official, Ms. Dana Nessel, our attorney general, who alongside the speaker pro tempore of the senate, Mr. Jeremy Moss, one of Oakland County's finest, they declared loudly this month in Michigan that we are the gayest State in the Union and that all are welcome in Michigan because, again, we thrive when everyone succeeds.

Of course, for some, this may not be your words or your declaration, but I speak for so many. I speak for Ferndale. I speak for affirmations. I speak for those who are watching and listening and wondering what they are going to do with their lives and what it means.

I represent and speak for disabled individuals and folks who I am fighting for on the Education and the Workforce Committee to fully fund IDEA so that our school districts do not need to rob Peter to pay Paul, so that we can properly educate every student in this country regardless of ability. That is the purpose of public education.

If you want something else, you can pay for it and go do it, but gosh darn it, we want everyone to have access to a good, quality education. That is what pays dividends to our country. That is what pays dividends back into our Treasury. Speaker PELOSI once shared

that, and I certainly join her in recognizing that point.

□ 2045

Cost, indebtedness, hard work, how to get ahead, how to catch our breath, and how to remain optimistic.

Sometimes it feels, to the outside world, maybe because they are not watching C–SPAN, and they are only watching the news that flies off of anger politics or divisiveness or red meat, but so much gets done here.

Now, in my fifth year here, I have mentioned a couple of times I founded the Women in STEM Caucus. I also founded the Plastic Solutions Task Force, alongside my colleague, KIM SCHRIER.

I formed the Democratic Manufacturing Working Group, alongside leader JIM CLYBURN, the great statesman from South Carolina, showcasing delivery and dedication to the manufacturing economy of America. Of course, I am also working on the bipartisan Manufacturing Caucus, alongside a colleague from Ohio.

I passed my first bill within my first year in Congress, the Building Blocks of STEM Act. It was signed on Christmas Eve. I wasn't at the White House for the signing, but it got signed. It was about STEM equity, making sure that more girls and girls of color can get included into the STEM field.

Will our work ever be done in this Chamber?

I hope not, because democracy thrives when people choose to participate in it. Democracy thrives when people choose to tune in during the middle of the week, on a rainy solstice day, maybe to listen, maybe to think, maybe to input. The tens of thousands of correspondence letters that we reply to in my office, the people writing in.

The ideas that come from knocking on the door in our neighborhoods. The Alleviating Intergenerational Debt Act that I introduced because I knocked on the door of this incredible family in Hazel Park, and mom and dad introduced me to their kids who were going off to Michigan State.

Dad said, HALEY, it is really expensive. I said, I know, college has gotten unbelievably expensive. And we are applying for financial aid. He said, you know, HALEY, it's outrageous, we didn't qualify for financial aid. I am a UAW worker. My wife here is a UAW worker. I have $90,000 student loan debt myself as a parent and I don't qualify for financial aid. Why is that?

So I went back, with a very hard-working member of my staff from Oakland County, Sammi Goldsmith, and we looked at this very diligently, and we found that this is a loophole in the financial aid formula.

So we introduced legislation to change it so that that family's daughter doesn't have to have the debt that dad has. Commonsense solutions, expand Pell grants, expand access to apprenticeship training programs, showcase our unions which allow you to earn as you learn.

There is so much to be proud of, by the way. So I am not just hemming and hawing. I am feverishly working on the solutions for tomorrow. I am feverishly working alongside my colleagues, even on tough days or tough moments, like with what happened with the censure earlier today, we remain committed.

We passed the CHIPS and Science Act. We know we need to do more. We need to fund basic scientific research. I was so proud, as the chair of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, to pass the National Science Foundation for the Future Act, that doubled basic scientific research funding in this country. Except it was just an authorization; it wasn't an appropriation.

I don't know what the rest of this year has in store. I don't have a crystal ball.

We didn't default on our debt. Some who sought to undermine the fiscal integrity of our Union by allowing America to default on its debt, it didn't happen because a bipartisan group of commonsense lawmakers came together to say, no, we won't do that.

Now we have to pass a budget. The Federal Government needs to be funded by September 30. So as the end of the year comes up, we are going to talk about basic scientific research funding. We are going to talk about food assistance. We are going to talk about making sure that students can go to school and get access to food, free and reduced lunch, a guarantee.

John Kennedy, President John Kennedy, gave an address 60 years ago this month at my alma mater. He gave a speech about peace. Mr. Kennedy, President Kennedy, comes from a time when it feels like there were fewer spoken words. There were certainly less tweets. There was certainly less cable news. Those words and the quotes, they carried movement. They carried action. I think sometimes that is what feels so frustrating about dealing with this scourge of gun violence. It is also Gun Violence Prevention Month here in June. We can give the best speech. We can write the most eloquent, smartest tweet. We have made some change.

We passed a bipartisan bill to award funding to States that have passed red flag laws, extreme risk protection order laws. Michigan just did it, under the leadership of our great Governor, Gretchen Whitmer, in the wake of tragic shootings at Michigan State and at Oxford and the nearly everyday gun violence in too many neighborhoods across Michigan. So we did pass that law.

Again, words, the words that I go back to, the words of Mr. Lewis, to not despair, to be optimistic, because to be optimistic is to stay active. It is to stay engaged. It is to stay agitated. It is to stay feverish toward the work that we must do.

Yes, I will speak until my throat runs dry because this moment and this activity, and my commitment to this democracy and being afforded this time in this Chamber is too serious to pass it up.

But Mr. Kennedy, 60 years ago this month, you know, as we think of other trying times, the Bay of Pigs, avoiding nuclear war, engagements in Vietnam—a war that we did not win, that took too many American lives, and we are so proud of our veterans and those who served.

Mr. Kennedy stood before American University and he said: ''I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary, rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war—and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task.''

It is certainly important and symbolic to reflect on those words today and in these moments that are upon us as a Nation.

I look out and I use that as a rallying call for our work on the Select Committee on Strategic Competition between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party, how to bolster American manufacturing, American competitiveness, how to strengthen southeastern Michigan and Oakland County, under the leadership of Dave Coulter, someone I am so proud to work alongside.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 40 years of unimaginable innovation and activity that has taken place in this Nation: In 1983, Sally Ride is the first woman into space. 1985, has Microsoft Office first hitting the stage. 1991, is the time when the world wide web hit our keyboards.

I remember my mother and my aunt taking me to a meeting. What is a website? If only we could imagine what we would be in now; smartphone devices connecting us at rapid speed. The way in which humanity evolved and changed and then yet again, as technology drives us to be together. The elixir of our alive experience here on planet Earth, and as Americans, through love, through connection, and through ability. Those things don't change. The meaning of family doesn't change. The meaning of friendship doesn't change.

In the 1980s it was a race with the Japanese. Now it feels as though it is a race with the Chinese. Open society, willingness to change, commitment to action.

Ben Franklin once said: ''A long life may not be good enough, but a good life is long enough.'' May we all commit to living the good life. May we, as public servants, commit to goodness, to one another, to our fellow Americans, and to this unbelievable and magnificent trajectory our beloved Nation is on.

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

OUR NATIONAL DEBT, OUR SPENDING, AND OUR DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I will take the next half hour to talk about the national debt, our spending, and our deficit.

Somebody asked how big is our national debt?

Well, Federal debt is $32 trillion. The $32 trillion mark arrived 9 years sooner than pre-pandemic forecasts had projected, reflecting the trillions of dollars of emergency spending to address COVID–19's impact on our sluggish economy.

How much does each individual owe?

According to the U.S. Treasury's official figure for the debt, the Federal Government is at $32 trillion in debt or, more precisely 32—well, I am not even going to go into it. It is just a lot of money, and it equates to $95,660 for every person living in the U.S., or $242,570 for every household in the U.S. This is an existential threat to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), my good friend, to talk more about the big picture of the debt, then we are going to talk about some specific issues.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to focus more on discretionary, just so people understand. The vast majority of our spending is on autopilot, but a lot of us have no understanding of how much the wheels have come off just this year, and this is so important to start the process.

I am going to start with a board, and please understand, if this were May 2022—you remember how long ago that was? Like a year. We expected the U.S. deficit for this year to be $980 billion. Okay.

So where are we at today? One year later, we are functionally pushing $1.18 trillion. We functionally have doubled the borrowing this year.

What happened? Healthcare costs went up dramatically. Interest is up dramatically. Tax receipts are down.

What happens if some of the protections we have for the next couple of years are off? Remember, that $1.8 trillion that we are projected to borrow in this fiscal year, we weren't supposed to hit that for almost 8 more years.

The wheels are coming off, and if you are on the left and you care about this program or that program, understand, there is no money. You should help us go at every dollar here.

So we get into this game of saying, oh, but that is discretionary, discretionary is fairly flat. It really is just not true. It is a lot flatter than Medicare, Social Security, all of those. But those are earned benefits that are about our aging population.

We need to walk through a sense of reality, and you are going to get the punch line here in a moment.

This is just sort of the breakdown for this year's borrowing, this year's spending and discretionary and what the 2018 baseline is. You will notice the growth in spending.

Here is the punch line. We were only supposed to have borrowing of about $1.8 trillion this year.

□ 2100

Let me rephrase that. We were supposed to have spending equal to only about $1.8 trillion for both defense and nondefense. Do you remember the borrowing number? It is about $1.8 trillion.

Every dime of defense and what you think of as government is living on borrowed money this year. You got to understand, when you get the folks saying, well, let's just cut this program or that program. You got to cut every dime of defense and what you think of as government, whether that be the FBI, foreign aid, the park service, our salaries, Congress, the White House. It is all on borrowed money now.

Here is the other thing we need to make part of our discussion: We can't play this game of we are going to talk about discretionary and we are only going to use the last 2 years as our baseline. We had a big plus-up, substantially during COVID. So let's actually use a true linear line. Let's go back to 1990, adjust the math for inflation.

Discretionary is up 154 percent. If you go from 1990 and do inflation, all that growth of inflation, but now we are at 154 percent growth. Defense is only up 35 percent since 1990 if you adjust for inflation.

The wheels are coming off, Mr. Speaker. I am terrified because, at this rate, if some of the predictions are true a decade from now, just the interest on U.S. sovereign debt, if we stay at these interest rates, could be approaching $2 trillion a year, more than all discretionary, defense, nondefense included. That is the future we are handing to America right now. It is time for great discipline.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) to ask some questions.

How much do we currently pay to service the debt?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. The number has actually been going up fairly dramatically. In the first 7 months just interest carry, just because the increase in interest, went up $108 billion.

Mr. BUCK. On an annualized basis, what is that number, a ballpark?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Actually, if 400, I think, was the baseline number, with the higher interest rates and the amount of borrowing, you could be approaching 600.

Mr. BUCK. So $600 billion?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. There are also other things going on. People don't realize, it is not just the $2 trillion of excess spending that has to be borrowed, how much of the debt has to be refinanced all the time.

You actually have, let's say, $26 trillion of publicly borrowed debt. There is something called a weighted daily average. Half of that has to be refinanced functionally every 5 years. Basically that means every year you are bringing $2 trillion and plus you are bringing a few trillion additional to market, and now those new issued bonds are at the new much higher interest rates.

Mr. BUCK. My question is this: How many jet fighters do we get for that money?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Interest is killing us.

Mr. BUCK. Let me ask another one: How many submarines, nuclear submarines, do we get for that money? How many people get help, food for pregnant moms? How many do we feed with that money?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Congressman BUCK, one of the best ways to think about this—the budget window we are working on in functionally about 9 budget years, interest is going to be more than all of defense. That is already baked into the cake.

Mr. BUCK. All right. We are going to start talking about what we can do about that. I thank my friend from Arizona for joining us tonight and giving us that advice.

Folks, you may have heard of Dave Ramsey. He has helped millions of Americans get out of debt, turn the corner on their finances. May have read one of his books or taken one of his classes.

The key to his get out of debt programs, he offers simple steps. These are reasonable measures that anyone can take. The first step he often recommends is to make a list of your current debt and your current spending. The actual first step is to decide that you are done being in debt.

Our Nation's debt stands at, as we just heard, almost $32 trillion. We need a Dave Ramsey program here in Washington, D.C. The United States debt stands at $32 trillion. Every year, the Government Accountability Office puts together reports on wasteful spending and ineffective programs in the Federal Government. These reports, if read and applied, would help us streamline government programs, reduce waste, minimize fraudulent payments, create oversight, and greater accountability to taxpayers.

As we head into the appropriation season, I am asking all of my colleagues to join with me and others who have read these roadmaps from the Government Accountability Office with recommendations for how we can reduce Federal spending, save taxpayer funds, and most importantly, start paying down the debt.

Here are some key findings from the General Accounting Office. In 2022, 18 Federal agencies reported an estimated $247 billion in improper payments. Over the past two decades, the Federal Government wasted $2.4 trillion on payment errors. Federal taxpayers pay $2

billion each year maintaining empty government buildings. GAO identified $552.7 billion spent on duplicate and redundant programs in 2022.

If our Nation is ever going to dig its way out of this debt, we will have to start tackling wasteful spending. That includes going after the improper payments made in error.

What is an improper payment? First, fraud. An individual or business willfully stealing from the government. Secondly, mistaken identity. Payments going to the wrong person. Third, payments going to a deceased person.

Here is just one example: More than 47 percent of the payments to the Veterans Administration Department, particular program in the VA, made in 2022 were improper. Let me say that again: More than 47 percent. That is almost half of the payments in one program. The good news is that is an improvement because 5 years ago that number was at 100 percent of that program's budget. One hundred percent went to the wrong people and they are down to just 50 percent now. Maybe in 5 years, if they keep going at this rate, they will be down to 25 percent. Maybe not.

In 2022, just 18 Federal agencies reported wasting an estimated $247 billion on incorrect payments. That is just 18 agencies, not the entire government.

Our government also holds thousands of vacant, unused properties. We pay every year for lawn maintenance, electricity, security, energy costs for these unused properties. The Government Accountability Office estimates that we spend $2 billion each year just on maintaining these empty buildings.

Another major area of concern is redundant programs. In 2022 alone, the Federal Government wasted $552.7 billion on duplicate programs. Taxpayers receive no benefit for these redundant programs that create more inefficiencies and run up the costs needlessly.

Unauthorized programs are also an additional source of wasted funds. If Congress hasn't authorized a program, why is the executive branch spending taxpayer funds on it? There are over a thousand unauthorized government programs that Congress continues to fund without reauthorizing or reviewing these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) to talk about that more in depth and to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for holding this Special Order and talking about this very important subject.

The reality is, as we are on that tank from ''Indiana Jones'' that is going off the cliff, we are busy fighting on top of it, but the tank is still going over the edge.

One of the problem areas that we have is this payment of a half a trillion dollars a year—think about that—that we are giving to unauthorized programs. You can go to the Congressional Research Services and they will give you a full print out. You can get the full display of all of them and when those programs expired.

One of the oldest ones—and I will just pull it up here. I have to scroll through all of these programs, these hundreds and thousands of programs. This is one where the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction, Mr. BUCK, and I mention that because Representative BUCK and I both sit on judiciary.

□ 2110

It is the payment to the Legal Services Corporation. You know what that is. That is the public defender's office. The expiration of their authorization was in 1980, 42 years ago.

What is the amount of money that they were last authorized to spend? Undefinite, an undefinite amount. There was no cap on it.

That is what we have. We have everything from EPA, State Department, ATF. These are agencies and departments that haven't been authorized. Then we have a whole list of additional programs that have not been authorized, but we continue to fund them. Our own rule proscribes that.

The remedy for us immediately is, when those come up, at least under previous terms of Congress, we have been able to actually raise a point of order and get that pulled out, if we can.

Representative BUCK, that gives you kind of a background and an idea of what we are facing, which is part of our huge budgetary problem.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, let me ask my friend a question, if I may.

We talk about authorizing programs. How does Congress authorize a program?

Mr. BIGGS. You would authorize a program—like the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act. That is an authorizing program. It authorizes us to spend money, and then we go ahead and appropriate to that authorization.

Mr. BUCK. A committee would hold a hearing, would invite in administration officials, executive branch officials, and would review the effectiveness of the program. There may be an inspector general's report about a wasteful part of the program. There may be newspaper articles or other sources of information. You hold a hearing, and the staff would be investigating this before the hearing. Then, we vote to recommend to the whole House whether that program should be reauthorized or not.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes. I am not sure that I knew that detail because I don't think I have seen that happen since I have been in Congress.

Mr. BUCK. How long have you been in Congress?

Mr. BIGGS. I am in my seventh year. That is the point. If you want to authorize something, like the Judiciary Committee, they should be holding these types of hearings because it is just what you say.

The year that I got elected from Arizona, a famous national journal did a study and estimated that the Department of Defense was wasting $125 billion annually. Well, that is one of those things where you probably would want to bring it in. Actually, in this instance, the NDAA, those hearings on authorization, you would be talking about if there is really that much waste there and what we do to recover that waste and prevent it.

We just don't do enough of that in Congress. We are just so busy, again, like I said, trimming around the edges. We are not getting at the core of the problem.

Mr. BUCK. We have just identified the process for one agency or one program to be reauthorized. We are talking about 1,100 unauthorized programs that Congress needs to authorize before it appropriates money to them. That is not even including the 325 programs that will need to be reauthorized at the end of this year. We are going to be close to 1,500 programs, and over half of the discretionary budget will go to unauthorized programs.

Mr. BIGGS. That is why I support what I call the Buck plan. The Buck plan calls upon Congress, the majority in this case, in every committee to have a subcommittee that is looking at the authorization jurisdiction of that committee and then makes the recommendations, has the hearings. Let's do this right.

Transparency is important, but beyond that, the process is broken. If we are going to try to get a handle on our out-of-control spending, you would think we would want to fix the process as much as anything.

I commend Representative BUCK.

For those watching at home, both of you, Representative BUCK has put together this plan, has been championing this plan, and I am behind that plan all the way. I think it is something we must do. It should be part of any appropriations process going forward.

Mr. BUCK. I thank my friend for that compliment. I have really just stolen a lot of ideas from a lot of people and tried to put them together in one place.

One of the things that aggravates me the most about unauthorized programs—and I am so happy that you raised it and are talking about it—is that it really was a fraud on Members of Congress.

For example, with the Endangered Species Act, it was a problem with eagles and this chemical called DDT. It was thinning the eagles' eggs, and the eagles weren't reproducing, so we had a declining bald eagle population in the United States.

We passed the Endangered Species Act, but the promise to the Members of Congress is: We will review this every 5 years. This isn't going to go on forever, folks. When we take care of this bald eagle problem and a few other critters, we are going to be done with this program.

I think Ronald Reagan said that the closest thing to eternal life on this planet is a Federal program, and that is what we have seen. Congress doesn't bother reauthorizing these programs, so they just go on and on because we would have to actually make a tough decision if we were going to reauthorize these programs, amend these programs, or cut these programs. Nobody wants to make a tough decision. It is much easier just to make our grandchildren pay a huge debt because we are too lazy, too unfocused, to actually do our job.

Mr. BIGGS. We are too fearful because every program that gets created creates a constituency, and you have to look somebody in the eye and say that program is no longer necessary.

The ESA is a perfect example of that. It has basically run amuck. It is why California doesn't build storage facilities for water, which impacts the entire western half of the United States. It is why we had someone who wanted to stop any building in Arizona. They tried to get the Sonoran Desert tortoise to be declared an endangered species, but they had to stop counting when they got over 3 million of them. They said, well, that is not really an endangered species. That would have impacted the entire State because they are found everywhere in Arizona. It is an example of one of those eternal programs that you and President Reagan talked about.

Mr. BUCK. The Endangered Species Act is no longer used as a shield. It is now used as a sword, yet we don't authorize it. We don't hold hearings, and we don't examine the impact of the Endangered Species Act. Parts of it undoubtedly are good, but a large part of it is a program that needs to either be cut, amended, or certainly examined.

Mr. Speaker, I invite our good friend from Virginia, who has a wealth of information for Americans, to join us and tell us what he knows.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, that won't take very long.

I thank my good friend from Colorado, Mr. BUCK, for his leadership on this Special Order on this critical issue tonight.

One of the key responsibilities, if not the number one responsibility, of the House of Representatives is to protect the fiscal and economic health of the country and the government, at least our ability to meet our obligations, our ability to fund our priorities, our ability to borrow when necessary—not to the degree that we do today—in times of crisis.

I want to make a couple of key points, if I may. Before the pandemic hit, before the China virus reached our shores, our annual spending was about $4.4 trillion. Spending this year is projected to be about $6.2 trillion, so an increase of $1.8 trillion, or about 40 percent, over 4 years.

The most ambitious of the somewhat serious proposals in this majority Conference to deal with the spending or to cut spending this year in this Congress is to cut about $130 billion. That is the most ambitious of what I would say is serious that is getting any traction in this Congress—in other words, to cut from a projected $1.6 trillion of nonmandatory, discretionary spending to $1.47 trillion.

□ 2120

Think about that $130 billion, which is the ambitious plan. That is the stretch goal. It represents less than 10 percent of the increase in spending from pre-COVID to today over 4 years.

We have grown our spending in the discretionary spending by $1.8 trillion in 4 years, and yet we are only projecting to cut it or even suggesting to cut it by $130 billion.

Said another way, we are on track to have a deficit this year of somewhere between $1.5 trillion and $2 trillion. Revenues are down, spending is up. Again, the most ambitious, the stretch goal of the somewhat serious plans in this Congress is to cut spending by $130 billion. Less than 10 percent of the projected deficit.

If we got through the $1.47, we would retain 90 percent of the projected deficit this year. In addition to it crushing us from a fiscal future standpoint, it is unsustainable. As you know better than I, we are on track to hit some $53 trillion in national debt in 10 years, if we don't have any new emergency exceptional special spending, but just on the current track—unsustainable.

Our friend from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) talked about the interest on the debt and how that is growing, and it is just unsustainable. Even in the immediacy, the American people are getting crushed today by this spending.

The massive inflation we haven't seen in 40 years, a diminishing purchasing power by some 15–16 percent on average over the last 2 years. In other words, $1,000 2 years ago is worth $850 today. It is even worse in the essentials. Groceries are up much higher. Everybody needs to buy groceries. Utility costs are much higher. Energy costs in terms of gasoline at the pump, which is probably the biggest factor that impacts senior citizens, low-income, fixed-income, middle-income Americans, or anybody else. Housing costs are through the roof.

We have inflation crushing the American people. How have we responded to the inflationary costs?

We are crushing them with the massive increase in interest rates historically utilized to combat a hot economy to try to head off inflation, to cool the economy—that is the theory. I never really agreed with that theory, but that is the theory.

Instead, what we are doing, we caused the inflation, not from a hot economy, but we caused the inflation from the massive spending. What we are doing is this futile attempt to combat inflation by raising interest rates. We went from an average mortgage rate being about 3 percent a year ago to now 7 percent. That extra 4 percent—figure an average mortgage is $300,000 in today's prices. So, 4 percent of $300,000 is $12,000, divide that by monthly. The average mortgage is $1,000 a month more than it was a year ago. That doesn't even account for the higher costs in housing, utility costs, and the grocery costs. All of that is primarily a result of the massive spending that is just crushing the American people. It is crushing their purchasing power. It is crushing their ability for their kids or their grandkids to make a start, buy a home, establish themselves in their young career. It is a result of the disastrous policies by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BUCK for his leadership on this all important issue and keeping the attention where it belongs.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would love to ask Mr. GOOD a couple questions.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. No tough ones.

Mr. BUCK. As a fellow deficit hawk, you heard about the vacant buildings that the Federal Government owns. I think the most accurate number I have heard is 77,000 vacant or underutilized buildings that the Federal Government owns. There have been some estimates that it is a little bit lower than that, but anywhere in that range is absolutely incredible to me.

It costs approximately $2 billion a year to just keep those vacant buildings up to speed, whether it is the electricity, the security, the lawn maintenance, all those things—$2 billion a year. We also spend billions of dollars to house Federal employees in office buildings that are privately owned.

This has been going on for 10 years. The GAO has been reporting this to Congress. My question to my good friend—and I am not accusing my good friend at all—why doesn't Congress—this is the worst part of it—the GAO, the Government Accounting Office, is a congressional office. Why do we pay for reports to find out about the waste and then ignore the reports that we are paying for about how the executive branch wastes money? What is the answer?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we work for the American people, the GAO works for us, and by extension the American people. So 77,000 buildings approximately, as you mentioned, it costs a couple billion dollars a year to sustain those buildings, the maintenance of those buildings, operate those buildings, maintain them, staff them, whatever it might be.

What about the value of the 77,000 buildings?

Why wouldn't we sell those buildings and realize the revenue to the Treasury?

Not just the $2 billion a year of not having to maintain those buildings. Let's just say that the average value of that building is $100,000. Let's be real conservative, let's say it is a million dollars—77,000. What is that?

That is $77 billion worth of assets if the average building was worth a million dollars. If it is only worth $100,000 on average, that is $7.7 billion. That would be not much more than a rounding error, the way that we spend money in the trillions here. When you take that over time, it ends up to be a few billion here, a few billion there, and before long you are talking about real money.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be a great idea to tell the executive branch that when they get done selling 10 percent of these buildings or 20 percent of these buildings they will start seeing funding again?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not a perceived viewing audience.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, before talking about the main event of three issues, it occurs to me it has been a while since we really have addressed what should be the end to the Ukraine-Russian war.

In the past I have expressed frustration, and I still have this frustration as to why the Biden administration is not trying to work towards an end to the war? Eventually every war ends. The longer the war drags on, the worst it is for all involved.

Ukraine has the second lowest birth rate in the world. It is a tragedy for any country to lose its young people, but particularly for a country that has so few young people in the first place. Likewise, Russia has a low birth rate, and they also have a high emigration rate, in which people are coming to this country. I ran into one in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I know from spending time in the San Diego sector along the Mexican border, a lot of Russians have come across there. So you have two countries with a shortage of young people, and they are dying in a war. For humanitarian reasons we ought to end that war.

□ 2130

Furthermore, the war is very costly. Buildings are being damaged in Ukraine to a huge extent, and geopolitically, the Biden policy of letting this war drag on without sticking their nose in there at all for well over a year now drives China and Russia together.

It wasn't that long ago that we had over 1,000 McDonald's in Russia. I recently toured a factory in my district. They owned a similar factory in Russia which they had to sell off. What I took from that, there was a time in the relatively recent past when the United States and Russia had very good relations, the United States and Ukraine had very good relations, and I don't know why we couldn't get back there if this war ended quickly. It seems when you talk to the Biden people they don't care if it goes on for years.

Again, I make a plea to the Biden administration: See if you can look into doing what you can do to end that war.

Now we will look at three issues that I think all have the potential to destroy the country, and I think we need some clear thinking on all three.

First of all, let's look at the border. There has been a change in the way some people are entering the country. They are able to sign on to get entry to the United States, an app apparently, if they are coming in from Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Venezuela. It is because more people are coming in that way that it makes it more difficult to see how many people are coming in each month, and because it is now in two different places, we begin to lose track of the number of people coming into this country compared to where we were historically.

Let's look at, for example, where we were in May. In the most recent May, 227,000 people came across the border as what we refer to as illegally; a year ago it was 166,000; 2 years ago it was 74,000; and 3 years ago, under President Trump, it was 6,000. We have gone from 6,000 a month crossing in May three years ago to 227,000 crossing in this past May.

It is kind of a dramatic increase and something that should remain on the front page of our newspapers every day until this crisis abates.

Mr. Speaker, it is the same thing if you look at April. Now that we have the other numbers, in April most recently 211,000 people crossing the border; a year ago 187,000; 2 years ago 66,000; and 3 years ago under 6,000.

Again, we have gone from under 6,000 to 211,000. A dramatic increase in the number of people crossing the border. This is not a problem we can't deal with because we have to be bipartisan. It is always nice to be bipartisan, but this problem was solved 3 years ago, and now we have gone up by a factor of over 30.

As we have an increasing number of people crossing the border, we also have more unaccompanied minors crossing the border. People ought to be especially concerned when people who are 13 or 14 years old are crossing the border without parents or even say an aunt or an uncle. Now we are having about 6,000 to 8,000 unaccompanied minors crossing every month. Under the prior administration it was 500 to 1,000. There are a lot more young people.

There was a time when people on the other side of the aisle would be concerned about people crossing the border separately from their families. That was people who were separated for maybe 2 weeks because their parents had broken the law. Now we have 6,000 to 8,000 people every month being separated from their parents.

Who knows if they will ever see them again?

For minors, the lack of concern is stunning.

Recently there was an article in The New York Times that I think the administration to a degree has disavowed, but no matter whose numbers you look at, Mr. Speaker, the administration has lost track of tens of thousands of minors. They don't know where they are after they gave them to people to take care of them. We have lost track of tens of thousands of kids.

Particularly, we have a crisis in this country of human trafficking and sex trafficking that should be of particular concern to the administration. It should be of particular concern because people rarely come over here without the Mexican drug cartels signing off. We can only imagine that when these young kids work, sometimes third shifts in factories illegally, that they were sending money not only back home but to the drug cartels as well.

I talked to the Acting Labor Secretary about what she should do if minors who are coming are found crossing illegally or if minors are found working illegally. She refused to say how often they contact the parents. Which, again, I thought was horrible. If you were an inspector of a factory, Mr. Speaker, and found 15-year-old immigrants working there who shouldn't, wouldn't the first thing you would do would be to contact the parents?

Obviously.

The Biden administration doesn't do that. The Secretary of Labor will not be drawn into even commenting that we ever contact the parents of young people who are found here. We should always try to unite children with their parents.

Quite frankly, I even feel at the border if children come across with one parent that we should hold them up and look for the other parent. In the United States if parents are dealing with a divorce situation, in an effort to keep that family together, they sometimes try and say that one parent cannot move to another part of the country because we want both parents to participate in raising the children. I don't know why we don't do the same thing at our southern border.

On the flip side of letting everyone in, we are also taking our eye off of criminals who are not kicked out. Without a lot of hoopla in the newspapers, the Biden administration in their budget guesses that for the next 2 years we can anticipate about 29,000 people being deported. I think they might have computed it in a different way, but in his final 2 years under Barack Obama, we deported about 460,000 people. In one 2-year period under Obama, 460,000 were deported. Under President Biden, we have only 29,000 who were deported in a 2-year period. It is just like saying that we absolutely don't care what is going on here.

Of course, many deportations are caused by people here who are breaking

the law. People who are for open borders at least say: They are all such wonderful people. They are all so hardworking. What an asset to America.

The Biden administration is doing a pretty pathetic job even compared to his predecessors, including President Obama. He is doing a bad job of deporting people who break the law.

Of course, along with being soft on the border and letting everybody across, it inevitably means more people are bringing drugs across the border. In this country right now we have about 108,000 people every year dying of illegal drug overdoses. That is a crisis that America is not paying careful enough attention to.

As I have pointed before, we have about 57,000 Americans who died in the Vietnam war over 12 years. I am old enough to remember the Vietnam war. There were articles all the time about American troops dying. People were protesting about how many Americans were dying, and 57,000 people died in 12 years. It was a true tragedy.

We now have 108,000 Americans dying every year from illegal drug overdoses in this country largely because illegal drugs are flying across the southern border. Virtually nothing is being done in this budget to tighten up the border. Nothing is being done to prevent more people from coming here. The inevitable result is a further change in America as the people who come here may not have the traditional American values that we need to keep our Republic going. Not to mention, we will have people coming here who are taking advantage of our generous welfare system and people coming who are breaking the law and are not going to be deported.

That is the first issue that I feel that we really have to address.

The second horrible policy concerns the bizarre demands of this new transgender lobby. This past week I had quite an experience. I met with an 18-year-old who had doctors prescribe from 12 years old on testosterone and puberty blockers. At age 15, the wonderful medical establishment in our United States of America—I think primarily from the psychiatry wing of the medical establishment—decided to remove her breasts at age 15.

I don't care if someone went to medical school. Anybody with an ounce of common sense knows people change dramatically between when they are 15, 20, 30, and 40 years of age. The idea that we have people going to medical school—I guess that is why they talk about people with book smarts and common sense. Nobody with common sense, unless they are absolutely obsessed with greed and just will do anything to make money in a surgery would possibly remove the breasts of a 15-year-old girl. They are doing it at two hospitals in Wisconsin which is horrible. This gal happened to have it done in California. Now this poor woman wants to undo the damage, and she can't.

In Europe they are finding that puberty blockers may affect bones and brain health. Sweden found that 10 years after reassignment surgery the suicide rate was 20 times that of their peers.

Is that even really a surprise?

I could almost guess it on my own without reading the study.

□ 2140

That is what they are finding in Europe, which went down this path before this. In European countries, even their liberal, let's worship the doctor societies know that they made a mistake.

I think someone has to look at the psychiatric industry and give them some more supervision because they are doing horrible things that anybody with any common sense would know.

The other thing the Europeans found is something we should realize in this country, too. This is a much bigger problem than when I was a child, and nobody ever seemed to know about it. How is that possible? Well, it is possible because the more they talk about it in the press, the more they talk about it in the entertainment medium, the more self-righteous politicians talk about it, the more young people begin to play in their mind with the idea that maybe if they are a boy, they should be a girl, and maybe if they are a girl, they should be a boy.

This is what happened to the poor gal I met with. She was 10 or 11 years old, 12 years old. She was unhappy. Given all that is out there on the internet, she thought, well, maybe I am unhappy because I should be a boy, which is perfectly understandable if you are inundated with this option on television and the computer constantly.

This is what we have. We have a gender dysphoria crisis, and the crisis has been caused by all these doctors claiming it is a common thing. The more kids hear about other people going through it—they may read articles about it, as this gal did, or read about it on the internet. It sounds interesting. ''There are these experts saying I am unhappy because maybe I want to be a boy.'' That is what happens.

I hope the press is a little bit more responsible in the future about pushing this as an everyday thing. When the press begins to push it, when it gets out there on computer screens, people begin to read it and begin to say maybe it is them.

There are at least two Congressmen out there with great bills on this, one from Georgia and one from California. I hope we see these bills on the floor of the Congress here in the very near future.

My one criticism of the bills is they only ban this type of risky surgery under age 18. I don't know why we don't try to knock that up a little bit higher.

I know in this country, as a practical matter, we bar the sale of beer until age 21. I think this surgery seems a little bit crazy even for a 30-year-old.

I hope we see these bills on the floor soon. I hope before they get to the floor, the authors make an adjustment to the bills and knock up the age to at least age 21.

One other comment I learned reading about this situation and talking to someone who went through it is that part of the problem is we have these well-meaning, progressive people who egg on these people. They get on their Facebook page or whatever. They tell people who they don't even know how proud they are of them for doing these surgeries, how happy they should be now that they did these surgeries.

By popular culture acting as cheerleaders for these surgeries, what do you think you get? A bunch of young, unhappy people who want to be happier.

Every time someone sends you an email, sends you whatever comments, ''You are so brave, and I am so happy for you,'' you are encouraging these people to get these horrific surgeries.

A lot of the blame, I think, goes on the people who are not familiar with this, not familiar with the study showing a dramatic increase in suicides, not to mention people without any common sense. They egg these poor boys and girls on to get these surgeries.

I beg people who consider encouraging these people or flattering these people for what they are doing to please stop it. Familiarize yourself with the information and stop to think that by flattering and encouraging these people, you may be the one responsible for making these life-changing decisions.

I will wind up by saying I think we need more people looking at the qualifications of some of these psychiatrists who push this and why this whole profession has allowed this to careen out of control. I think we have to look at the role that profession is playing in our society.

I will blame President Biden a little for this. His administration is all-in on this transgender, sexual confusion agenda, which is leading so many people to be unhappy.

The fourth area that I would like to address tonight, I don't like to address it. I really don't like to address it because it is such an awkward area, but it has to be addressed because the President of the United States is obsessed with it, so I have to address it.

The final issue is the issue of racism. It is Joe Biden's favorite issue, as far as I can tell. Joe Biden talked about racism four times in his inaugural speech and white supremacy once.

He keeps bringing it up in his State of the Union speeches. Again this year, he inferred that policemen are racist, and we have to warn particularly little Black children about racist police.

The studies don't show it. The studies show, adjusted for crimes committed, if anything, it is the other way around.

Joe Biden, a White guy—I wonder what other people think of him—keeps getting up there and saying how racist

we all are, that we have a racism problem with police. Like I said, the studies show that that is not true.

What you can do, and I think people like Joe Biden have done, is intimidate the police into being afraid to act because they are in fear of being charged with racism. That is what you can do. You can make the police timid.

Of course, ever since we had this massive antipolice feeling in the aftermath of the events in Minneapolis a couple of years ago, we have had a dramatic increase in the number of murders. I think a lot of these murders have to be blamed on the timidity of the police, which is caused by this strong antipolice feeling that you are getting out of Joe Biden and his allies and the mainstream media, which I think also creates this antipolice feeling and causes the police to feel that they have to back off for fear they will be called racists or whatever.

Joe Biden again talked about white supremacy at Howard University, at their graduation. It was kind of a weird speech because I think normally in graduation speeches, you are dealing with the best and brightest in America. I know Howard has a very good reputation. You should have people leaving that stage with smiles on their faces, anxious to change the world and do wonderful things in the United States. Instead, we get President Biden showing up and saying what a racist society we have and creating, I think, a defeatist attitude for the people graduating there. I hope they got over Joe Biden's speech.

Joe Biden's Secretary of Labor—designated; she hasn't been confirmed yet—believes the country was built on white supremacy. She will not back off that statement, despite me asking her a couple of times to do so. The Secretary of Labor, who has something to do with all sorts of laws in this country, apparently believes our country was built on white supremacy.

The proposed Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff feels we should be capping the number of White officers in the military at 42 percent. I mean, I would think he would be primarily concerned about getting the best people in there. It is important we have the best military in the world.

Instead, we are going to have a bean counter who it sounds like is more concerned about where people's great-great-great-grandparents were born than what their qualifications are today.

A study found, I mentioned before, in Joe Biden's first 2 years, of 97 judges he appointed, only 5 were White men. Two of those were gay. This was in the aftermath of two Democratic Senators telling President Biden they were not going to confirm any more of his appointees if they were White men unless they were gay.

To what degree are our judges being picked as the best, or to what degree are they being picked with Joe Biden feeling there is something wrong with appointing a White guy for the job?

Those are kind of amazing numbers, aren't they? I am not a big fan of President Biden, and I would have guessed, if you would have asked me how many White men were in his first 97 judges, I would say, well, he is probably doing all he can to find people who aren't White guys, so it is only 25 or 30. Well, it is only five.

□ 2150

In his budget, he is asking that all of his agencies—Department of Defense, Department of the Interior, wherever—have new equity action teams. These pernicious new employees, I think, are going to run around and judge people solely by race or gender. Their goal is supposedly to look at diversity, which we will talk about in a second. Again, their goal is to follow down this path of all Americans are supposed to view themselves as a subgroup.

He tried to discharge debt of only farmers of color until the courts shot him down there. He is trying to add a new preferred class. All these topics are recent topics. We ought to discuss this issue before it goes any further.

Right now, there are a variety of classes when you fill out your Census form, when you fill out your EEO–1, which is a form that you have to fill out if you do business with the government. They break out if you are Asian, Pacific Islander, African American, Latin American, Native American.

They want a new class—and I think with a class comes preferences—for Middle Eastern and North African people. Again, I think we should have a public discussion here. I don't think Middle Eastern and North African people have been discriminated against or mistreated in America.

I assume most of the people, if there are benefits from this program, will come to people who just came here or are coming in the future. I haven't seen a lot of articles on that, but there should be a public discussion.

If somebody comes here from Syria, if somebody comes here from Algeria, should they get preferences in hiring? Should they get preferences if they found a business and are looking for a government contract? Should they get preferences if they want to get into medical school? That is what President Biden apparently wants, but I think we should have a public discussion on whether he gets away with it.

As an aside, I am not sure how Joe Biden feels the country is such a white supremacist country. I don't believe you can really judge people that are worth their happiness by the amount of income, but it is a number that is easy to judge. If you look online, most of the successful groups in America today are not of European heritage. The most successful are from India. Most Indians that I know came here and are wildly successful, although they came here without even knowing English—people from Pakistan, Philippines, Taiwan, Cuba.

Thomas Sowell wrote a book 40 years ago—so it is a bit out of date, but I can't find any more recent information—in which he claims that people coming from the Caribbean, the children of people who come here from the Caribbean, make more money than the average American. I guess he would be talking about people from Jamaica.

I suppose you would think of people, therefore, like KAMALA HARRIS' dad, who came here from Jamaica and wound up being a professor at Stanford. He did very well. I don't think he had a huge amount of experience with racism, becoming a professor at Stanford. I would think most professors would love to have a job like that.

Before we go that much further, I do think we should look at individual questions that should be answered. The first question is, right now, for the purpose of these government forms and who you hire, you kind of self-identify. We will pick Peru because I talked to someone from Peru the other day. If you came here directly from Peru, you are Peruvian and Latin American. If you have one of four grandchildren, they are also called Peruvian and are considered to bring a diverse attitude toward a job, or America supposedly should make up for past discrimination even though their ancestors may never even have been in America.

Is it 25 percent? Is it 12½ percent? The Senator from Massachusetts had one of these DNA tests, and she found out she was like 1/64th Native American or less than 1/64th, but she apparently felt that was enough to put on her forms and apparently add diversity to the Harvard Law School faculty. I don't know if she really thought that, but I guess she allowed herself to be labeled as Native American based on whatever that would be, one great-great-great-grandparent.

Is that the way we should go? Or should it be one out of eight? Like, if one of your eight great-grandparents is a certain type, is that enough to identify with that type? Now we have DNA tests, so we can look at these things.

I know in my district, there was a rumor. People questioned whether one person who owned a construction company was really a person of color like he claimed he was. He could have been because he could say he was one-eighth, and under the current law, that would be enough to get preferences. I think we ought to have that discussion.

The next question is, since affirmative action really began in the 1960s, the idea was to make up, I think, for America's past sins, so should you have to have ancestors in America who can at least claim to have been hurt, or can you get what amounts to special preferences if you just immigrated to this country, say, a year ago?

Right now, you don't even have to be a citizen. You can count on the government forms in which I think they view you more favorably if you have people from certain backgrounds, even if you were not in America for more than a couple of years. Should we require beneficiaries of these programs to be in America?

Were your ancestors slaves in America, or can you be like KAMALA HARRIS' dad and just have moved here from Jamaica, whether you had preferences or not? I don't know.

The next issue that we should talk about is how long this should happen. We began to have affirmative action in the early 1960s. I think it really kicked into effect in 1965 under Lyndon Johnson. There was a lesser program under John Kennedy.

We have had this program going for about 50 years. Obviously, they have added new groups that weren't included in the original number of groups. We have women in the mix now, too. How long should this program last with its government bureaucracy, with, in essence, government looking over people's shoulders, telling them who they have to hire for their company, that sort of thing? Another 10 years, another 100 years?

Thomas Sowell has written about affirmative action, so that is another issue that we will have to look at. We will return and talk about other issues after this evening. Not the least of which I think we should talk about is how certain people think since you are supposed to be bringing diversity to the table.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 30.—An act to authorize major medical facility projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 22, 2023, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–1284. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Faucets and Showerheads [EERE-2019-BT-TP-0021] (RIN: 1904-AE75) received June 15, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1285. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Testing Provisions for Air Emission Sources; Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2020-0556; FRL-8335-05-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AV35) received May 25, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1286. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; ID; State Board Composition [EPA-R10-OAR-2022-0753, FRL-10190-02-R10] received May 25, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1287. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Air Plans; 2015 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements; Clean Fuels for Fleets; California [EPA-R09-OAR-2022-0936; FRL-10470-02-R9] received May 25, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1288. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Sulfur Dioxide Regulations [EPA-R05-OAR-2022-0477; FRL-10516-02-R5] received May 25, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1289. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Second Maintenance Plan for 1997 Ozone NAAQS; Jersey County Portion of St. Louis Missouri-Illinois Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2022-0744; FRL-10682-02-R5] received May 25, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1290. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure To Submit State Implementation Plan Submissions for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards; California; Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin [EPA-R09-OAR-2023-0261; FRL-10932-01-R9] received May 25, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1291. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0448; FRL-10570-01-OCSPP] received June 15, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1292. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Idaho; Inspection and Maintenance Program Removal [EPA-R10-OAR-2023-0195; FRL-10612-02-R10] received June 15, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1293. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Disapproval of Clean Air Plans; Sacramento Metro, California; Contingency Measures for 2008 Ozone Standards [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0425; FRL-10618-02-R9] received June 15, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1294. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Revisions; California; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District; Oxides of Nitrogen [EPA-R09-OAR-2023-0087; FRL-10672-02-R9] received June 15, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1295. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Revisions; California; Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District; Oxides of Nitrogen [EPA-R09-OAR-2023-0092; FRL-10674-02-R9] received June 15, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1296. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sulfoxaflor; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0853; FRL-10967-01-OCSPP] received June 15, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1297. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glufosinate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2022-0014; FRL-11019-01-OCSPP] received June 15, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–1298. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of an interim rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2023-04; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR-2023-0051, Sequence No.: 3] received June 7, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–1299. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Prohibition on a ByteDance Covered Application [FAC 2023-04; FAR Case 2023-010; Docket No.: 2023-0010, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AO58) received June 7, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–1300. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's small entity compliance guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2023-04; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR-2023-0051, Sequence No.: 3] received June 7, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–1301. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Exemptions of Certain Plant-Incorporated Protectants (PIPs) Derived From Newer Technologies [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0508; FRL-7261-04-OCSPP] (RIN: 2070-AK54) received May 25, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Agriculture.

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. SMITH of Missouri: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4004. A bill to approve and implement the Agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States regarding Trade between the United States of American and Taiwan, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118–116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 529. Resolution relating to the resolution (H. Res. 503) impeaching Joseph R. Biden, Jr., President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors (Rept. 118–117). 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. TAKANO (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. BUSH, Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASAR, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEU, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. MANNING, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. MCCLELLAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. PELTOLA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 15. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, House Administration, and Oversight and Accountability, 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. SANTOS:

H.R. 4230. A bill to transfer the unobligated balances of amounts made available to the Internal Revenue Service under the Inflation Reduction Act to the Secretary of Homeland Security to secure the border; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. WATERS (for herself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 4231. A bill to provide downpayment assistance to first-generation homebuyers to address multigenerational inequities in access to homeownership and to narrow and ultimately close the racial homeownership gap in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 4232. A bill to provide a path to end homelessness in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. WATERS:

H.R. 4233. A bill to facilitate the development of fair and affordable housing, decrease housing costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 4234. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards under the Department of State's rewards program relating to information regarding individuals or entities engaged in activities in contravention of United States or United Nations sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KIM of California (for herself and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 4235. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to establish a wildfire technology testbed pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 4236. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to modify the areas of focus for centers of excellence at 1890 Institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 4237. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to specify requirements concerning the consideration of pecuniary and non-pecuniary factors; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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 Mrs. BICE (for herself, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HERN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COLE, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BUDZINSKI:

H.R. 4239. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to establish the Rural Innovation and Partnership Administration and to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish the Rural Future Partnership Fund to invest in the rural areas of the United States to achieve their preferred future while maximizing their contribution to the well-being of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees

on Financial Services, and 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. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 4240. A bill to require that opioid overdose rescue kits be located at public elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; 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. COHEN (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CARSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. STANTON, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CHU, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LIEU, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 4241. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 4242. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, to issue guidance on considerations for conducting clinical trials for psychedelic assisted therapy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4243. A bill to amend the consumer product safety laws to repeal the exclusion of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms from the definition of consumer product under such laws; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EZELL (for himself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 4244. A bill to adjust the definition of service in the uniformed services with respect to readmission requirements for servicemembers under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BARR, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. SANTOS):

H.R. 4245. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide for discretionary spending limits for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2029, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 4246. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize the use of COPS grants for recruitment efforts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 4247. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a task force on the California snowpack and flood mitigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself and Mr. SORENSEN):

H.R. 4248. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to reestablish the Driftless Area Landscape Conservation Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. LAWLER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. POSEY, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROSS, Mr. NEAL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. PORTER, and Ms. PETTERSEN):

H.R. 4249. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care and medical services to veterans and dependents who were stationed at military installations at which the veterans and dependents were exposed to perfluorooctanoic acid or other per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, to provide for a presumption of service connection for certain veterans who were stationed at military installations at which the veterans were exposed to such substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILEY (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LIEU, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4250. A bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by establishing appropriate limits on the federally compelled disclosure of information obtained as part of engaging in journalism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of Florida (for herself and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 4251. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study of the effectiveness of the Federal Government in carrying out its responsibilities under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to promote access to voting for absent uniformed services voters and an analysis of means for improving access to voter registration information and assistance for members of the Armed Forces and their family members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. VAN DUYNE, and Mr. EDWARDS):

H.R. 4252. A bill to clarify the requirements of authorized representatives under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 4253. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 307 N Goose Creek Blvd in Goose Creek, South Carolina, as the ''Lucille Simmons Whipper Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 4254. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to international organizations that advocate for sexual activity by persons who are younger than the domestically prescribed minimum age of consent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 4255. A bill to ensure that Foreign Service officers are evaluated and given opportunities for advancement based on their conformance to merit system principles, to require the review of Performance Improvement Plans during tenure and promotion appraisals of Foreign Service officers, and to eliminate the requirement for the inclusion of a public member on selection boards; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 4256. A bill to amend section 485 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require venue-specific heat illness emergency action plans for any institution of higher education that is a member of an athletic association or athletic conference, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H.R. 4257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude property and facilities located on prime farmland from certain credits relating to renewable energy production and investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS (for herself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H.R. 4258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a child tax credit for pregnant moms with respect to their unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. MOLINARO (for himself and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 4259. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to require notification with respect to individualized education program teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms.

ROSS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 4260. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an equitable Social Security formula for individuals with noncovered employment and to provide relief for individuals currently affected by the Windfall Elimination Provision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. PORTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 4261. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of peripheral artery disease screening tests furnished to at-risk beneficiaries under the Medicare and Medicaid programs without the imposition of cost-sharing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. FINSTAD):

H.R. 4262. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the online administration of the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 4263. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the label of a drug intended for human use to identify each ingredient in such drug that is, or is derived directly or indirectly from, a major food allergen or a gluten-containing grain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 4264. A bill to direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment to submit to Congress a report on incinerators and waste-to-energy waste disposal alternatives to burn pits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4265. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit a report about the effectiveness of the procedural safeguards used by the Secretary of Defense to protect classified information from insider threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4266. A bill to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to independently initiate civil actions to recover certain civil penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 4267. A bill to repeal the USA PATRIOT Act and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STRICKLAND (for herself, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. BUSH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CHU, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CASTEN, Mrs. MCCLELLAN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mrs. RAMIREZ):

H.R. 4268. A bill to authorize grants to eligible entities to pay for travel-related expenses and logistical support for individuals with respect to accessing abortion services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4269. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to conduct a study on the effectiveness of spending by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to provide technical assistance and compliance assistance in relation to heat-related illness; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARSON, and Mrs. RAMIREZ):

H.R. 4270. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to authorize State energy conservation plans to include programs to provide grants for planning, designing, and installing green roofs on elementary school and secondary school buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mrs. MCCLELLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Ms. WEXTON):

H.J. Res. 76. A joint resolution redesignating the Robert E. Lee Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery as the ''Arlington House National Historic Site''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.J. Res. 77. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the pardon power of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTOS:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution calling on the President to sign H.R. 2 of the 118th Congress, the Secure the Border Act of 2023; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROW (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SWALWELL):

H. Res. 530. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 21, 2023, as National ASK (Asking Saves Kids) Day to promote children's health and safe storage of guns in the home; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANDSMAN (for himself and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York):

H. Res. 531. A resolution directing the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives to immediately notify the full House of Representatives with respect to the names of the individuals who guaranteed Representative Santos' bail bond in relation to the indictment brought against Representative Santos in May 2023 by the Department of Justice, and submit to the House of Representatives an interim report on the investigation into Representative Santos not later than July 17, 2023, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H. Res. 532. A resolution third Reconstruction: Fully addressing poverty and low wages from the bottom up; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. MACE:

H. Res. 533. A resolution recognizing and commending the name change of the USS Chancellorsville to the USS Robert Smalls, in honor of the late Representative Robert Smalls, an extraordinary native of Beaufort, South Carolina, and his significant contributions to American history; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H. Res. 534. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the day of June 19, 2023, to commemorate and celebrate the 75th Anniversary of the Specially Adapted Housing Grant Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN (for himself, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HUNT, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. CRANE, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 535. A resolution expressing support for the designation of November 12, 2023, as ''National Warrior Call Day'' and recognizing the importance of connecting warriors in the United States to support structures necessary to transition from the battlefield; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

ML-34. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 125, urging the United States Congress to Adopt National Carbon Fee and Dividend Legislation; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. TAKANO:
H.R. 15.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
To prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SANTOS:
H.R. 4230.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
US Constitution, Article 1 Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
To transfer the unobligated balances of amounts made available to the Internal Revenue Service under the Inflation Reduction Act to the Secretary of Homeland Security to secure the border.

By Ms. WATERS:
H.R. 4231.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''
The single subject of this legislation is:
Provides downpayment assistance to first-generation homebuyers to address multigeneratiorial inequities in access to homeownership and to narrow and ultimately close the racial homeownership gap in the United States, and for other purposes.

By Ms. WATERS:
H.R. 4232.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''
The single subject of this legislation is:
To provide a path to end homelessness in the United States, and for other purposes.

By Ms. WATERS:
H.R. 4233.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''
The single subject of this legislation is:
To facilitate the development of fair and affordable housing, decrease housing costs, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:
H.R. 4234.
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 State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards under the Department of State's rewards program relating to information regarding individuals or entities engaged in violation of United States or United Nations sanctions.

By Mrs. KIM of California:
H.R. 4235.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.
The single subject of this legislation is:
To establish a wildfire technology testbed pilot program.

By Ms. ADAMS:
H.R. 4236.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
to modify the areas of focus for and expand the presence of Centers of Excellence at 1890s Institutions.

By Mr. BARR:
H.R. 4237.
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:
To amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to specify requirements concerning the consideration of pecuniary and non-pecuniary factors.

By Mrs. BICE:
H.R. 4238.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
The single subject of this legislation is:
Immigration

By Ms. BUDZINSKI:
H.R. 4239.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
Providing support for rural America economic development.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:
H.R. 4240.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
To require that opioid overdose rescue kits be located at public elementary and secondary schools. and for other purposes.

By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 4241.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Transporting Horses

By Mr. CRENSHAW:
H.R. 4242.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.
The single subject of this legislation is:
To direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, to issue guidance on considerations for conducting clinical trials for psychedelic assisted therapy

By Mrs. DINGELL:
H.R. 4243.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution.
The single subject of this legislation is:
Defective Firearms Protection

By Mr. EZELL:
H.R. 4244.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
To adjust the definition of service in the uniformed services with respect to readmission requirements for servicemembers under the Higher Education Act of 1965,

By Mr. GROTHMAN:
H.R. 4245.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Addressing America's debt

By Mr. HARDER of California:
H.R. 4246.
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 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize the use of COPS grants for recruitment efforts.

By Mr. HARDER of California:
H.R. 4247.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
To direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a task force on the California snowpack and flood mitigation.

By Mrs. HINSON:
H.R. 4248.
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:
To amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to establish a conservation initiative to reduce erosion and restore cold water streams in the Driftless Area of the Midwestern United States.

By Mr. KILDEE:
H.R. 4249.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The bill provides eligibility for Department of Veterans Affairs health care services to veterans and their family members who have specified conditions and resided at a military installation where individuals were exposed to PFAS. For disability compensation purposes, the bill also establishes a persumption of service-connection for specified conditions in veterans who served as a military installation at which individuals were exposed to PFAS

By Mr. KILEY:
H.R. 4250.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is;
To maintain the free flow of information to the public by establishing appropriate limits on the federally compelled disclosure of information obtained as part of engaging in journalism.

By Ms. LEE of Florida:
H.R. 4251.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; Article I, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a navy
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.
The single subject of this legislation is:
This bill requires the Comptroller General to conduct a study on the effectiveness of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 4252.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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:

This legislation clarifies the requirements of authorized representatives under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 4253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 307 N Goose Creek Blvd in Goose Creek, South Carolina, as the ''Lucille Simmons Whipper Post Office Building.''

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 4254.

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:

A prohibition on contributions to international organizations that advocate for sexual activity by persons who are younger than the domestically prescribed minimum age of consent.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 4255.

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:

To ensure that Foreign Service officers are evaluated and given opportunities for advancement based on their conformance to merit system principles, to require the review of Performance Improvement Plans during tenure and promotion appraisals of Foreign Service officers, and to eliminate the requirement for the inclusion of a public member on selection

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 4256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Student Athlete Safety

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H.R. 4257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

Single Subject Statement

The single subject of this legislation is:

Taxes

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 4258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

to provide a child tax credit for pregnant moms with respect to their unborn children.

By Mr. MOLINARO:

H.R. 4259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Education

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 4260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Social Security

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 4261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

health care

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 4262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Veterans' Affairs

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 4263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress has the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The Allergen Disclosure in Non-food Articles (or ADINA) Act would amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require labeling of major food allergens or gluten-containing grains on drugs intended for human use.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 4264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

The single subject of this legislation is:

this bill directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment to submit to Congress a report on incinerators and waste-to-energy waste disposal alternatives to burn pits.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 2

The single subject of this legislation is:

Directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study to assess the Department of Defense's ability to mitigate insider threats and the unauthorized release of classified information and systems.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize the Federal Trade Commission to independently initiate civil actions to recover certain civil penalties.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 4267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation protects civil liberties by repealing the USA Patriot Act and FISA Amendments Act of 2008.

By Ms. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 4268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The Reproductive Health Travel Fund Act would set up a grant program, authorized at $350 million per year for FY24 through FY28, to help ease the financial burden associated with traveling long distances to access safe and legal reproductive health care. Specifically, the bill would allow the Treasury Secretary to award grants to eligible entities to pay for travel-related

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill requires the Department of Labor to study the effectiveness of their heat-illness programs.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

The single subject of this legislation is:

Environment

By Mr. BEYER:

H.J. Res. 76.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Legislating

By Mr. COHEN:

H.J. Res. 77.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V

The single subject of this legislation is:

pardon power

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 16: Mr. SOTO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. STANTON, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 33: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 34: Mr. GARAMENDI and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 82: Mr. PETERS, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 253: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 294: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 369: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

H.R. 598: Ms. CROCKETT.

H.R. 615: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.

H.R. 663: Ms. PETTERSEN.

H.R. 782: Mrs. MCCLELLAN.

H.R. 790: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 802: Mr. OGLES.

H.R. 807: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 871: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 883: Mr. NICKEL.

H.R. 911: Mr. KEATING and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 934: Mr. KILEY.

H.R. 936: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 953: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 963: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 984: Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H.R. 1015: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. HINSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TRONE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. CARAVEO, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 1065: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 1147: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. HERN.
H.R. 1167: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1262: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
H.R. 1267: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1277: Mr. MURPHY and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 1332: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1351: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 1385: Mr. ESTES and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1399: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 1477: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. MOONEY.
H.R. 1511: Ms. ESCOBAR and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 1582: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1634: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1637: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1666: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1680: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 1719: Mr. CORREA and Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 1729: Mr. MCGARVEY.
H.R. 1750: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1763: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1776: Ms. PETTERSEN and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 1777: Mr. BOST, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. STEIL, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. FALLON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 1788: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1800: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1818: Ms. CARAVEO and Mr. EZELL.
H.R. 1823: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1824: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1839: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2385: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 2394: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2400: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 2407: Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. LANGWORTHY, and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 2550: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2567: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2584: Ms. ROSS and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 2630: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 2663: Mr. CASAR, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2742: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 2748: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2757: Mrs. MCCLELLAN.
H.R. 2766: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 2771: Mr. TIMMONS and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2803: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2855: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 2891: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 2940: Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 2955: Ms. BUDZINSKI and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 3008: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 3023: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LUNA, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3032: Ms. ROSS and Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 3033: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3034: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 3039: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 3046: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3131: Ms. MACE, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 3144: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3146: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 3148: Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 3159: Mr. NICKEL.
H.R. 3246: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 3249: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3381: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 3394: Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 3396: Mr. KILEY.
H.R. 3413: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 3448: Ms. WILD and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 3461: Ms. STANSBURY and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3468: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3499: Mr. KILEY.
H.R. 3503: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 3519: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 3539: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 3561: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mrs. BICE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 3563: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 3576: Mrs. RAMIREZ.
H.R. 3656: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 3702: Mr. TRONE, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 3713: Mr. SORENSEN.
H.R. 3714: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 3723: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 3755: Mr. BURCHETT.
H.R. 3773: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3774: Mr. FALLON, Mr. LANGWORTHY, and Mr. PFLUGER.
H.R. 3809: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3825: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 3843: Mr. VAN DREW and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 3847: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 3865: Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3873: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 3882: Ms. TITUS, Mr. BALDERSON, and Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3887: Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
H.R. 3894: Ms. NORTON, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3910: Mr. STEIL.
H.R. 3922: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3928: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3934: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 3947: Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. MILLS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. MAST, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 3970: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 3982: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3985: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3989: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 3995: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 3996: Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4007: Ms. PETTERSEN.
H.R. 4032: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4070: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 4077: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4083: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 4088: Ms. PETTERSEN.
H.R. 4122: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 4125: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.
H.R. 4144: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.
H.R. 4175: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 4196: Mr. MOONEY.
H.R. 4201: Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 4212: Mr. EVANS, Mr. FITZGERALD, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. STEIL.
H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CARSON.
H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BROWN, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WEXTON.
H. Res. 81: Mr. LYNCH.
H. Res. 259: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H. Res. 488: Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. SALAZAR.
H. Res. 492: Mr. MCCORMICK.
H. Res. 497: Mr. KEATING.
H. Res. 503: Mr. MILLS.
H. Res. 505: Ms. OMAR.
H. Res. 516: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. VEASEY.
H. Res. 527: Mr. LAWLER.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *118th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2023 *No. 108*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. 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.

Most holy and gracious God, who turns the shadow of night into morning, satisfy our hearts with Your mercies, that we may rejoice and be glad all the day. Abide with the Members of this body, permitting the light of Your countenance to calm every troubled thought and to guide their feet in the way of peace. Lord, perfect Your strength in their weakness and help them to serve You and country to the glory of Your Name. In a world so uncertain about many things, make our Senators sure of no light that illuminates their pathway will lead them into darkness. Give our Senators the courage to see the truth and wisdom and to humbly follow where it leads.

We pray in Your precious 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, June 21, 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.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO ''CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION FROM NEW MOTOR VEHICLES: HEAVY-DUTY ENGINE AND VEHICLE STANDARDS''—VETO

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the veto message with respect to S.J. Res. 11, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 11, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards''.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

S.J. RES. 11

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this year, the Senate made use of the Congressional Review Act to push back on a particularly dangerous part of the Biden administration's radical approach to environmental policy.

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska, put forward a resolution that would prevent the administration from implementing even stricter emission standards on the trucks and heavy equipment that literally drive our economy.

The nitrogen oxide emissions of new trucks on the market today are already 98 to 99 percent lower than they were in the late 1990s. So we are talking about regulation in search of a problem.

In order to keep up with the rule President Biden's EPA released in December, heavy-auto manufacturers would be forced to add a dizzying array of new technologies to their products. By one estimate, the new regulations could raise the cost of a new truck by $42,000—$42,000, just to keep pace with the changing whims of unelected bureaucrats in Washington.

As truckers themselves have warned, the EPA's latest overreach would drive many of them to stick with ''older, less-efficient trucks or leave the industry entirely.'' And, needless to say, higher costs for the men and women behind the wheel means higher costs for fuel, food, and other essentials at the store. But that didn't stop President Biden from vetoing Senator FISCHER's commonsense resolution.

Well, today, we will vote one more time, and we will find out, once and for all, whether Washington Democrats care more about keeping pace with leftwing climate activists than helping

Printed on recycled paper.

working families contend with the runaway inflation that they helped create.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. President, on another matter, as I have discussed at length, America's partners in the Indo-Pacific understand the link between Russian aggression in Europe and the threat of Chinese aggression closer to home. Japan and Taiwan have devoted serious resources to Ukraine's defense, but our friends are also wisely strengthening their own defenses.

Last year, Taiwan's government put forward its largest defense budget proposal ever—ever—a 14-percent increase in top-line spending, along with greater attention to territorial defense, longer service requirements for conscripts, and a focus on whole-of-government resilience.

Japan has a new transformational strategy. Prime Minister Kishida's government is pursuing new long-range strike capabilities, increasing defense spending, and buying SM–6 interceptors. In a sign of deepening cooperation with the United States, it has expanded its defense industrial capacity by building facilities to assemble F–35s in Japan.

South Korea is also deepening its security cooperation with the United States, expanding its defense industrial capacity and providing military capabilities to key American allies over in Europe.

President Yoon and Prime Minister Kishida have also worked to improve relations between their two countries and open the door for increased cooperation with America in the face of an increasingly belligerent North Korea.

The Philippines is engaging in regular joint exercises in the South China Sea and working closely with the United States on enhanced defense cooperation sites that improve our interoperability.

And, earlier this year, Australia reached an agreement with the United States and the United Kingdom to procure nuclear-powered conventional submarines—the biggest defense investment in the nation's entire history.

In other words, our friends are putting their money where their mouths are. That is important because so has the People's Republic of China.

Beijing has made historic investments in its own military modernization. PRC defense spending has grown every year for almost three decades, but in each of the last 2 years, it has jumped by at least 7 percent. And, needless to say, China's official statistics tend to be obscure as much as they reveal.

While our most hostile strategic adversary is accelerating its military investments, the Biden administration asked Congress to shrink—shrink—spending on America's Armed Forces in real dollars.

Today, our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee will mark up the National Defense Authorization Act, beginning the Senate's annual work on tending to our Nation's common defense.

Facing down a common threat is a chance for the United States and our partners to grow the defense industrial base we will need to sustain effective deterrence in the Indo-Pacific. It is an opportunity to reform America's sluggish foreign military sales procedures, promote interoperability, and expand joint exercises and access agreements across the region.

If we are serious about deepening our defense industrial cooperation, America and our partners must make it easier to work together to share technology and intelligence and to align our defense investments. We need to streamline regulations that can prevent our partners from investing in their own defense bases in closer cooperation with the United States.

Of course, this is not a one-way street. America can also benefit from technologies our partners are developing, if our regulations and bureaucracies simply allow it. Our agreement with the UK and Australia could represent a transformational new approach to collective security.

If the Biden administration wants this partnership to succeed, it should consider providing broader country exemptions for defense trade licenses for those closest allies, similar to what we already do with Canada. Very simply, it is an opportunity we cannot afford to miss.

So China's bid for hegemony in the Indo-Pacific extends far beyond investments in naval vessels and new missile technologies.

The PRC has poured billions of dollars into development projects in vulnerable island nations out in the Pacific. So make no mistake, if the United States and our partners fail to work together to maintain robust deterrence on behalf of a free and open Indo-Pacific, China will be all too happy—all too happy—to fill the void.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, under Biden's leadership, the United States has experienced an unprecedented border crisis. That is not exactly news because for the last 2½ years, Customs and Border Protection has encountered more than 5.2 million migrants at the border, plus another 1½ million ''got-aways.''

In other words, under our bizarre and broken immigration system, 5.2 million people basically were welcomed at the border, while another million and a half simply fled the Border Patrol and made their way into the interior of the United States.

Now, it is true out of the 5.2 million under title 42, the COVID–19 order, basically public health order, that 2.6 million of the 5.2 were returned to their country of origin or at least expelled out of the United States. That was a public health order, but that is gone. That is expired. That has served its time.

So under any scenario, you can conclude that under President Biden's tenure, millions of people have made their way into the United States, not using the legal pathways that are designed to make our immigration system safe, orderly, and humane—something that I know we all support, legal immigration—instead, President Biden's failures, when it comes to border policy, has resulted in transnational criminal organizations controlling immigration, and they also control the drug trafficking that makes its way across the border.

And as was acknowledged by the Attorney General, Merrick Garland, when he was testifying before the Judiciary Committee, I believe he said he understood that this was part of the business model of these organizations, these criminal organizations. They would flood the border with people, and as the Border Patrol was diverted to try to deal with that mass of humanity, including unaccompanied children, that left huge gaps in the border which were then exploited by the drug cartels to move drugs into the interior of the United States.

Rather than secure the border or make any attempt to deter illegal immigration, the Biden administration has allowed the chaos to continue for nearly 2½ years.

Now, inexplicably, the President claims this is all part of his plan to promote safe, orderly, and humane migration, but there is nothing safe about the journey migrants take to the United States in the hands of cartels, coyotes, and ordinary criminals.

There is nothing orderly about migrants using inflatable rafts and ropes to cross the Rio Grande where some meet their death when they drown. And there is nothing humane about what is happening in the United States now as a result of the border crisis.

First, let's look at what happens to the children. Since President Biden took office, more than 300,000 unaccompanied children have been encountered at the border and then placed with a sponsor in the interior of the United States. To be clear, these children did not arrive in the United States with their parents. These children made the dangerous journey north with basically any adult who is willing to convey them from their home, across the border, into the United States.

But the truth is, these children are not unaccompanied. They are accompanied by the criminals who make this their business. The sad reality is that many come to the United States in the care of cartels, human smugglers, and coyotes, and parents pay smugglers thousands of dollars to bring their children to the United States.

I have no doubt that when those children reached the United States, their parents thought they would be safe. After all, this is the greatest country

in the world, a country that values freedom, justice, and opportunity. I am sure their parents expected they would live safe and happy lives while their asylum claims are being considered, but we know the ugly truth.

We know now that countless children have experienced a new hell right here in the United States. The New York Times, for example, published two bombshell investigative reports detailing widespread exploitation of migrant children here in our country. Some children are being forced to work in meatpacking plants, food processing facilities, and construction jobs—underage children. These are not part-time jobs after school; these are full-time jobs instead of going to school, in violation of many States' child labor laws.

They are being treated as indentured servants as they try to pay off the debts they owe to the traffickers who brought them here. And there is no question the Biden administration understands what is going on, and, yes, their silence is complicity. Once unaccompanied children are apprehended and processed at the border, the Department of Health and Human Services has the legal responsibility to place these children with a safe sponsor.

According to longstanding policy, the agent follows up with a phone call 30 days later to make sure that the child is safe. On both counts—the preplacement vetting and the post-placement wellness check—the Biden administration has completely fumbled its responsibilities.

Health and Human Services actually loosened the vetting requirements in order to get children out of shelters fast—as fast as possible—with little regard for the increased danger to these children.

The New York Times has documented that at least 85,000 of those 300,000 children cannot even be reached within 30 days. So the practice is to make a wellness call in 30 days, but 85,000 of those 300,000 children, there is no answer.

So the Biden administration can't tell you where these children are, whether they are being fed, whether they are going to school, whether they are being neglected or abused or forced into involuntary labor. President Biden's administration doesn't know, and I think the sad truth is they don't care—because if they did care, this would not be allowed to continue.

This isn't breaking news. This isn't something I am announcing here today for the first time. Two major investigative pieces by the New York Times has exposed this scandal.

Over the last couple years, the Department of Health and Human Services has received countless warnings that these children are in danger. Those warnings came through its own hotline, government contractors, and scores of employees who sounded the alarm. Not only did Health and Human Services ignore the warnings of whistleblowers, it tried to silence them.

Department leadership retaliated against employees who shined a light on this massive abuse. As a result, countless children have remained in dangerous situations just so the administration could avoid an embarrassing PR headache.

As we know, the tens of thousands of migrant children who have been lost—literally lost—by the Biden administration are not the only victims of the border crisis.

Now, I sometimes ask myself, what is it going to take? How bad are things going to have to get before this situation registers with enough people of good conscience and good will that they are actually willing to do something about it? And I am constantly disappointed that in spite of the scandal, we can't find enough people of good will and good intentions here in the U.S. Senate to change this, to make it better, to throw a rescue line to these kids.

But the story gets worse. We know the fentanyl epidemic has killed more than 70,000 people a year in the United States just last year, making it the leading cause of death for Americans ages 18 to 49—the leading cause of death. We know that the fentanyl epidemic does not discriminate. It kills young people. It kills old people. It kills rich people. It kills poor people, both those living in major cities and those living in rural America.

And we know the overwhelming majority of this fentanyl comes across the U.S.-Mexico border. Again, this is not breaking news. This is something known to all of us, including the Biden administration.

We also know where the precursor chemicals come from. These are chemicals shipped from China, shipped to Mexico, where the drug cartels mix them up. They use industrial-sized pill presses to gin out hundreds of thousands of pills that are contaminated with fentanyl.

Now, most of the time people who get poisoned by fentanyl don't actually know they are taking fentanyl. They may think they are taking a Xanax or Percocet or some other more innocuous medication, something we would prefer our kids not to take, but we understand sometimes that happens.

But they have no idea that a tiny dose of fentanyl can kill them and that many of these pills ginned out by the drug cartels, using these precursor chemicals in Mexico, are then shipped across the border and, unfortunately, routinely, take the lives of young, bright children who have the best of their lives ahead of them.

Between October of last year and April of this year, Customs and Border Protection seized more than 12,000 pounds of fentanyl at the southern border. Again, if you have a pencil—and I don't have a pencil, but I have a pen—it is basically the part of the pen that sticks out of the end of the part you hold onto. It takes that little amount of fentanyl to kill you. And last year, Customs and Border Protection seized 17,000 pounds of it.

Now, some people say: Well, that is great. We don't have a problem. The Border Patrol seized it. Well, you remember those ''got-aways'' I mentioned earlier, more than a million of them? They were running away from law enforcement, and I guarantee you it was for a reason. Either they knew that their criminal record and background would not make it possible for them to legally migrate into the United States or they were carrying drugs like this fentanyl. And we know a lot of it is getting through because we are seeing the devastation that it has wrought—again, with 71,000 fentanyl-related deaths last year alone. So we know CBP is not able to interdict every ounce of illicit drugs—far from it.

Over the past couple years, the unprecedented border crisis under the Biden administration has affected all of our missions at the border, including those that have nothing to do with immigration. Law enforcement has been shifted to the frontlines in order to process and care for the migrants. Instead of stopping dangerous drugs and criminals, many agents are pushing paper and changing diapers.

No one is happier with this situation than the drug cartels and the criminals who smuggle migrants for money. They are getting rich. What is not to love from their standpoint? With fewer agents on the frontline, they have a clear and easy path to move fentanyl, heroine, methamphetamine, and other deadly drugs into the United States, and our communities are being ravaged by the overdose epidemic. The administration has given the cartels clear and easy corridors to traffic even more of their poison into the United States, as I have described.

Well, this is hardly a picture of a humane response to the border crisis, as President Biden and his administration claim. This is not humane.

Well, as I said earlier, sometimes I ask myself, what will it take? What will it take to get the attention of the people who actually have the authority to change this, to make it better, to save lives? Because hearing about these crises is enough to make your blood boil.

The administration cut corners in order to place migrant children with sponsors. It exerted minimal effort to follow up with those children to ensure they are safe and healthy. At the same time, the chaos caused by the border crisis has led to a security breakdown which enables fentanyl and other dangerous drugs to pour into the United States, killing Americans—108,000 last year alone.

Despite the widespread suffering caused by the Biden administration's policies, the President and his senior officials just don't seem to care. They don't care. If they did care, they would

do something about it. So it is clear to me they don't care.

There is a clear need to secure the border and stop the unprecedented migration crisis, but the majority of our Democratic colleagues refuse to address the border crisis unless Congress passes what they call comprehensive immigration reform. So, in other words, they are holding these children, they are holding the rest of the country hostage in order to achieve a legislative goal which they know is not possible—one, because we have a divided government: a Republican-controlled House and a Democratic-controlled Senate and a Democrat sitting in the White House.

There is no question that America's immigration system is in need of modernization. It is outdated, inefficient, and crippled by backlogs. But, as everyone knows, immigration reform is a very, very difficult, thorny issue. For 2 years, our Democratic colleagues controlled all three branches of government, and they couldn't even pass a partisan immigration bill. Now that we are operating in divided government, that calculus becomes harder, not easier.

There is absolutely zero chance that the Democrat-led Senate and the Republican-led House will be able to reach an agreement on immigration reform anytime soon. I wish that were not true. It doesn't have to be true, but I think, unless attitudes change, that is a fact.

Still, this elusive idea of comprehensive immigration reform has become a holdup for other problems relating to the border and immigration. In other words, these emergencies occurring at the border are being held hostage to an impossible goal, which is passing bipartisan immigration reform as a demand for solving these other problems.

Right now, the major problem we need to address is the humanitarian crisis fallout from what is happening. We can't prolong the suffering caused by the border crisis while our Democratic colleagues try to build support for a massive immigration reform bill that many of them seem to have zero interest in, because if they had interest, I assume they would be rolling up their sleeves and doing the hard work, doing more than just talking about it.

For example, in the Senate, the Democratic chairman of the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction to mark up and presumably pass with some combination of Republican and Democratic votes a bill to address the crisis that I mention. The Democratic majority leader has the authority to bring a bill to the floor, to open it to amendments so that all Senators can participate to try to find out if there is some path forward and some consensus. But in the 2 years our Democratic colleagues controlled all three branches of government, they did zero about it.

That means that the young adults who are in a box because of deferred action on childhood arrivals—this is an illegal scheme that President Obama did unilaterally 10 years ago which has been tied up in litigation ever since and is likely to be held illegal by a court of last resort here very soon.

So trying to address that, trying to address the drug crisis, trying to protect these 300,000 children—all of that is being held hostage for our Democratic colleagues to pursue an unattainable goal given the current political environment.

Migrant children are being abused within our own borders. Drugs kill about 109,000 Americans a year. We cannot leverage these lives for unrelated and unattainable measures.

There is nothing safe, orderly, or humane about the Biden administration's response to the border crisis, and until something changes, more people will continue to suffer and die.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Republican whip.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this week, the Senate Armed Services Committee is marking up the fiscal year 2024 National Defense Authorization Act. The NDAA is one of the most important pieces of legislation we consider literally every year. It is a bill that authorizes funding for our men and women in uniform and our defense needs and lays out our defense priorities. Hopefully, it is one of the things that force us to sit down and seriously consider the state of our national defense and what we need both now and in the future to ensure that America's military is prepared to deter and if necessary confront any threat.

I like to say that if we don't get national security right, the rest is conversation. And it is true. All these other things we debate and talk about, if we can't protect the country, really end up being very secondary. The security of our Nation is the precondition for everything else—for the continued enjoyment of our freedoms, for a flourishing society, for a healthy economy, for the government's ability to do anything.

My Democratic colleagues these days often seem to think we can let defense spending take a back seat to the latest Big Government issue, but that betrays a fundamental lack of understanding of reality. We live in a fallen world, and as long as we live in a fallen world, there will be evil people bent on aggression. So our national defense is not something we can ever afford to minimize or take for granted. We have to be prepared at all times to deter and to meet any threat.

The United States has a reputation for having one of the strongest militaries in the world. While that reputation is deserved, the fact of the matter is that our military readiness is not where it needs to be. Thanks to budgetary impasses and increased operational demands, by 2018, our readiness had eroded to the point that the bipartisan National Defense Strategy Commission released a report warning that we might struggle to win a war against a major power like Russia or China.

While we have made progress since then, we are still a long way from where we need to be. Recent U.S. war games positing a U.S.-China conflict following an attack on Taiwan have had grim results, showing enormous military and economic costs on both sides. One news story on these war games noted, and I quote:

> And while the ultimate outcome in these exercises is not always clear—the U.S. does better in some than others—the cost is [clear]. In every exercise the U.S. uses up all its long-range air-to-surface missiles in a few days, with a substantial portion of its planes destroyed on the ground.

Let me just repeat that line.

> In every exercise the U.S. uses up all its long-range air-to-surface missiles in a few days, with a substantial portion of its planes destroyed on the ground.

That is not a promising scenario, and it points to serious readiness shortages, particularly deficiencies in our inventory of munitions. I don't need to tell anyone that the side that runs out of munitions first is likely to be the side that loses in any conflict, which is why we need sustained investments in rebuilding our supply chain—an effort that is reinforced by multiyear purchases.

China is flexing its power with increasingly aggressive actions in the Indo-Pacific. It is investing heavily—heavily—in its military. China's defense budget has doubled over the last decade, and this year it will increase by more than 7 percent for the second year in a row. That doesn't even count any additional defense funding that China hides. So it should come as no surprise that China is outpacing our military in modern capabilities like hypersonic missiles and has amassed a larger navy.

I said that China is growing increasingly aggressive in the Indo-Pacific, but China is also growing increasingly aggressive toward the United States. Everyone remembers the Chinese spy balloon that flew over our country earlier this year, but that is just the tip of the iceberg. Recent reports indicate that China is using Cuba as a base for intelligence gathering against the United States. Now it has emerged that China is in discussions with Havana to establish a new joint military training facility in Cuba. That is not even to mention the aggressive behavior of the Chinese military toward U.S. assets in the Indo-Pacific.

It is impossible to overstate the necessity of ensuring that we have the

military and economic strength necessary to deter attacks from China or, in the worst case, confront and defeat them.

While China is obviously a major focus, we cannot forget the threat posed by Russia, as we continue to see in Ukraine, which is why it is vital that the United States and the Western world continue to support Ukraine in its fight and that NATO members take seriously or exceed their commitment to spend 2 percent of their GDP on defense.

Outside of great power threats, there are rogue nations like Iran, which is deepening its ties with both Russia and China and is dangerously close to becoming a nuclear power.

The legislation the Senate Armed Services Committee is considering this week is vital, and I hope the markup will produce a strong bill that helps address the shortfalls in our readiness.

I put forward a number of proposals that I hope will be included in the final legislation, with full funding for development of the new B–21 bomber, which will be housed at Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota, at the very top of my priority list.

I am also working to ensure that, in addition to funding for the B–21 and the necessary support facilities, the Ellsworth area gets the resources it needs to support the military personnel and their families who will be coming to the area with the arrival of the B–21s.

Ronald Reagan once said:

> We know only too well that war comes not when the forces of freedom are strong, but when they are weak. It is then that tyrants are tempted.

Today, as ever, it is vital that we make sure the forces of freedom are strong, and I will do everything I can to help ensure that this year's National Defense Authorization Act advances our Nation's readiness so that we can be prepared to deter any threat or meet it if called upon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF NATASHA C. MERLE

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I am honored to stand in support of Natasha Merle, whom I was proud to nominate for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

Ms. Merle is a deeply experienced litigator. She has practiced at virtually every level of the legal system, and she has litigated in both State and Federal courts, handling both civil and criminal matters.

Ms. Merle doesn't just have the experience and training necessary for the Federal bench; she also brings a crucial and unique perspective as a former public defender. If confirmed, she would not only be the fourth Black woman on the district court but also the first person with experience as a public defender to fill this role in nearly 30 years.

Ms. Merle has demonstrated fairness in the courtroom and will uphold the rule of law as a judge. Nineteen senior lawyers from prominent national and international law firms submitted a letter in support of her confirmation. And I can tell you that her high ethical standards and reputation for fairness will leave a powerful mark on our communities and on the Eastern District of New York.

I hope she will receive a swift confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

S.J. RES. 11

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, in just a moment, the U.S. Senate will vote to override President Biden's veto of my legislation that would stop yet another aggressive environmental regulation.

This specific regulation is an EPA rule that would impose stricter emissions standards on heavy-duty vehicles. While this might sound well-intentioned, let's be very clear about the facts.

First, the EPA's own economic analysis projects that the cost to Americans associated with this new regulation could reach up to $55 billion from 2027 to 2045. That is because, when you force truckers to purchase new, expensive equipment in the name of climate, you are asking the American people to foot the bill. Any product transported by trucks, whether that is food headed to your local grocery store or something that you bought off of Amazon, each one of these products will cost more due to massive inflationary burdens this rule will place on the trucking industry. That means every American consumer will feel the effects of this rule and its price increases.

Every agriculture producer and every local business will feel its effects. If you are an ag or an energy-heavy State like Texas, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Illinois, Nebraska, California, or Montana, your local economy will be especially impacted by these higher freight costs.

That is not to mention the 3 million Americans who work as commercial truckers. Many truckers work for mom-and-pop operations—small businesses that simply don't have the financial resources to handle a spike in cost. Many of these businesses and the good-paying jobs that they support won't survive this rule.

And do you know? The real irony here is that the way this ''green'' regulation is structured, it actually undermines its own stated goal of reducing emissions. Think about it. If the price of newer vehicles shoots up, the government is incentivizing businesses to hold on to their older, higher emitting trucks.

So let's tell it like it is. The Biden administration's emissions rule is a political move that won't even be effective. The administration is making an ineffective climate statement at the expense of millions of Americans' livelihoods.

We in the Senate should know that we are not playing a political game of chess. We are dealing with real people. We are not moving pawns. That is why my CRA passed the Senate and the House with bipartisan support, and that is why we need to push back against the President's insistence on playing these regulatory games, because working families don't have the luxury for these games. They are reeling from inflation and economic turmoil caused by this administration.

So I would encourage my colleagues to join me in choosing our economy, our truckers, and, ultimately, the American people over another politically charged mandate from a power-hungry White House.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

TAX CONVENTION WITH CHILE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this year marks the 20th anniversary of diplomatic ties between the United States and Chile and 20 years since Congress approved a free-trade agreement between our two countries.

In April, I led a codel to Chile. I had a chance to meet with Chile's leaders and American businesses operating there. We were a bipartisan group. I went with Senator KAINE, Senator HAGERTY, and Congressman TONY CÁRDENAS.

We met with tech companies. We met with insurance companies. We met with mining companies—you name it. Do you know what every single one of them said to us? Do you know what they all wanted from the U.S. Senate? To approve the Chile tax treaty.

They said, if the United States doesn't ratify the treaty, they will continue to be at a huge disadvantage. The world is changing—we are undergoing an energy transition—and without this treaty, we are going to fall behind on critical minerals and manufacturing of the future.

And they are right. China already has a tax treaty with Chile. If the United States wants to level the playing field for American businesses and deepen our ties with Chile, we need to act.

Chile is one of our strongest democratic partners in the Americas, and the Chileans want us to ratify the treaty as well. We heard that message loud and clear when we spoke to the President and senior Members of Chile's Senate. We heard it from the Speaker of the Chilean Congress, and we heard it directly from President Gabriel Boric, a strong democratic leader who seeks closer ties with the United States.

We live in a world with increased global competition and in a contest between democracy versus

authoritarianism. The United States needs to be strategic about how we deepen our relationships with key democratic partners like Chile and President Boric. We must avoid unnecessary delays that undercut our competitiveness.

Remember, we signed this agreement in 2010—that was 13 years ago—and this would be only our third bilateral tax treaty in all of Latin America. China is not waiting around. So, if we want to be competitive, we need to move forward with the same determination, and the Chile tax treaty is an incredible opportunity in that regard.

Chile is an important market for U.S. goods and manufacturing, including aircraft, vehicles, and machinery. Chile is a leading producer of copper, and Chile has the second largest lithium reserves in the world. This critical mineral is the building block for many modern technologies.

As global demands skyrocket in the coming years—by as much as nearly 4,000 percent—this tax treaty will make it easier for U.S. businesses to be competitive in this emerging sector.

U.S. businesses and their Chilean counterparts want predictability and consistency in tax treatment. As they continue to scale up operations and as the United States and Chile forge even stronger economic ties, they want to know that they won't be taxed twice on the same income in two different countries. That is why the Chile tax treaty has overwhelming support from the U.S. private sector.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has expressed its resounding support for the treaty. It has support from U.S. companies across a range of industries and sectors. And the treaty enjoys strong bipartisan support as is evidenced by the fact that it passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a nearly unanimous vote of 20 to 1.

By approving this treaty, we not only give the Senate's stamp of approval right now, but we have high hopes for where this treaty will take our two nations in the future.

While we are debating this tax treaty, I do want to take a minute to speak about how we engage on treaties more broadly. Treaties are a shared constitutional responsibility of the Senate and the executive branch. Nonetheless, as we worked last year to move the Chile tax treaty through the Senate, the Biden administration withdrew from our tax treaty with Hungary without consulting with the Senate or providing advance notice, let alone having approval. It is deeply disappointing that Presidents of both parties have advanced these types of unilateral actions and omissions in the past.

Let me be clear. Such actions are completely inconsistent with our constitutional structure. I have asked the President to commit, at a minimum, to meaningful consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee prior to terminating any treaty. Without such a commitment, I will work to address this issue in future resolutions of advice and consent, as well as in legislation, and I will continue to work to make sure the Senate protects our constitutional prerogative on treaties. Abiding by our Constitution—standing up for our democratic values and institutions—this is what binds us with close partners like Chile.

It was in 1823 that this very Senate confirmed our first diplomatic representative to Chile. This established, for the first time, official relations between our two young nations. We took that action then because our countries were determined that the rest of the world take us seriously as independent states.

Our shared values and ambitions have given us 200 fruitful years of working together—in science and technological innovation, on immigration visas and academic exchanges, and, yes, on the question of critical minerals and renewable energy, which this treaty will take to new heights.

This treaty will advance U.S. interests by building partnerships that will position our country, our economy, and our manufacturing sector for the future.

I appreciate the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee. We had some issues originally. We worked together, and we came to a conclusion that is satisfactory to all. I urge my colleagues to vote to advance this treaty and to ultimately vote to provide advice and consent to its ratification.

With that, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON VETO MESSAGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Shall the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 11) pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are required under the Constitution.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 167 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Vance
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Mullin	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Cortez Masto	Kaine
Bennet	Duckworth	Kelly
Blumenthal	Durbin	King
Booker	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Brown	Fetterman	Luján
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Markey
Cardin	Hassan	Menendez
Carper	Heinrich	Merkley
Casey	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Coons	Hirono	Murray
Ossoff	Schumer	Warner
Padilla	Shaheen	Warnock
Peters	Sinema	Warren
Reed	Smith	Welch
Rosen	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Sanders	Tester	Wyden
Schatz	Van Hollen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, not having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution on reconsideration fails to pass over the veto of the President of the United States.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Natasha C. Merle, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 30, Natasha C. Merle, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Margaret Wood Hassan, Ben Ray Luján, Raphael G. Warnock, Tammy Duckworth, Jack Reed, John W. Hickenlooper, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Baldwin, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Tina Smith, Debbie Stabenow, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Natasha C. Merle, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

(Ms. CORTEZ MASTO assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 168 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Kelly	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Luján	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Welch
Fetterman	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—50

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	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Vance
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Mullin	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative.

The motion is agreed to.

RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:32 p.m. recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FETTERMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

NOMINATION OF NATASHA C. MERLE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote to confirm Natasha Merle to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. She is a highly skilled litigator who has practiced at virtually every level of the legal system. Ms. Merle received her undergraduate degree from the University of Texas at Austin and her law degree from New York University School of Law. She then completed two Federal clerkships, one in the Southern District of New York and another in the Eastern District of New York. Following her clerkships, Ms. Merle devoted her early career to representing indigent clients, particularly as an assistant Federal public defender. She has also spent time in private practice, where she represented individuals, companies, and financial institutions in commercial litigation.

Since 2016, Ms. Merle has worked at the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, where she has devoted her practice to ensuring equal justice under law. She has also taught at two of the Nation's top law schools: Columbia Law School, as a lecturer in law, and New York University School of Law, as an adjunct professor of clinical law. Ms. Merle has significant experience in the courtroom at both the trial and appellate levels. She has litigated in State and Federal court on both civil and criminal matters, practiced before the U.S. Supreme Court, and successfully argued an appeal before the California Supreme Court. Ms. Merle's deep expertise, diversity of experience, and commitment to public service will make her an outstanding addition to the Eastern District of New York.

The American Bar Association rated Ms. Merle ''well qualified,'' and she has the strong support of her home state Senators, Mr. SCHUMER and Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Ms. Merle's nomination.

VOTE ON MERLE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Merle nomination?

Mr. MENENDEZ. 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.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 169 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Kelly	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Luján	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Welch
Fetterman	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—49

Barrasso	Grassley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Collins	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Vance
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Mullin	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 1, Treaty Document No. 112–8, Tax Convention with Chile, and a resolution of advice and consent to ratification with 2 reservations and 2 declarations.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Margaret Wood Hassan, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Patty Murray, Thomas R. Carper, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Tammy Baldwin, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Tim Kaine, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Cory A. Booker.

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on treaty document No. 112–8, Tax Convention with Chile, and a resolution of advice and consent to ratification with 2 reservations and 2 declarations, shall be brought to a close?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Baldwin	Ernst	Merkley
Barrasso	Feinstein	Moran
Bennet	Fetterman	Mullin
Blackburn	Fischer	Murkowski
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Murphy
Booker	Grassley	Murray
Boozman	Hagerty	Ossoff
Braun	Hassan	Padilla
Britt	Heinrich	Peters
Brown	Hickenlooper	Reed
Budd	Hirono	Ricketts
Cantwell	Hoeven	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Cardin	Johnson	Rosen
Carper	Kaine	Rounds
Casey	Kelly	Rubio
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sanders
Collins	King	Schatz
Coons	Klobuchar	Schmitt
Cornyn	Lankford	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Luján	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lummis	Shaheen
Crapo	Manchin	Sinema
Cruz	Markey	Smith
Daines	Marshall	Stabenow
Duckworth	McConnell	Sullivan
Durbin	Menendez	Tester

Thune	Warner	Wicker
Tillis	Warnock	Wyden
Tuberville	Warren	Young
Van Hollen	Welch	
Vance	Whitehouse	

NAYS—2

Hawley	Paul

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). On this vote, the yeas are 97, the nays are 2.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

TAX CONVENTION WITH CHILE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty will be stated.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 112–8, TAX CONVENTION WITH CHILE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 136

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 136.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This resolution of ratification shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after ratification.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1999

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, 1 year ago, the rightwing majority of the U.S. Supreme Court overturned decades of established precedent and stripped away the right to abortion in the Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization decision.

In this decision, the Supreme Court overturned the right of the American people to make decisions about their own bodies and their own health. That is why, 1 year ago, I filed the Right to Contraception Act with my colleagues Senators DUCKWORTH, HIRONO, BALDWIN, and MURRAY, and I stood here, much like I am today, to request unanimous consent to pass our legislation. The House of Representatives passed the bill by a bipartisan vote of 220 to 195 at that time. Unfortunately, the Republicans in this Chamber chose to block its passage.

Here is just a short list of what has befallen us since that time.

District court judges have blocked teens from accessing birth control at federally funded clinics and taken aim at health insurance coverage for contraception. Extremist State legislators have restricted, criminalized, and stigmatized reproductive care, including by suspending payments for emergency contraception for survivors of sexual assault. And people are left paying more, traveling further, and working harder to get essential medication.

The threats to contraception are real and happening now. So I stand here today, once again, to invite every Member of the Senate to join me, Senator DUCKWORTH, Senator HIRONO, Senator BALDWIN, Senator MURRAY, and the 35 additional cosponsors to pass the Right to Contraception Act.

Cosponsoring this bill means that you support codifying the right to obtain and use contraception; enshrining Supreme Court precedent into Federal law, guaranteeing a healthcare provider's right to prescribe these products and services and to share information related to them; preventing the Federal Government and States from interfering with the right to contraception; and authorizing the U.S. Attorney General, healthcare providers, and all Americans harmed by unlawful restrictions to go to court to enforce the rights this bill establishes—because there is no right without a remedy.

Passing the Right to Contraception Act means setting the bare minimum standard that the right to contraception should be protected even if the Supreme Court, once again, overturns settled precedent.

Nine in ten Americans support the right to contraception. This is not just a moral duty but part of our duty to represent the will of the American people. The right to contraception is central to life, liberty, and freedom. This is for every person who wants to live without politicians in their homes and waiting rooms, especially women, Black, Brown, indigenous, LGBTQ+, rural, immigrant, low-income, and disabled Americans most impacted by the failures of this Supreme Court.

With the right to abortion stolen and the right to contraception now threatened, I urge my colleagues to stand with us and to pass today the Right to Contraception Act.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 1999 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, 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. Is there objection?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this bill is not about contraception; it is about abortion.

The bill defines ''contraception'' as ''any drug, device, or biological product intended for use in the prevention of pregnancy, whether specifically intended to prevent pregnancy or for other health needs, that is approved by the FDA.''

The FDA has approved dangerous chemical abortion drugs that can also be used as contraceptives off-label. There is a huge difference between a drug that blocks fertilization and a drug that can end a life.

This bill also includes a provision that would act as a guaranteed earmark for Planned Parenthood. Under the bill, the government could not directly fund a health organization unless it provides abortion drugs.

Finally, this bill does not respect freedom of conscience for healthcare providers. It would no longer allow for religious exemptions for organizations that have deeply held objections to providing abortions.

The bill uses intentionally vague language to hide its ulterior motive of protecting access to abortion drugs. For these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. This is an issue that we are going to return to. Justice Thomas, in his comments on the Dobbs decision, said that the decisions made by the Supreme Court that extended privacy rights were an overreach. This Supreme Court began with the Dobbs decision. It is very clear, because he mentioned it specifically, that the Griswold decision—the decision to, in fact, protect the right to contraception—is also now in the crosshairs of the Supreme Court. So it is imperative that we return to this law to begin the process of passing legislation to codify this protection for Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2053

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, this Saturday marks 1 year since the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade at the urging of extremist politicians upending 50 years of precedent protecting women's right to healthcare.

In the year since that decision, half the States in our country have banned or effectively banned access to abortion. Women in those States have extremely limited options for getting the healthcare they need. Those who can afford to travel have no choice but to go to other States to receive critical reproductive care.

That is what happened to Lauren Hall. She and her husband were excited that she was pregnant for the first time. But then she learned that her fetus was developing without a skull—a condition that meant it wouldn't survive. This condition also increased Lauren's risk of hemorrhaging. Her doctors at home in Texas refused to help her terminate the pregnancy, so she had to travel to Seattle, where she was finally able to get the abortion care that she needed. She is currently

suing the State of Texas for refusing to give her potentially lifesaving medical care.

We knew that after the Dobbs decision, stories like Lauren's would only happen more often and millions of women would lose the healthcare they need. Even before Roe fell, healthcare organizations in Nevada were prepared for an influx of women from out of State who needed abortion services.

Justice Brett Kavanaugh recognized this too. In his concurring opinion, he indicated that women who have to leave their home State to get the care they need would be protected by the constitutional right to interstate travel.

But we could see from miles away in Nevada that the far right would never stop plotting to roll back women's rights even further. In the last year alone, we have seen extremist Republicans try to stop women in our military from getting the healthcare they need. They have come after safe and effective birth control, and they have even supported a Federal abortion ban to outlaw reproductive care in all 50 States. And now we are seeing far-right extremists actively work to bar women from seeking care in States outside their own.

Let's be clear: This is about controlling women. The far right doesn't trust women to make their own healthcare decisions, so they think those decisions should be made by politicians instead. Well, I don't know about some of my colleagues across the aisle, but I don't think elected officials should be telling women what to do with their bodies, and neither do the vast majority of Nevadans.

We are a proud pro-choice State. Back in 1990, Nevadans overwhelmingly voted to codify a woman's right to choose. And, today, over two-thirds of Nevadans believe that a woman's healthcare decisions are between her and her doctor, and that is across all parties—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

But even though Nevada is a safe place for women who need healthcare, far-right Republicans living outside my State are telling women: Oh, no, sorry. We are making it illegal for you to go there.

This April, Idaho became the first State to make it a criminal offense for someone to help an individual traveling out of State to seek an abortion. And elected officials in States like Tennessee, Texas, and Missouri are trying to punish women for leaving their State for reproductive care, as well as anyone who helps them, including their doctors or even their employers.

This is why my colleagues and I are reintroducing the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act. One year after Roe v. Wade was overturned, we need this bill more than ever. Our legislation reaffirms that women have a fundamental right to interstate travel and makes crystal clear that States cannot prosecute women—or anyone who helps them—for going to another State to get the critical reproductive care that they need.

We are talking about upholding a constitutional right to allow women to travel outside their home State. Now, why do some of my anti-choice colleagues want to restrict women from moving freely between States? The answer is simple: They don't trust women to have control over their own bodies.

Well, I do. And I am going to keep doing everything in my power to protect women, not just in Nevada but in every State across the country. We must pass the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act.

So, Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 2053 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, 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. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there is an obsession on the left with abortion. It is becoming all-encompassing, infecting conversations that we have in the Senate on everything from the military to the Department of Veterans Affairs to phantom State laws that don't even exist.

Judges have to bow their policy objectives if they want to be appointed in this administration. Or those who are already on the bench, if they don't bow their policy objectives, if they don't bow to the abortion-centric, abortion-obsessed culture on the left, then all of a sudden, they are going to face these baseless attacks to their credibility and even threats of violence.

This bill, properly understood, really should be called the ''Freedom to Traffic Act.'' You see, to my knowledge, no State—not a single State—has enacted a law restricting an adult's right to travel across State lines for purposes of an abortion or otherwise. I am not even aware of a single State considering such a thing.

And if a State were to even consider it, they wouldn't do it. And if they did do it, social law would undoubtedly be struck down as unconstitutional on one of at least several grounds, including the fact that the commerce clause, article I, section 8, clause 3 of Constitution has interpreted by the Supreme Court—among other things—to prohibit any State from treating an article of commerce—including a good, a person, a thing—in interstate commerce differently based on its origin or designation, out of State or outside the United States.

States can't cabin their own residents or anyone inside their own State boundaries. That is well-understood. So they don't have that authority. But more importantly, we are dealing with a phantom problem, a phantom law that does not exist. There is not a single State law out there that restricts an adult's right to travel out of State for an abortion or otherwise.

What some States do have, and perhaps that is what is causing the confusion here, are some laws to stop the trafficking of children across State lines to obtain an abortion without notifying their parents.

This is well-established. We have laws on the books prohibiting the trafficking of minors across State lines with good reason. This is very different than what was implied as a reason why we need to pass this bill here today. It just isn't true. Those laws don't exist. They are not on the books. They are not even being considered to be placed on the books.

These laws are aimed to stop the sexual abuse of children by prohibiting their adult abusers and those in the abortion industry to help facilitate that abuse by transporting them across State lines for the purpose of obtaining an abortion and thus hiding the fact that they got an abortion from their parents.

There are good reasons for these laws. In 2004, for example, the 14-year-old daughter of Marcia Carroll was taken by her boyfriend's family from their home in Pennsylvania, where they lived, to New Jersey—New Jersey, where parental consent for an abortion was not required at the time. There, once in New Jersey, they threatened to leave her in New Jersey unless she got an abortion, which she did, under duress, under coercion, afraid. The grief and devastation crushed this 14-year-old girl and her family, who had agreed to keep the baby.

This so-called Freedom to Traffic Act would hamper the ability of States to punish such criminal and cowardly actions. I don't think there is anyone here who can defend that—trafficking a child across State lines for purposes of obtaining an abortion.

Sadly, this is not an isolated incident—far from it. We know from undercover videos, testimony from other courageous victims and reports from former employees that Planned Parenthood actively works to hide these child sexual abuse instances—covering up for adult abusers by providing their child victims with abortions and failing to report abuse.

This, again, is another thing that happens. Not only do we distort the facts, not only do we distort the status quo of the law in this country, but we also distort key facts when people become obsessed with abortion, and they see abortion as if it were, somehow, an unmitigated good.

This bill was just barely introduced in the Senate—I believe as recently as yesterday. This bill has not been through any committee. It has not been marked up in the committee of jurisdiction—the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I serve. But Democrats think we should just pass it

anyway. I guess maybe they are channeling the now infamous words of former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI when she said ''We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it.''

This isn't how we legislate, and we certainly shouldn't be legislating when we haven't reviewed the bill, it hasn't been through committee, we don't know what it says, and the bill's proponents are badly mischaracterizing what it does and why we need it.

On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, as was already pointed out, the Constitution does protect the right to travel in this country, and there is no doubt that the Supreme Court has made that precedent clear. But constitutional rights don't enforce themselves. And my colleagues on the far right only cloak themselves in the Constitution when it suits them, and right now, it really doesn't suit them. That is why far-right Republicans in State legislatures across the country are working on and passing laws specifically focused on restricting a woman's right to travel for reproductive healthcare—something I noticed my colleague from Utah seemed to ignore—Tennessee, Texas, Missouri, or some of those States.

At the end of the day, let me just touch on this idea that somehow this legislation is focusing on trafficking of individuals for sexual exploitation. Now, again, this is a perfect example of some of the far-right Republicans—when they really can't argue the facts and the law of something, then they just make things up or they throw inflammatory arguments out there to try to scare individuals.

But let me just make this clear. As a former attorney general who worked and continues to work on human trafficking issues that address the sexual exploitation of adults and minors, this is not trafficking. And I would say to my colleague in Utah, who knows better, that sexual exploitation of individuals that this country needs to address, along with many other countries—and we have passed laws to protect individuals—this is not it.

What I do know is, instead of addressing the true issue before us, which is, why can't women be free to travel from a State that has restricted their right to abortion to my State, where we have chosen to allow them to get the healthcare they need, the essential healthcare—it is always fascinating to me that I hear, on the far right, my colleagues say it is always about States' rights; it is about States' rights; this is a States' rights issue.

Dobbs basically said in its decision this is a States' rights issue, but then, when it doesn't suit what they care about, the far right says: Well, forget those States' rights. Only listen to what we as elected officials determine you should have. Ignore what Nevada has done. Ignore the Democrats, the Republicans, the Independents, the men and the women in Nevada who chose to codify the right of a woman to choose and seek essential healthcare. Ignore that completely.

That is what this legislation is about. It is about trusting women and giving them the ability to come to a State like Nevada to seek essential healthcare for their reproductive rights.

Again, I constantly hear this emotional argument about—and my colleague from Utah, whom I respect, but he said this—the left somehow has an obsession with abortion. It is outrageous, outrageous, inflammatory talk. What we do have an obsession with is freedom and that every American in this country, whether you are a man or a woman, should have that freedom, and it shouldn't be taken away from you by elected officials who think they know better about your healthcare than you do, who think that they can restrict in their State your access to healthcare, that they can jeopardize your healthcare and your decisions about your family and your future because they think they know better.

Mr. President, I just think it is outrageous that one simple thing that we cannot agree to in this Congress in a bipartisan way is that women should have that fundamental freedom to travel for their healthcare needs without being restricted, without being called names, without being fearful, and we should be protecting those doctors and the healthcare decisions to do that.

I will say one final thing. We have worked hard in this country to evolve so that all our medical care is some of the best. We are fighting right now to make sure that we have access to technology, that we have access to medical care. We do the research. We do the development. We have the medical care of the 21st century.

What my far-right Republicans are telling women across this country is, you can't access that medical care for the 21st century. Do you know why? Because we think that we should hold you back to the 19th century. We want to politicize this, and we want to take away your rights, and so we are going to take you back to the 19th century.

It is outrageous—outrageous that we have to be here in this day and age. Over 50 years of Roe v. Wade and not one issue that we can see impeded anybody's rights here, for women across this country and this fundamental freedom about reproductive rights.

So I am disappointed, but I will tell you what, Mr. President, this is an issue you are going to see all of us, one after another, continue to fight. This is an essential fight for women in this country and their rights and their freedom to choose—the freedom to choose and not have somebody else dictate what they should or shouldn't do with their bodies; not to have somebody else dictate, based on whatever their religion is or their rights, that they know better than somebody living in an issue that is so personal to them, that they can be dictated to in this day and age.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is important to point out that this legislation makes no distinction between those covered by it, whether they are children or adults, and that is my whole point, is that one of the problems with this is that it would block the effectiveness of State statutes that are there to protect children against interstate trafficking for the purpose of getting them abortions in another State without the knowledge or consent of their parents. That is an issue.

Yes—and I do maintain—I am not aware of a single State law that prohibits a woman from traveling out of State, an adult woman from traveling out of State. If such a law exists, I am not aware of it, and if it exists despite my nonawareness of it, it is unenforceable. It would be deemed invalid instantaneously. You can't do that.

But what this would do, since it makes no distinction between children and adults, is it would halt the operation of these States' State laws designed to protect children from interstate trafficking for the purpose of obtaining an abortion, which is very often necessary in order to conceal child sex perpetrators and child traffickers and what they are doing.

Now, my colleague and friend from Nevada, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, referred to this—kept characterizing the ''far right.'' Now, to my knowledge, nearly every Republican in this Chamber is pro-life. There are a few variations along the way, but nearly all of us are pro-life. To call all of us far right is excessive, and it is unfair. It is unfair especially because there is a mischaracterization also of why we believe what we believe. At least I can tell you what I believe about this.

She refers to States' rights. I never call it that. Why? Well, because States don't have rights; States have authority. Authority is sort of the inverse polar opposite of a right. A right is something that you have that protects you from actions by the State, by the government, protects you from the authority of the collective, coercive force that is government. So they aren't States' rights; this is State authority. And that is really how we arrived here. That is really where we have been for the last half-century.

While people are, on the left, bemoaning the depravation of a right, I challenge each of them to tell me where in the Constitution it talks about abortion. Of course, the word ''abortion'' doesn't appear in the Constitution, but what part of the Constitution actually confers that right? That is the problem we are getting at

here, and that is what I would like to address here for a moment.

You see, because in Washington, it sometimes starts to feel like we are up against an immovable object and where progress is measured in inches and then victories are sparse and hard-fought, and occasionally the tides turn and something significant happens and there is a seismic shift.

One year ago, we experienced such a seismic shift when the Supreme Court issued its landmark decision in the case of Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health. But to fully appreciate the significance of that historic moment and that decision, we must first understand the journey that got us to this point in the first place. So let's rewind the clock 50 years, all the way back to 1973, when the Supreme Court handed down its ruling in Roe v. Wade, a decision that—to say that it legalized abortion doesn't really capture the image. It centralized power in Washington, DC, over abortion policy decisions, and then it kept that power not in the legislative branch of the Federal Government based in Washington, DC, but across the street at the Supreme Court in nine lawyers wearing black robes who have been sworn in as Justices, by removing the American people's ability to make decisions through their duly-elected lawmakers regarding abortion. It was a moment that completely reshaped the American people's ability to impact abortion policy.

So for nearly five decades after that decision, this power to determine abortion policy rested ultimately with the Supreme Court. Sure, the Supreme Court would leave enough wiggle room to leave the impression that lawmakers—primarily at the State level, of course—could make law, but the Supreme Court was constantly inventing and reinventing what the standard was, what was and what was not a permissible restriction on abortion.

You see, this is what happens when you make up a nonexistent constitutional right, when you just decide that something is really important, that you feel so strongly about it that it must be in there, that it has to be in the Constitution because it is so important. When you take away the constitutional text from the words of the document, all of a sudden, you are left in this sort of no-man's land where you have to make things up as you go along.

The result was chaos—49½ years of chaotic manipulation at will of the law. A State would do one thing; the Supreme Court would strike it down. Another State would do something slightly different; the Supreme Court would uphold it, sometimes changing the standards along the way.

But in Dobbs, the Supreme Court recognized the constitutional importance of keeping the power with the people, affirming that they have a legitimate interest in protecting the lives of the unborn and that they possess the authority to enact laws that reflect their values.

You see, remember a moment ago when we talked about the difference between authority and rights. They are the opposite of each other. Rights protect you from authority.

So when the Supreme Court decided as a matter of policy that it was so passionate about abortion in 1973 that it had to be in the Constitution, they effectively wrote it into the Constitution even though it is not there. They made it utterly impossible for people's elected representatives—either in their State legislative bodies, entities of local government, or, where appropriate, in Congress—to make most of the laws, and ultimately those were all subject to the will and the whim and the caprice of the Supreme Court. They did that because they deemed it part of the Constitution. But when you just deem something a part of the Constitution, that doesn't make it a part of the Constitution.

I believe it was Abraham Lincoln who once asked rhetorically the question: If you call the tail of a dog a leg, how many legs does the dog have?

He asked the question.

Someone answered: Five.

He said: No. Wrong. It is still four. Just because you call the tail a leg doesn't make it a leg. The dog still has four legs.

This is still the Constitution. There still is nothing in here that says, by the way, that people can't make laws to protect the lives of the unborn unless the Supreme Court decides that they are permissible based on its own meandering standards ultimately untethered from the text of the Constitution or from 400 years of Anglo-American legal and jurisprudential tradition.

So in Dobbs, they restored this power back to the people. In Dobbs, it reaffirmed the fundamental belief that every human life is sacred, and every human life is deserving of protection. In Dobbs, the Court recognized the decisions of deeply personal and morally significant matters should be made closest to the people they affect.

Unfortunately, in the wake of Roe, we have witnessed a really dark chapter in our Nation's history. This decision wrongly declared that abortion was a right, despite no mention of it anywhere in the Constitution. A decision ushered in a new era, one that forced us to tolerate some of the most barbaric of practices: late-term abortions, gruesome procedures that practically no American supports became a stain on our society.

Even as those cases were litigated, the gruesome procedures were described, some of the most hardened lawyers could barely tolerate mentioning or even listening to the words describing the procedures.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for a question about how long he plans to speak, just for the convenience of others?

Mr. LEE. Sure. I anticipate I will be finished within 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I appreciate that very much. Thank you.

Mr. LEE. We refuse to accept this as the new status quo. We knew something had gone terribly, terribly wrong.

The Dobbs decision brought us a glimmer of hope. It reaffirmed the fundamental belief that every human life really is sacred and is deserving of protection and is capable of being protected within our constitutional system.

Finally, we are empowered to exercise our constitutional prerogative and resume our efforts to protect the lives of the unborn and end these unspeakable horrors.

And so this issue of States' rights—again, these are not States' rights. That is oxymoronic. And we call it federalism, State authority. So this victory of Dobbs, it is not just a victory for States' sovereign authority; it is also a victory for humanity because when we are told by the judicial branch of government, contrary to fact that the Constitution tells us that we cannot, may not, must not protect unborn human life, that really does grave damage to humanity.

The victory in Dobbs is a reminder that we can't afford to turn a blind eye to the moral and ethical implications of our laws. We must proceed in a way that protects the innocent and defend against the atrocities allowed under this lofty-sounding but ultimately barbaric platitude of choice.

Even with this victory, we still have a long way to go. Contrary to the assertions of many on the Democratic side of the aisle, the Dobbs decision did not make abortion illegal. It did nothing of the sort.

While many States have passed laws that protect preborn children—and I applaud them for doing so—others have expanded their abortion laws. Late-term and partial-birth abortions are still a reality in many States. This isn't something that I celebrate. I disagree with those laws. But I don't live in those States. And the important thing is that the people in those States are making those laws. And most of the time, it is in the States, and not here in Congress, where things not rendered Federal by the Constitution should be decided.

As we approach the 1-year anniversary of Dobbs, I believe we are dutybound to remember the millions upon millions of innocent lives lost, the pain and suffering endured, and the resilience of the men and women who fought for those who could not fight for themselves, who have no voice and therefore had to have others speak on their behalf.

We should be inspired to build a society where every life is cherished, where compassion triumphs over convenience and cowardice, and where the horrors of abortion become a distant memory, especially the horrors of abortion forced upon us by a judicial oligarchy utterly untethered from the text of the Constitution.

The Dobbs decision represented a turning point the moment when we said: Enough is enough. Now we are positioned to acknowledge that every life, from conception to natural birth, deserves our protection and our compassion and our care. And, yes, in some States they are going to do that differently than in others, but the fact that they are going to do it differently in one State or another doesn't mean that they don't deserve protection.

So as we celebrate this milestone, I hope we can remain committed to this cause. Let us never forget the horrors hoisted upon us by Roe and the significance of the Dobbs decision in restoring sanity and compassion to the laws that guide our Nation. Together we can forge our future, where the rights of the unborn are safeguarded, where the dignity of every human being is cherished, and where the dark days of the past remain only as reminders of our resolve to create a better world.

In the face of adversity, remember that change is possible. Remember that we possess the ability to achieve great things. Our Nation's health and strength lie in the people's hands, and together we can shape a future where every life is valued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to support my colleague and friend Senator CORTEZ MASTO in her efforts to bring this legislation not only to the floor but to passage.

This has been a long, long trail of broken promises and false assertions. It began with the broken promises and false assertions of judicial nominees who came before the Judiciary Committee to assure us that the protections of Roe v. Wade were a precedent and that they would respect precedent. Of course, that all evaporated.

We then heard the argument that this was ''States' rights.'' My friend from Utah may not like the phrase, but it is one that his side has used over and over and over again. Call it States' rights or call it federalism, the notion was that all we were doing was opening this up to States.

But you heard right here on the Senate floor that the notion that every pregnancy is subject to the control of the government from the moment of conception. That does not allow for a differentiation between one State and another.

And now that the States' rights assertion has been proven false, now that it is clear that there are many Members not only of Congress but of State legislatures who want a nationwide ban on women's ability to make these reproductive choices, it becomes clearer and clearer why this particular bill is so important. It is only a matter of time until we see those bills being voted on in legislatures, trying to criminalize a citizen of one State if they go to another State to get this kind of care or trying to create a nationwide abortion ban.

However you call it, it will intrude on the ability of women to go and seek this care. And what we are seeing already is women with troubled pregnancies, for whom there is an indicated treatment, unable to get the treatment that medical science knows is the right treatment, whether it is twins, one of whom isn't viable, or a woman's ability to have further pregnancies if this one is not terminated, or the ability of a woman to simply be treated for sepsis, for instance, before it turns to life-threatening and not have to wait and look at the watch and let her get sicker and sicker, knowing that the end is the same, in any event, but putting her life and health at risk in order to allow the will of a bunch of State legislators to turn up in the examination room or the treatment room with her and her family and her doctor. For all of these reasons—because the proponents of a nationwide abortion ban, because the proponents of undoing Roe v. Wade, have simply been incredible for too long—we simply have to assume the worst.

And this bill is an important and sensible way to make sure that if the Presiding Officer's State or my State want to allow that freedom for women, that women can come there and get the care that they need—very often, in a troubled pregnancy, for their own or their future children's or the siblings' well-being. So for all those reasons, I wish we had the chance to vote on this and look forward to future chances.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 631

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, as we know, this Saturday marks the 1-year anniversary of the day the U.S. Supreme Court decided to overturn half a century of precedent on a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions.

I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from Rhode Island and all of my colleagues who are here today.

When they made this decision, it went against the 70 to 80 percent of Americans who believe that this decision should be made by a woman and her family and her doctor and not by politicians. As a result, as we predicted that day, women across the country are at the mercy of a patchwork of State laws governing their ability to access reproductive care.

In States like Texas, women have been forced to carry pregnancies for days after learning that their baby would not survive because their doctors can't legally provide care unless their life is at risk.

And then there was the heartbreaking story about the 10-year-old girl in Ohio who had to go to Indiana to get an abortion after she was raped—10 years old. People said it was some kind of a hoax. It wasn't. It was real. And everyone in this Chamber knows it.

The Supreme Court's decision threatened women's health and freedom. And to this day, it demands a legislative response, not a response where the women of Texas are told that they have different rights. In fact, no rights compared to women in Minnesota or even in our next-door State of Wisconsin. Part of that is codifying Roe v. Wade into law. That is true.

We must also address the full scope that women are facing, the full scope of threats right now. Recent reports have illustrated how social media companies are collecting and data brokers are selling location data that could be used to identify women seeking reproductive healthcare services.

We know that the collection of this data, we know that people on both sides of the aisle understand that this has ramifications beyond women seeking abortion care. They could have anyone, man or woman, seeking a mental health provider, an addiction clinic, counseling therapy—all of it—the rules are murky, and the data is being collected and sold.

That is why I am leading the UPHOLD Privacy Act with a number of our colleagues, including Senator WARREN and Senator HIRONO. And that is why I am seeking unanimous consent to pass this legislation.

Our bill sets commonsense limits on how companies can use people's personal data. First, it bans data brokers from selling location data. Women making their most personal healthcare decisions should be able to go to their doctors' appointments and consult specialists without worrying that the data about their location where they are going to be or are will be purchased or sold.

Second, it says you can't use health data for commercial advertising purposes, period. That means companies can't use data from fitness trackers or browser histories to sell ads, all healthcare data.

Third, it gives consumers more say over how their personal healthcare information is used by allowing them to request that their data be deleted.

It also places limits on what health data companies can collect about Americans. Consumers deserve to be in the driver's seat when it comes to determining how their personal health data is used. This legislation does just that.

It is past time that we update our privacy laws, in general, and I hope we get that done by the end of this year. But we must also update our health privacy laws to reflect the reality of how social media platforms and data brokers are profiting off our data.

In a world without Roe, this couldn't be more urgent. I supported, with a Republican, limits on this health data to begin with, and now, as we are in this post-Roe world, as I know, it becomes even more important.

I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in declaring that these Big Tech companies cannot sell

off, through data brokers, our private personal healthcare and that our decisions should never be a tool for profit. This is not a radical proposal. It is completely common sense.

As we get closer to marking a year without Roe v. Wade, I continue to stand with my colleagues in the fight for reproductive freedom. We stand firmly on the side of the American people who have come together, time and time again, in Kentucky, in Michigan, in Montana, and in the middle of the prairie in Kansas to defend reproductive rights. We will not settle for a reality in which our daughters have fewer rights than their mothers and their grandmothers.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 631 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, 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. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Madam President, this bill presents a solution in search of a problem. Unfortunately, it appears that the intent of this legislation is to treat abortion as healthcare, to prevent pro-life entities from sponsoring ads designed to help provide women and girls with trustworthy support during pregnancy, and to make it harder for States to enforce their own laws protecting life and the most vulnerable.

When it comes to ensuring patient privacy and healthcare, I believe there are bipartisan solutions to be found that we can all agree on. One-sided efforts to promote abortion are not the way for us to find common ground on this issue.

I would also like to point out that this bill has not received a hearing or markup in the Commerce Committee, which would be a great opportunity to have.

I would like to turn now to recognize that this Saturday will mark the first anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark decision in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization. I am incredibly proud that this victory for the pro-life movement, reversing the moral stain of Roe v. Wade, came out of my State of Mississippi. I am amazed and grateful that in God's sovereign plan, a law introduced by my friend, Mississippi State Representative Becky Currie, ultimately achieved what I and so many have prayed for, for 50 years now, to restore the sanctity of life.

My friend, Mississippi Attorney General Lynn Fitch, our State's solicitor general, Scott Stewart, and the many others in the AG's office worked tirelessly to represent our State's direct challenge to Roe.

After a draft of the Dobbs majority opinion was shamefully leaked, the conservative Justices resisted disgraceful intimidation tactics and threats to their own lives. They stayed true to their judicial oaths to uphold and defend the Constitution.

The Supreme Court recognized correctly in Dobbs that the Constitution does not confer a right to abortion and that Roe was ''egregiously wrong and on a collision course with the Constitution from the day it was decided.''

While the Dobbs decision did not end abortion in America, it took a monumental step in returning the issue back into the hands of the people and their elected representatives. Today, as a result, 14 States are protecting unborn children through all 9 months of pregnancy. Several others now protect babies at the point where they have a heartbeat, at 6 weeks, and still others at 12 weeks. One recent study found that there were more than 24,000 unborn children saved from abortion in the first 9 months since Dobbs. That is 24,000 miracles, because that is what a child is—a miracle.

But it is not just the States that can protect life after Dobbs. We in Congress also have a responsibility to protect life and stop the Democrats' extreme pro-abortion agenda.

It saddens me deeply that Democrats in Congress continue to advocate for appalling legislation that would impose legalized abortion on demand up until to the moment of birth across all 50 States. Their legislation is even more radical than Roe was and would eliminate even the most modest pro-life protections, like parental involvement laws and bans on sex-selective abortions. Democrats cannot name a single limit on abortion they support—not one.

The American people, however, reject this extreme position. A new Tarrance Group poll this month found that three-fourths of voters oppose allowing abortions through all 9 months of pregnancy and support at least some limits to abortion.

More Americans continue to reject abortion when they learn more about the child in the womb—when they can hear the child's heartbeat, when they can see them suck their thumbs and yawn in an ultrasound, and when they learn that they can feel pain.

Despite this, the Biden administration's FDA and Department of Justice continue to allow the abortion industry to obstruct the will of pro-life States by illegally flooding the mail with do-it-yourself abortion pills, turning post offices into abortion centers. These actions not only endanger women's lives and their health, but they violate longstanding Federal laws that clearly prohibit the mailing of abortion drugs.

Finally, we also must advance policies to support pregnant mothers in choosing life. In particular, we need to support the work of pregnancy centers. More than 2,700 pregnancy centers across the country provide critical medical and material support for women and families facing unplanned pregnancies to choose life rather than abortion.

This is the promise of the Declaration of Independence: that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to life.

Thanks to the Supreme Court's decision in Dobbs, 1 year ago this week, we can finally begin the hard work to make good on the promise for unborn Americans too.

Finally, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Just a few specific responses. First of all, this bill is very specific. It addresses health and location data, and, as I noted before, I continue to believe that we need Federal privacy legislation, in general, to address other privacy needs. But this bill is targeted at sensitive health data when it comes to location.

And I know it was the conservative members of the Supreme Court who actually issued the broad decision to overturn half a century of precedent on a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. And this bill is a targeted response on one issue, and that is to set commonsense limits on how companies can use people's personal data.

I just also wanted to respond to the issue of mifepristone, which was temporarily thrown out by one judge in the State of Texas, and that is now pending before several different courts. A different decision was made in another court, in Washington State. But I will note that the statute referred to, which would somehow limit this drug that was approved by the FDA decades ago and has been found safe in dozens and dozens of countries across the globe—that law that was referred to was actually enacted, the Comstock Act in 1873—1873—when they treated pneumonia with bloodletting, when the Pony Express existed, and, which I know, is 10 years before they even did the ''Yellowstone'' prequel.

So if my colleagues want to move backward to that time period, those are the laws they are citing. I believe the people of this country want to move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1297

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, listening to this debate today, I can't believe we are having these debates in 2023. It is just stunning to me that we are having to debate privacy and the ability to make your own reproductive health decisions and all the ramifications for it. But here we are.

So I rise today to speak up for American women, the doctors who care for us, and our freedom to make our own healthcare decisions. What a novel idea that, in the United States of America, we would be able to make our own healthcare decisions.

But thanks to a radically conservative Supreme Court and radicals in State legislatures, reproductive freedom is no longer a constitutional right in the United States.

Roe v. Wade protected our freedoms for 50 years, until it didn't. Nearly half of the 50 States have already banned abortion or are likely to do that—half. And, sadly, this change is already making American healthcare worse. It just breaks my heart to hear about the individual situations of women.

In Michigan, fortunately, we are in a situation where the people of Michigan have stood up for reproductive freedom. But to see the women coming into Michigan, the people who are pregnant coming into Michigan, who are coming in to get help that they can't get in their own State, it just breaks my heart.

A poll of OB/GYNs released today by the independent health policy research organization KFF shows the effects. Sixty-four percent of OB/GYNs surveyed said that the Dobbs decision has increased pregnancy-related deaths. Now think about that: 64 percent of the doctors—of the OB/GYNs surveyed—said that this Supreme Court decision has increased pregnancy-related deaths.

Seventy percent of OB/GYNs said that the Dobbs decision has made racial and ethnic inequalities in healthcare worse. And 68 percent of OB/GYNs—the doctors serving women—say that the Dobbs decision has made it harder for them to manage their patients' pregnancy-related emergencies, including women who desperately want their babies. They are desperate for this. They want to have this child. And something comes up, and it breaks their heart and their family's hearts. And there is an emergency that may threaten their life, and doctors are saying that it is harder for them to respond in an emergency.

Just think about that: 68 percent of doctors say that this Supreme Court decision makes it harder for them to keep patients alive.

These doctors know what they need to do to save lives. In many States, they are just not allowed to do it. How could that be in America in 2023?

And even doctors in States like Michigan—and I am proud to say we now protect reproductive freedom in our constitution, voted on by the people of our State, overwhelmingly, last November. But even we aren't immune from that.

A State law in Texas allows vigilantes to sue doctors even in States where abortion is legal. So much for States' rights. And radicals in other States are scrambling to pass similar legislation.

That is why we need the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Healthcare Act. Thank you to Senators MURRAY and PADILLA and LUJÁN and ROSEN for leading this effort, and I am proud to be their partner, as we all are.

This bill would ensure that healthcare providers in States where abortion is legal—States' rights; it is legal—can keep providing the reproductive healthcare their patients need. And it would help protect patients across the country who choose to access reproductive healthcare in a State where it is legal.

I trust Michigan doctors. Michigan doctors know what their patients need. What Michigan doctors and their patients don't need are Texas legislators standing in their exam rooms.

It is time to pass this legislation to protect doctors and to protect their patients. So, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1297 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, 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. Is there an objection?

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I object to S. 1297 for a simple reason: It would make it easier for unborn life to be ended.

Last year's Dobbs decision brought renewed hope to Americans who believe in the sanctity of each and every life, including life in the womb. After 49 years, a new culture of life has begun to take hold across our country. But this bill would actually take us backwards.

This bill would allow abortion on demand in pro-life States so long as the patient is from another State. This bill would expose doctors and nurses who work in religious organizations, clinics, and hospitals—it would expose them to costly lawsuits if they stand by their deeply held beliefs. This bill would violate the spirit of bipartisan Hyde protections by providing 80 million taxpayer dollars to the abortion industry.

I was elected to save as many unborn lives as possible, and this bill puts more unborn lives in danger; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, let me say two points to my colleague. First, fundamentally, this is about who makes medical decisions. Do we trust women? Do we trust the person who is pregnant? Do we trust their ability to work with their doctor? Who makes the decision in the United States of America? We stand with the women of America.

The second thing I will say is that it is so difficult for me to hear over and over again about the sanctity of life when I lead the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, where we have to fight every day to make sure food is available for children who are born.

The House of Representatives just passed an agriculture appropriations bill that gutted WIC, which is the Women, Infants, and Children Program for newborn babies and moms, to get them started in a healthy life.

When we can't pass quality standards for Medicaid births, which are half the births of this country, because we have had objections on the other side of the aisle for years about somehow having quality standards for prenatal care and birth, it is very hard for me to listen to the idea that we ought to be protecting—it is not just the unborn. It is the born. It is the children. It is the moms. It is the quality of life that we fight for every day, for food, healthcare, and so on.

So I find it very hard to listen to that language.

I am very disappointed that there is an objection to a bill that would let doctors practice healthcare to protect women and babies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before she leaves the floor, let me say to my seatmate on the Senate Finance Committee how much I appreciate her passion and leadership on this critical issue.

I note that the Presiding Officer is also one of the outspoken members on the committee on this issue.

This has been a terrific debate coming from our side, and I thank my colleague for her comments.

It has been a year since the atrocious decision of Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization. I remember reading the leaked decision in the press early last May and realizing with dread that the Court was going to strike down Roe v. Wade. My first reaction was that the Court has set in motion a catastrophe for the health, safety, and privacy of American women. To the horror of the 36 million women living in States that have already banned abortion or are likely to ban access to abortion, unfortunately, my prediction was right.

The Supreme Court's decision in Dobbs tossed out half a century of legal precedent, curtailed the fundamental rights of women, and jeopardized the health and safety of millions across the country. The Court defied the American people, who are living with the grim reality that some of the Nation's most powerful people are eager to violate their privacy and their basic right to make their own decisions with respect to healthcare.

So the last year has been a nightmare for millions of women in America. It has been especially felt by those living in the more than 20 States that have passed laws banning or severely restricting access to abortion.

The personal stories that you hear if you spend time listening are gut-wrenching. Women in Texas who desperately wanted to be parents and suffered pregnancy complications nearly died trying to access lifesaving care. Yet they were told they weren't sick enough to get it. Far-right politicians

are suing healthcare providers for providing care to a 10-year-old who had been raped—raped—and was pregnant. The cruelty apparently is the point.

I am proud to be from Oregon, where abortion remains legal. We have some of the most pro-choice laws in the country for those seeking reproductive health care. That is because, in Oregon, we understand that people can make the best decisions for themselves and their families. But even in Oregon, you can't take freedom for granted. Extreme Republicans won't stop until they pass a national ban on abortion, and they are trying.

A national 6-week ban was introduced in Congress right after the Dobbs decision came out. Anti-abortion advocates sought out a lone judge in Amarillo, TX, to ban mifepristone, which is widely and safely used in medication abortions nationwide. The FDA approved the safe and effective medication for dispensation more than 20 years ago. I organized the first congressional hearings about this drug as a Member of the other body in 1990. This effort was never based on some extreme or some political agenda; it was based on one proposition—that science ought to be making the judgments and not politics.

I came to the Senate floor in February and called on the administration to do everything it could to keep the lifesaving medication on the market. Thankfully the far-right extremists haven't won yet, but, as a number of my colleagues have said today correctly, we are not home-free as that case moves through the courts.

Contrary to what Justice Kavanaugh told us in concurrence of Dobbs, anti-abortion zealots are not leaving these matters up to the States. Several States are trying to restrict freedom of movement, criminalizing women who travel to other States for an abortion or even the person who gives them a ride. Think about that. You can't sugarcoat that. They are talking about enacting laws that reach beyond State borders, and that hearkens back to some very dark days in our history.

This has always been about control, and one speaker after another on our side has said that through the course of the day. This is about politicians inserting themselves in exam rooms and in the private decisions about whether and when to start a family.

I care about this issue for several reasons. Right at the heart of my concern is Americans' right to privacy. That right to privacy is what makes America, America.

As women grapple with the strictest State laws that threaten their health and take away their privacy, they also face a crisis of digital privacy and what we have come to call uterus surveillance. Governments are weaponizing the most personal and private data about women's bodies and healthcare and using it against them. I and a number of colleagues on our side have been sounding this alarm for years that location data leached from phone apps is ripe for abuse. States where extremists have restricted or banned abortion—that goes straight to a five-alarm crisis.

We also know that shady data brokers have tracked women to and from Planned Parenthood centers. They have and will sell this information to anybody with a credit card. And in States where abortion is illegal, anything women say or read online can be used against them. Researching birth control online, updating a period tracking app, even just carrying a phone into the doctor's office—you name it—it is potential evidence for the prosecution. The possibilities are endless and frightening.

As to our laws governing women's sensitive private health data, as we think about what is ahead, we have to recognize that those laws have been outdated and weak for decades. I commend the administration for drawing attention to this issue and being interested in shoring up loopholes in our laws.

More has to be done. We have seen over this past year that Republican State attorneys general and Governors are ready and willing to discard women's privacy in their quest to prohibit access to reproductive health care.

This has been a horrific year, but as my colleagues have said on the floor this afternoon, we are going to be resolute. All the bills that the group led by Senator MURRAY, my colleague, the President of the Senate—they are common sense. They are common sense, the package that my colleagues have offered today for unanimous consent. They go a long way toward protecting women and healthcare providers.

I just want my constituents to know and I want my colleagues here in the Senate to know I am on the program. I don't think this is the time when we can even take for granted any of these concerns—not a one. The whole question of access to healthcare, the right to privacy, making sure that States' rights really mean States' rights and not tracking people down across the country—these are all priorities that my colleagues have laid out very, very well.

As long as I have the honor to represent Oregon in the U.S. Senate, I am going to be working with all of them.

The fact is, as we close—and it seems like we are getting ready to wrap up—I think it is clear that the American people are on the side of my colleagues over here who have spoken today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, earlier this afternoon, my colleague Senator MARKEY asked unanimous consent to advance the Right to Contraception Act. There was an objection heard, but I wanted to come to the floor to voice my strong support as a cosponsor of the Right to Contraception Act.

Across the country, women are frightened. They are frightened that after decades of progress in advancing their rights and freedoms, they are watching an activist Supreme Court ignore precedent and strip away their rights and freedoms.

For nearly six decades, American women have come to rely on their right to control when and if they are going to have a family, including through the use of contraception. In fact, about 90 percent of women in the United States have used contraception.

In 1965, the Supreme Court correctly decided Griswold v. Connecticut, reaffirming that our Constitution guarantees the right to privacy. This particular case was over a Connecticut law that banned the use of contraception and imposed penalties, including up to 1 year in prison for doing so. The Supreme Court correctly overruled the law as an invasion of the right to privacy and determined that Americans could use contraception should they choose without government interference.

At the time, the majority opinion reasoned that there were many implied rights that Americans have within the Constitution. On a basic level, this is obvious. Not every single right we are due could be written into our Constitution. So this concept of ''implied rights'' is the foundation for various rights that Americans have come to rely on and, frankly, never think twice about, like the right to learn a foreign language or to travel across State lines or to live with your own family.

Famously, 8 years after Griswold was decided, the Supreme Court used a similar legal foundation—the constitutional right to privacy—to rightly decide in Roe v. Wade that women in the United States have the right to abortion care.

But, despite Roe being the law of the land for nearly 50 years and ''settled as a precedent of the Supreme Court, entitled to respect under principles of stare decisis,'' according to Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh, it was thrown out the window.

This Saturday will mark the 1-year anniversary since this activist Supreme Court—crafted, of course, by anti-choice Republican politicians—stripped 22 million women and counting of their freedom to control their bodies, families, and futures; 1 year since women lost the right to an abortion nationwide; 1 year since women in my home State of Wisconsin were sent back to 1849—and I didn't misstate that, 1849—living under an archaic law that effectively criminalizes all abortion procedures; 1 year since women in America became second-class citizens.

Sadly, that fateful decision that overturned Roe v. Wade put more of Americans' rights on the chopping block.

In Justice Clarence Thomas's concurring opinion, he explicitly said that the rationale used to overturn Roe should be used to overturn cases establishing

the right to contraception, the right to same-sex consensual relations, and same-sex marriage. Justice Thomas wrote that the Court ''should reconsider'' all three of these decisions, saying the Supreme Court had a duty to correct the error in these decisions.

He was essentially providing an open invitation to litigators across the country to bring their cases to the Court, inevitably instilling fear among millions of Americans.

Let that sink in.

With the right to abortion care already ripped away from tens of millions of Americans, a Supreme Court Justice essentially asked for someone to bring him a case so he could rip away one of the only tools many women have left to control if and when to have a family—that being having access to contraception.

Americans have spoken loudly and clearly that they do not believe that a woman's right to control her own body is an error or that the freedom for someone to love whom they love is an error. We cannot rely on an activist Supreme Court to protect our rights and freedoms. Congress must act.

So I stand here, with the backing of 9 in 10 Americans who support access to all forms of birth control, to call for the Senate to listen to our constituents and pass the Right to Contraception Act. Our legislation is simple and common sense. It would guarantee the legal right for individuals to get and use contraception, and it would stop politicians or the government from trying to get in the way, and that is it.

Americans want the right and freedom to control their own reproductive healthcare without interference from judges or politicians. In my home State of Wisconsin, where women are already living under an 1849 criminal abortion ban, access to contraception is absolutely essential. Every person should have the right to control their own bodies, families, and futures no matter where they live. Former Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, who advocated for the right to privacy, called it ''the right to be left alone.''

So I stand here to reiterate this sentiment and to tell Washington to pass our legislation and give women the right to be left alone.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

ABORTION

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, 1 year ago, Americans lost a constitutional right for the first time in history, and they didn't just lose it—Republicans ripped it away.

Just 1 year now after the Dobbs decision, more than 22 million women have lost their right to an abortion, and no corner of our country has been spared from the fallout. Abortion providers in States where abortion is legal, like in my home State of Washington, are being overworked and just totally overwhelmed with patients who have had to wait weeks and travel hundreds of miles to get an abortion.

Then there is the wave of other appalling Republican attacks on abortion: proposals to charge grandmas and older sisters with human trafficking if they drive a minor out of State for an abortion, prosecute abortion providers—doctors—as criminals, ban emergency contraceptives like Plan B, and let's not forget the partisan lawsuit on mifepristone to rip safe medication abortion off the shelves in all 50 States.

You know, when you listen to patients about what this all means and when you hear the actual stories—the nightmares—that Republicans are putting women in this country through, they are heartbreaking: parents driving miles and miles because their child was raped, their child is pregnant, and abortion is banned in their State; doctors being forced to forgo providing lifesaving care because they fear Republican politicians will put them in jail for doing their jobs; women facing miscarriages, left bleeding, unable to get the care they need for days on end.

One woman learned that her fetus had no skull—had no chance of survival—and she still could not get abortion care in her State.

Another woman learned that she had an ectopic pregnancy—a serious, life-threatening condition. She was not able to get an abortion. Instead, when she was at death's door, she ended up having to get a hysterectomy. Why? Because Republican politicians decided that their views mattered more than her health and mattered more than her family.

Let's be clear. The vast, overwhelming majority of Americans stand with women and support the right to choose abortion. In every place abortion rights were on the ballot last November—every single place—abortion rights won. Still, the Republicans are ignoring their own constituents and doubling down on their extreme anti-abortion politics.

Just now, when we tried to pass other basic protections—and I mean the most simple, most straightforward protections imaginable, protections that just say, yes, you can travel to another State for an abortion; that, yes, doctors can provide an abortion in States where it is legal without fear of being thrown into prison; that, yes, we will protect the right to birth control; that, yes, we will keep your online health and location data private so it cannot be used against you—the Republicans said: No, we are not going to let you do that.

One Senator on the floor earlier said that legislation that restricts a woman's right to travel is really about protecting minors from trafficking. Seriously? That is outrageous, and I was absolutely—and I mean absolutely—outraged to hear him say that. I hope that the American people understand what those laws mean.

What it means is that a grandmother who is taking her 17-year-old granddaughter—who was raped or who, maybe, just wants to make her own personal healthcare decision—to a State where abortion is legal could be jailed. States like Idaho have passed these laws that restrict travel. What they do is hold the young women captive in their own State and threaten anyone who might help them get the care they need with time in prison. Those kinds of laws and proposals in other States are an appalling attack on the rights of women and our most basic right as Americans to travel freely within our own country.

I absolutely refuse to let a Senator or anyone twist the reality of these truly heinous laws being passed to hold women captive and to force them to stay pregnant no matter what.

Now, Republicans have basically adopted two approaches to the healthcare crisis they have caused: one, to double down with increasingly extreme, dangerous proposals or, two, to stick their heads in the sand whether that means pretending this isn't a problem, pretending it is not really their fault, or hoping it will fade away.

But there is just no forgetting the unforgivable pain the Republicans' policies have caused.

There is no forgetting the fear of being pregnant when you don't want to be or the heartbreak of learning a pregnancy is not viable or the horror of learning it is life-threatening and knowing you have no control over your body.

There is no forgetting the panic of calculating how many thousands of miles you will have to travel to get care or how many days you will have to take off of work and wonder how you can possibly get the care you need and whether you will face legal action for doing so.

There is no forgetting being investigated for having a miscarriage or for driving your kid across State lines to get an abortion or hearing your doctor tell you they cannot act to save your life because they are afraid of going to jail.

People across this country are facing those realities every single day.

Women are heartbroken and terrified, but they are also mad. They are determined, and they are speaking out. They are not going to settle for a country where they don't have the fundamental freedom to decide what happens to their own bodies—where their daughters and granddaughters have fewer rights than they did just a few years ago—and neither am I.

We on the Democratic side are going to stand up and tell our stories. We are going to make our voices heard, and we are going to fight here, on this side, to restore the freedoms that Republicans took away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me first salute my colleague from the State of Washington. She has really shown extraordinary leadership on this

and so many other issues. She asked us to gather today, on the first anniversary of the Dobbs decision, to really reflect on what has happened to America in 12 months.

I am saying that 2 months ago the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, held a hearing on the devastating consequences of the Dobbs decision on the women and doctors who are affected by it. We did it 2 months ago because the news was pouring in of incidents which had to be told and shared with the American people. Growing reports of chaos and harm caused by that decision are so alarming that we decided to move up our fact-finding to 2 months ago.

There was one witness I will never forget. One of the people we heard from that day was Amanda Zurawski. She shared some of the most heartbreaking testimony I have ever heard, and I have heard a lot.

Last August, in the second trimester of her pregnancy, Amanda suffered a catastrophic medical condition which ensured that she would lose her much loved and much longed-for baby. What is more, without medical care to help manage her miscarriage, Amanda was in grave risk of dying herself. But she was denied that medical care for one reason—she lived in the wrong place—because Amanda Zurawski lived in Texas, which was one of the first States to impose a near-total ban of abortions after Roe v. Wade was overruled. So Amanda waited at home, in agony, for days. Then sepsis set in. Her husband rushed her to the hospital. Hours later, her daughter arrived stillborn. Amanda spent the next 3 days in the ICU, fighting for her own life.

Amanda told our committee:

> People have asked why we didn't get on a plane or in our car to go to a state where the laws aren't so restrictive. But we live in the middle of Texas, and the nearest ''sanctuary'' state is at least an eight-hour drive. Developing sepsis—which can kill [very] quickly—in a car in the middle of the West Texas desert, or 30,000 feet above the ground, is a death sentence. . . . So all we could do was wait.

This was Amanda's first baby. Tragically, because of the trauma her body endured, she may never have another.

And she is not alone. This is happening to women across America. Every day brings us another heartbreaking story of a woman who is denied healthcare, another story of a woman whose life was needlessly put at risk by the Dobbs decision.

According to a new survey, nearly two-thirds of OB/GYNs say the Dobbs ruling has worsened maternal mortality rates in the United States, which were already the worst of any developed nation, and 70 percent of these doctors say the ruling has deepened racial disparities in maternal and infant healthcare. These findings are from a survey released this week by KFF, known as Kaiser Family Foundation.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the AMA both warned that the Dobbs case would unleash an immediate healthcare crisis in our country. With the first anniversary of this ruling, those warnings, sadly, have come true.

Just 100 days after the Dobbs decision, 22 million Americans of reproductive age—almost one out of every three women in America—found themselves living in States where abortion is now illegal or highly restricted. Abortion is now completely banned in 14 States, leaving large swaths of the country without care. Some statewide bans include jail time for healthcare providers who perform abortions. And make no mistake: Unless we act, more and more severe restrictions are coming.

The last year has exposed the true aim of the anti-choice extremists. They want a national ban. Medication abortions account for more than half of all abortions in America. More than 20 years ago, the Food and Drug Administration approved the drug mifepristone as safe and effective for use in medication abortions. Yet anti-abortion groups are now seeking in Federal court to ban its use in every State in America.

The impact of abortion restrictions in any State are felt well beyond that State's borders. In my State, largely as a consequence of near-total bans in many surrounding States, the number of abortions performed by Planned Parenthood in Illinois increased by 54 percent last year. That increase was driven largely by women from out of State seeking access to abortion that is now outlawed in their home States. As a result, wait times to obtain abortions have increased dramatically in our State.

In addition, some anti-choice extremists are seeking to deny women's right to abortions through increased threats and violence against abortion clinics.

We saw this recently in Illinois, when a man rammed his car into a building that was being renovated to serve as an abortion clinic in the Danville area. He also tried to set fire to the clinic; but, thankfully, he was stopped.

According to the National Abortion Federation, last year saw a huge increase in violence at abortion clinics, and a disproportionate increase occurred in States like Illinois that protected women's rights to reproductive care.

Personal decisions about healthcare should be made by individuals and their doctors, not by politicians with an ideological agenda. That is why I strongly support the four measures that my Democratic colleagues have offered to today to protect women's rights to travel to receive healthcare, protect patients' data privacy, protect healthcare providers' ability to provide abortions in States where it is legal, and protect the right to contraception. It is hard to imagine that in 2023, we are actually facing the prospect of losing a woman's right to contraception, as well as access to reproductive healthcare.

The Dobbs ruling has sown chaos, fear, and division. It has usurped doctors' rights to make the best healthcare decisions for their patients. Doctors live in fear of these new laws, whether they include criminal liability for what was good medical practice and still is. They have stripped women of their right to make healthcare decisions and given the power to politicians. It is now up to Congress to protect women and healthcare providers from the results of this disastrous ruling.

(Mr. OSSOFF assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, you were at the Judiciary Committee today. We had a hearing on LGBTQ rights, and there was some extraordinary testimony. A 16-year-old came to us who has gone through a change to her status. This young woman, 16 years of age, explained how she realized at the age of 10 or 11 that she was really inclined toward being a woman and not a man. She sought counseling, through her understanding parents, sat down with doctors, and they began working through the psychology of that decision, the importance of it.

Fortunately for her—and she testified—her parents were supportive of her all the way. We were lucky to have Dr. Ximena Lopez at the hearing as well. She practices medicine in Texas. She is an endocrinologist who treats patients just like this young 16-year-old girl.

She disabused us of many of the myths which are outstanding when it comes to healthcare for those who are in a trans situation. No, there are no surgeries early in life on these children who are making this decision. Yes, medications are held back until puberty to make sure that they are doing the right thing at the right time. Yes, parents are consulted every step of the way.

These are important and critical decisions which parents and families make every day across America. Every day. They are decisions based on the advice of a doctor, as well as what is right for your child. They are decisions that parents will never forget. I know; I have been involved in them. And they are decisions which really would determine the future lives and the well-being of so many individuals.

To think that so many legislatures across the United States are now regulating and putting criminal penalties on the conduct of that doctor who was before us today is heartbreaking. It defies medicine. It defies science. It is politics, pure and simple. The same thing is true on this issue of women's reproductive healthcare.

We have got to leave these basic decisions, fundamental decisions, to the families who are affected by them directly, to the women who are affected by them directly. We have got to say to the doctors across America: Follow the science. Practice good medicine. Don't let a local legislature divert you from the best treatment of your patient to make sure that they come out of this process in a very positive way.

It is a sad moment in America that we are debating these things and debating whether or not to rely on sound medical judgment. In the end, that is the only thing we can count on.

I am glad that we had the hearing today, and I am glad that we gathered on the floor to make a record out of what is happening in our great Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations: all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Space Force; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN503 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning ANDREW K. BERKEY, and ending BRANDON WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN504 AIR FORCE nomination of Jacquelyn P. Smith, which was receive by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN596 AIR FORCE nominations (16) beginning DAVID B. BARKER, and ending JOCELYN M. WHALEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN653 AIR FORCE nomination of Daniel J. Wittmer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN654 AIR FORCE nomination of Marina F. Perez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN692 AIR FORCE nominations (265) beginning STEPHEN DAVID ALBERT, and ending JAMIE TAYLOR ZIMMERMANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN693 AIR FORCE nominations (135) beginning ROBERT D. ALLEN, and ending NICOLAS H. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN694 AIR FORCE nominations (600) beginning CHRISTOPHER K. ADAMS, and ending RAYMOND P. ZHANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN695 AIR FORCE nominations (74) beginning NICHOLAS F. ALIOTTA, and ending JASON J. ZUMMO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN697 AIR FORCE nominations (52) beginning ANDREW D. AHN, and ending OYUNCHIMEG YOUNG, which nominations were received the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN698 AIR FORCE nominations (14) beginning SARAH E. ABEL, and ending MICHELLE E. WYCHE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN699 AIR FORCE nominations (20) beginning MICHAEL J. ALFARO, and ending SARA M. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN700 AIR FORCE nomination of Candice L. Pipes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN701 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL A. GROWDEN, and ending HSIENLIANG R. TSENG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN745 AIR FORCE nomination of Craig A. Ambrose, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN746 AIR FORCE nomination of Bibek Joshi, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN747 AIR FORCE nomination of Adrian K. Williford, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN748 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning DANIEL D. COLE, and ending EDWARD F. LEONARD, which nominations were received by the Senate an appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

IN THE ARMY

PN472 ARMY nominations (90) beginning KYLE D. AEMISEGGER, an ending DO17212, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2023.

PN473 ARMY nominations (19) beginning AILEEN R. CABANADALOGAN, and ending JOHN F. UNDERWOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2023.

PN515 ARMY nominations (136) beginning HARRY T. AUBIN, and ending D016621, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN516 ARMY nominations (29) beginning JOSHUA A. AKERS, and ending SHENICE L. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appear in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN517 ARMY nomination (301) beginning ALEXANDRA M. ADAMS, and ending D016620, which nominations were received by the Senate an appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN518 ARMY nominations (61) beginning ANDREA C. BAEDER, and ending PETERS. YOON, which nominations were received by e Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN602 ARMY nominations (76) beginning HEATHER R. ALSUPMORTON, and ending JUDIZA L. ZELAYA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN603 ARMY nominations (122) beginning BOMA 0. AFIESIMAMA, and ending D016999, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN604 ARMY nominations (31) beginning JAMIE D. BELL, and ending JUSTIN ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN605 ARMY nominations (13) beginning RACHEL A. ACCIACCA, and ending LAURA E. RIDDLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN606 ARMY nominations (33) beginning JAMILIA M. ADAMSHENDERSON, and ending JOHN E. WILSON, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN607 ARMY nominations (44) beginning COREBRIANS A. ABRAHAM, and ending CHRISTOPHER R. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate an appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN608 ARMY nominations (10) beginning AARON CROMBIE, and ending LARRY A. WYATT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN609 ARMY nominations (7) beginning CHARLES E. BANE, and ending THOMAS R. TUCKER, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN643 ARMY nomination of Thomas A. Summers, which was received by the Congressional Record of May 9, 2023.

PN655 ARMY nomination of Nicholas J. Norton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN656 ARMY nomination of Artreese R. Adams, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN657 ARMY nomination of Warren N. Washington, which as received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15 2023.

PN658 ARMY nomination of Jacob W. Cavender, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN659 ARMY nomination of Justin M. Fowler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN660 ARMY nomination of Jason P. Pancoe, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN661 ARMY nomination of Benjamin F. Iverson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN702 ARMY nomination of Mark G. Kappelmann, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN703 ARMY nomination of Leah H. Georgieva, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN704 ARMY nomination of Nicholas R. Yetman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN705 ARMY nomination of Kevin L. Montgomery, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN706 ARMY nominations (9) beginning DAVID J. BEDELLS, and ending MICHAEL D. ZULTAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN707 ARMY nominations (3) beginning MOLLY E. KEITH, and ending DALLAS D. MCMULLEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN749 ARMY nominations (14) beginning STEVEN D. BRYANT, and ending D011339, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN750 ARMY nomination of Joseph A. St Pierre, II, which was received by the Senate

and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN751 ARMY nominations (2) beginning JEFFREY BANKS, and ending JEFFREY R. WEINSTEIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN752 ARMY nomination of Isaac A. Gutierrez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN753 ARMY nomination of Rick J. Mata, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN754 ARMY nomination of D016094, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN662 MARINE CORPS nomination of Dustin R. Kosar, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN709 MARINE CORPS nomination of Steven E. Anderson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

IN THE NAVY

PN559 NAVY nominations (206) beginning BRYCE D. ABBOTT, and ending MATTHEW A. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN560 NAVY nominations (13) beginning EDWARD A. CARLTON, and ending GENEVIEVE G. UBINA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN561 NAVY nominations (6) beginning ANDREA H. CAMERON, and ending WARREN W. TOMLINSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN562 NAVY nominations (14) beginning MYLENE R. ARVIZO, and ending ASHLEY S. WRIGHT, which nominations were received the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN563 NAVY nominations (10) beginning SARAH E. ABBOTT, and ending JOHN A. WALSH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN564 NAVY nominations (4) beginning CURTIS BROWN, and ending GARY M. SHELLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN565 NAVY nominations (3) beginning MARK K. CORBLISS and ending ANTOINE D. THORNTON, which nominations were received by the Senate an appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN566 NAVY nominations (18) beginning HANNAH L. BEALON, and ending STANLEY C. WARE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN567 NAVY nominations (14) beginning CAMERON M. BALMA, and ending MELINDA K. SCHRYVER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN568 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ALAN M. BRECHBILL, and ending DAVID J. TEBBE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN569 NAVY nominations (4) beginning ROSS M. ANDERSON, and ending ROGER D. HORNE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN570 NAVY nominations (4) beginning HOMER F. HENSY, and ending GREGORY F. NOTARO, which nominations were received the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN571 NAVY nominations (5) beginning TOMMIE G. CRAWFORD, and ending SHANNON P. THOMPSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN572 NAVY nominations (4) beginning JOHN E. FAGE, and ending REBECCA L. REBARICH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN573 NAVY nominations (10) beginning GAVIN H. CLOUGH, and ending MATTHEW G. ZUBLIC, which nominations were received the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN574 NAVY nominations (4) beginning JENNIFER J. LANDRY, and ending JONATHAN A. SAVAGE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN575 NAVY nominations (14) beginning BRADLEY H. ABRAMOWITZ, and ending CHELSEY L. ZWICKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN619 NAVY nominations (63) beginning ERIC J. ADLER, and ending MATTHEW A. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN620 NAVY nominations (22) beginning LUCAS R. ARGOBRIGHT, and ending SARAH E. TURSE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN621 NAVY nomination of Patrick C. Lazzaretti, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN622 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ROBERT A. PAYNTER, JR., and ending TODD C. WINN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN623 NAVY nominations (6) beginning STANLEY J. BENES, IV, and ending MICHAEL SULLIVAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN624 NAVY nominations (3) beginning JAMES P. MCDONNELL, and ending JOSEPH E. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN625 NAVY nomination of Donna M. Chuba, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN626 NAVY nomination of Anton B. Allen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN627 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ADAM M. CLAMPITT, and ending GUSTAVO PEREZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN628 NAVY nominations (3) beginning CHRISTOPHER P. COOK, and ending MATTHEW E. HOBBS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN629 NAVY nominations (2) beginning DEMETRIO A. CAMUA, III, and ending ARTHUR C. FONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN630 NAVY nomination of Loren C. Hoelscher, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN631 NAVY nominations (3) beginning MATTHEW T. CHATIGNY, and ending KEVIN C. LIEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN632 NAVY nominations (3) beginning JOSHUA C. GETTLE, and ending GERARDO TORRES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN633 NAVY nominations (8) beginning JOHN J. BRIDGES, and ending MARK H. OVERSTREET, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN634 NAVY nomination of Ryan H. Metzler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN663 NAVY nominations (20) beginning DENNIS L. AVERY, and ending BRIAN D. WUESTEWALD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN664 NAVY nominations (10) beginning KHRISTIANNOE C. CAINDOY, and ending DIMITRY P. VINCENT, which nominations were received by the Senate appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN665 NAVY nominations (3) beginning MATTHEW D. GLEASON, and ending EMILY Y. ROYSE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN666 NAVY nomination of Jacob S. Tharp, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN710 NAVY nominations (30) beginning CHRISTOPHER BARNES, and ending CHADWICK Y. YASUDA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN711 NAVY nominations (65) be inning KENRIC T. ABAN, and ending JEFFREY C. WORTHLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate an appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN712 NAVY nominations (20) beginning MICHAEL R. ANDERSEN, and ending CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN713 NAVY nominations (11) beginning DOMINIC J. ANTENUCCI, and ending CHRISTOPHER C. SWAIN, which nominations ere received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN714 NAVY nominations (550) beginning WILLIAM H. ABBITT, and ending THOMAS W. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN715 NAVY nominations (38) beginning JOSHUA M. ANDERSON, and ending ALEXANDER G. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN716 NAVY nominations (25) beginning DAVID L. AGUILAR, and ending DANIEL J. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN717 NAVY nominations (8) beginning SEAN A. BROPHY, and ending JESUS A. URANGA, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN718 NAVY nominations (16) beginning FRANCIS G. COYLE, and ending DANIEL A. TANTILLO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN719 NAVY nominations (14) beginning REBECCA L. ANDERSON, and ending JOHN L. VINCENT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN720 NAVY nominations (23) beginning NICK AVILA, and ending MICHAEL P. WOLCHKO, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN721 NAVY nominations (11) beginning MICHAEL K. BEALL, and ending ALANNA B. YOUNGBLOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN722 NAVY nominations (2) beginning FORREST N. BUSH and ending NATHAN J. RICHARDSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN723 NAVY nominations (48) beginning SCOTT B. AARON, and ending CLINTON M. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN724 NAVY nominations (32) JESSICA L. ALEXANDER, and ending CRYSTAL R. WARRENE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN725 NAVY nominations (46) beginning SUZANNE T. ALFORD, and ending ERIC R. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN726 NAVY nominations (14) beginning NICHOLAS D. CHIUDIONI, and ending JULIAN G. WILSON, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN727 NAVY nominations (16) beginning MARVIN E. BARTHOLOMEW, and ending KIRTLEY N. YEISER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN728 NAVY nominations (13) beginning QUENTIN ALBEA, and ending EDWARD E. WEEKLEY, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN729 NAVY nominations (15) beginning PAUL M. ALLEN, and ending THOMAS H. WILLIAMS, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN730 NAVY nominations (9) beginning SCOTT P. ADER, and ending PHILIP R. SAULNIER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN731 NAVY nomination of Erika M. Meszaros, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN732 NAVY nominations (36) beginning MARY R. ANKER, and ending BRANDON K. WOLF, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN733 NAVY nominations (12) beginning DAVID W. ALEXANDER, and ending JOHN C. VANDYKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN734 NAVY nominations (11) beginning CHRISTOPHER S. CASNE, and ending JUSTIN D. SPINKS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN735 NAVY nominations (28) beginning KEVIN L. BORKERT, and ending BLAKE A. WHITTLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN755 NAVY nominations (11) beginning THEODORE G. CAVOORES, JR., and ending CHRISTY L. ROUSSEAU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN756 NAVY nominations (7) beginning ANDREW E. CARMICHAEL, and ending DAVID N. STOCK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN757 NAVY nominations (7) beginning KRISTEN M. BETAK, and ending SUZANNE J. WOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN758 NAVY no which nominations (4) beginning SARAH E. DAVIS, and ending JEFFREY J. ROCKWOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN759 NAVY nominations (28) beginning BRYAN T. ALVAREZ, and ending JENNIFER J. VOGT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN760 NAVY nominations (8) beginning RODNEY M. BONNER, and ending CHARLES C. THOMPSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN761 NAVY nomination of Julie K. Moss, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN762 NAVY nominations (5) beginning LUIS E. ALDERMAN, II, and ending MELINDA S.L. ZALMA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN763 NAVY nominations (6) beginning TIMOTHY W. GLEASON, and ending CORY A. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

PN764 SPACE FORCE nomination of Robin J. Glebes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN765 SPACE FORCE nominations (3) beginning LISA T. GREEN, and ending KEITH D. VAN DYCK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN766 SPACE FORCE nominations (36) beginning PHOENIX L. HAUSER, and ending DUSTIN L. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

EATS ACT OF 2023

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the recent Supreme Court ruling in favor of the California law that is called Proposition 12, affecting the pork industry, has sent shock waves through the entire agricultural industry. Particularly hard-hit by the news is my State of Iowa, which is No. 1 in pork and No. 1 in eggs; and another proposition California law affects the selling of eggs in California.

California is 15 percent of the national market for pork, so you can see what California is doing can have a big impact on the pork industry in the other 49 States.

If California can regulate pork producers out of business through costly and unrealistic regulation, which food will be next? What segment of agriculture will be negatively affected next?

Consumers should be waking up to the reality of activist policies coming from folks on the left who want to put the kibosh on animal agriculture.

California's law is based on arbitrary and prescriptive standards that lack any scientific, technical, or agricultural basis. It also jeopardizes sow safety. And for you city slickers, ''sow'' is the word we use for mother pigs.

The cost to implement Proposition 12 has been measured to be approximately $3,500 per sow—a cost that farmers would need to pass on to the consumer.

This additional cost will threaten the independent pork producers in rural Iowa and run them out of business due to burdensome regulations.

I am not only speaking for Iowa pork producers, even though we are No. 1 in pork production. This is affecting pork producers in the other 49 States. The result of this law will be significant on Iowa's independent pork producers.

We all know people will continue to eat pork chops, ham, and bacon, but this will only lead to further consolidation so that you will only have three or four companies controlling the entire supply of pork for our country.

The future of the independent pork production is at stake, and I do not want to sit idly by as pork producers across Iowa go out of business. So this Monday, our national holiday, when the Senate wasn't in session, I met with 40 pork producers in Palo Alto county. Hearing from Iowans firsthand on this issue was especially impactful.

Iowa producers who have raised hogs for more than 50 years told me that they have never been so worried. How will rural agriculture fight against the special interests and big money of the coasts is a question I was asked. How can farmers afford to remain compliant with nonsense policies written by someone who has never been on a hog farm?

There has to be a legislative solution to what California is negatively doing to pork producers in the other 49 States, so Senator MARSHALL, Senator ERNST, and I have been working on a solution. The EATS Act—E-A-T-S, that is an acronym for a piece of legislation preventing States from impeding ag trade from other States within the United States, under the constitutional power of Congress, to regulate interstate foreign commerce. Our legislation is an example of Congress regulating interstate commerce.

In the court's majority decision, it was a five-to-four decision—an odd combination of liberals and conservatives on the Supreme Court saying that California did the right thing and an odd combination of liberals and conservatives who said that California didn't have the power to do what they did under our Constitution. But in this majority opinion, Justice Neil Gorsuch wrote that Congress has the power to regulate commerce but has yet to enact legislation to displace Proposition 12.

I read Justice Gorsuch saying to the Congress of the United States—the courts are kind of saying to themselves something like this: Why should we say that California has acted unconstitutionally when Congress has the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and they have not done it?

So this is the reason for this bill. This bill would put an end to California's war on breakfast and override the coastal State's overreach into the heartland's breadbasket.

The Supreme Court asked Congress to act, so that is what Senators MARSHALL, ERNST, and I—and many other Senators have now joined us in this effort. We are responding to the Supreme Court's decision.

Feeding your family is not a partisan issue and neither is protecting our food supply chain. Food security, after all, is national security.

I am engaging in discussions with as many as my colleagues as I can on this very issue. I hope this will soon be a bipartisan bill.

It is common sense to protect affordable, quality food for America's families and support the 2 percent of the country that we call family farmers who feed the other 98 percent of the people in this State; and not only produce for the other 98 percent but about a third of our agriculture production is exported. Remember, bacon doesn't grow in grocery stores.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of the EATS Act.

STUDENT DEBT

I have one more statement in regard to education that I would like to give.

Mr. President, every person taking out a loan knows it must be repaid. Still, we have seen lots of talk about canceling student debt after the debt has been assumed. But that doesn't help students who are not in college yet but going to enter college. It is closing the barn door after the horse has been stolen.

To lower the cost of college, we need to let students be able to compare the true costs between schools. They can't do that now because, right now, schools that are upfront about their costs, meaning they give the students an exact figure on what they are going to have to pay to get a college degree, these very schools are at a disadvantage to their competition that doesn't play by honest rules and honest policies about what it actually costs to go to a particular school.

So I am going to go into some detail about what is wrong with the present environment, and I am going to start with the Government Accountability Office taking a look at the financial aid letters that should show students how much they will pay. Unfortunately, according to the GAO, not a single college followed all 10 best practices that have been suggested by that Agency, the Government Accountability Office.

Now, here are some examples:

A third of the colleges confused loans and grants—how misleading. You think you are getting a grant, and you find out later it is a loan. And 91 percent of the colleges understate their true costs.

So it is quite obvious the free market doesn't work if students only find out how much they owe after they have already selected the college that they will attend.

That is why my bill that I entitled Understanding the True Cost of College Act creates a standard, easy-to-read financial aid letter. Under my bill, students could take this letter that they get from the various colleges that they have been accepted to and see, side by side, what each school offers them. They can compare, in other words, apples with apples, not apples with oranges, as is the very case today.

Another thing that doesn't make any sense: Do you know that the current practice effectively encourages students to go into debt more than what it actually costs to get a college degree? The paperwork offering student loans tends to default to the maximum eligible loan amount, whether that maximum is needed or not, to get a college degree. So then, under this practice, students have to go out of their way to borrow less money than what is offered. But guess what. Most students actually do borrow the maximum.

So, you see, we have a Federal policy that encourages students to take out more debt than they need to get their degree, and we shouldn't have the Federal Government encourage indebtedness that is not needed. The Federal Government, in other words, should help students borrow only what they need.

So I have a bill that goes by the title of Know Before You Owe Act. This act would show students their estimated monthly loan payments after graduating. They would see it compared to the average salary for graduates of their particular college major. It would also require students to type in the amount that they want to borrow, instead of clicking a box that ends up with them taking the maximum that is allowed.

Each of these proposals puts students, then, in the driver's seat, where the student should be.

Choosing a college happens to be one of the largest purchases many Americans ever make. It should be a good investment for a bright future, not a one-way ticket to excessive debt. Students should have all the information they need when they are making that decision of what college or university to attend.

All the ideas I mentioned here are bipartisan, and I have been advocating some of these issues for years. It is not a Republican or Democrat idea to give students the information they need to make the right decision for which school to attend. That is why I was glad to see each of these two ideas that I am talking about now included in legislation called the Lowering Education Costs and Debt Act.

My colleagues in the Senate are right to focus on the start of the process, when students choose a college and take out a loan. Dealing with debt only after it is taken out does not lower the cost of a college education. Right now, a student can't pick a college on price even if they wanted to.

I hope this is the start of a discussion to help students limit their borrowing on the front end and, ultimately, to put pressure on institutions to bring down the cost of college.

Whereas President Biden's proposal to wipe out student debt would give colleges a license to pump up tuition costs, these proposals would pump the brakes on soaring tuition costs by empowering students to make smart decisions on the front end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

ABORTION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have a question for this body. It is not a legislative question. It starts first with just a question. It is a question for us to be able to think about, and it is a question, quite frankly, that is essential that we think about but that we don't think about very often because it is introspective, because it is personal, because it connects both science and faith and culture and background. But it is essential to who we are as people, human beings, and it is this simple question: When does life begin?

I don't say it flippantly. It is a real question. It is a question that we have had as a nation now the entire time we have been a nation, and it has been decided by different States and by different people from the very beginning of our Nation.

When does life begin? For some people, they would say life begins at birth, when I can see that child, when they are screaming and crying and just born, red-faced.

Some people would say it is actually 10 minutes before that birth; that it is not at birth; that it is just a little bit before.

There are some people who would back it up, and they would say: No, you are really a child when you are alive and you are viable—that is somewhere around 21 weeks' gestation now—that when you are viable, that is when you are really alive.

Some people would back it up even more to say: Not at 21 weeks; maybe at 15 weeks because science would say at about 15 weeks that child in the womb has a nervous system that is developed and they can feel pain.

Some would say: No, I would back it up more than that. I would actually take it to 6 weeks because, at 6 weeks, it is the early stages of a beating heart, and we would say, when that heart beat is actually happening, that is when that child is alive.

And others would back it up even further and would say: When that child has unique DNA that is different DNA than the mom or the dad—in fact, in that mom's body, every single cell in her body has the same DNA marker except for those cells. For those cells in the woman's body, that DNA is different. They are the only cells that are different, and, as they multiply and divide, that DNA signature grows, but it stays right there with that child.

It is a real question.

Fifty-one years ago, our country had different opinions. Different States had different ideas about when life began.

And each State voted, and each State had a debate in their State about when life began. That was what we were like from the very beginning of the country up to 51 years ago.

And then, in 1973, the Roe v. Wade decision happened in the Supreme Court, and, at that time, nine Justices said: Nope, individual States and people aren't going to decide this; the nine of us are going to decide this.

And for almost 50 years, the law of the land was that those Justices all made one determination for everybody—until 52 weeks ago, when that same Supreme Court, nine Justices again, said: No, this should be back in the hands of the people, where it has always been, because Justices shouldn't decide this issue. This is a decision we the people should make.

Justice Alito wrote the opinion in that decision, and he said this:

Roe was egregiously wrong from the start.

He said:

And far from bringing about a national settlement of the abortion issue, Roe and Casey have enflamed debate and deepened division. It is time to heed the Constitution and return the issue of abortion to the people's elected representatives.

The permissibility of abortion, and the limitations upon it, are to be resolved like most important questions in our democracy: by citizens trying to persuade one another and then voting.

It is back to the people. So that is where we are.

Now, 1 year after the Dobbs decision came out, on the June 24 of last year, it is still back to the same conversation. We still haven't agreed as a nation when life begins. Maybe, we never will. But as a nation, now, that conversation is happening all over the country. Individuals are having the dialogue: When does life begin?

In the past year, there is really no way to know how many children are alive today that would not have been alive prior to the Dobbs decision. About half the States in America have already passed some sort of law to limit the number of abortions in their State, while about half of the rest of the country has either left abortion policies in place in their State or even expanded them.

Some of our States have no abortion at all in their States, and in some States, literally, you can have abortion all the way up until the second before delivery—late-term, literally the second before delivery—and choose to have an elective abortion. That is a pretty wide spread in our country. It is a pretty wide set of opinions.

And while we don't know how many children are alive today, we can be certain that there are tens of thousands of children alive right now who would not have been alive a year ago, prior to the Dobbs decision. That is tens of thousands of children who are alive that, in the next few months, will be giggling and laughing. Next year, they will be running around singing silly songs. Two years after that, they will be in kindergarten learning their colors. They will be alive today because of that Dobbs decision. And while I understand some people are disappointed that those kids are alive, I am not, and I am convinced our communities and our schools and our workplaces in the future will be glad they are there.

In the past year, while a lot of people have been celebrating the value of every single one of those children who have been born, there are some who have not been.

In fact, in my frustration, this Biden administration has been obsessed with increasing the number of abortions in America, not decreasing them.

Today, there have been numerous unanimous consent requests from the floor of this Senate asking to be able to take out all of the laws across the entire country and to be able to move it back to there is abortion on demand at any stage. They all lost on the floor today, but there is a push on the floor of this Senate today to be able to expand abortion on demand all the way up until moments before birth.

This administration has taken even more aggressive actions than the Senate took today. This administration has shifted a policy longstanding on mail order abortions—do-it-yourself abortions at home, to be able to take a two-drug cocktail to be able to have an abortion at home—where they have stripped out the rules that you have to see a doctor to get this prescription, remembering that this prescription actually takes the life of a child and causes excessive bleeding. You don't have to see a doctor anymore. They have now shifted that to say you have to see a medical professional of any type.

You also don't have to have any screening for ectopic pregnancies. If you take this two-drug cocktail—and the only way you can really determine that is a medical examination—then it could actually kill the woman while it takes the life of that child as well.

If you have the wrong blood type—and the only way to really determine that is to go see a medical professional, although the Biden administration is now saying you no longer have to see them—but if you take this particular two-drug cocktail and have the wrong blood type, it will actually make you infertile for the rest of your life as well as take the life of your child. So if you want to have a baby later, you can't.

The only way you would know one way or the other on that is actually having a medical screening and test, but the Biden administration is so obsessed with increasing the number of abortions in America, they have now said: Don't worry about going to the doctor. Don't worry about if you have an ectopic pregnancy or the wrong blood type.

In fact, they have taken even an extra step and have said to emergency rooms: If someone shows up in an emergency room who has taken this two-drug cocktail and is excessively bleeding, you do not have to report it to the FDA unless she dies.

Every other condition—excessive bleeding, on the edge of life, emergency room trips—don't report those. Those don't get reported anymore at all. Literally, they are saying we don't need the information about other side effects—only death—for this particular drug. That is an enormous shift. That is an administration that is obsessed with saying: We need more abortions in America, and if things go bad with this two-drug cocktail, don't tell us.

I mentioned before that there is a very, very old Federal law that still stands in Federal law that says you can't mail anything that is going to cause an abortion. It is against Federal law to put something in the mail and mail it to someone that causes an abortion. The Biden administration literally has put out a public opinion from their Office of Legal Counsel saying that law really doesn't apply anymore; it is old. It is trying to say: Well, it means something different than what it actually says. I would encourage anyone to actually read that statute and to come to any other conclusion other than what it says.

The Biden administration has made it very clear under the Department of Justice that, we know this is against Federal law to be able to mail abortion materials, but we are not going to prosecute this. Literally, it is against the law, but we don't care—so much so that even if a woman ends up in the hospital, in the emergency room and checked in, don't even tell us unless she dies.

Last summer, there were several of my colleagues who brought a bill to this floor to give a $100,000 fine to any pro-life pregnancy center that didn't perform abortions. Now, just let that soak in for a minute. Now, it didn't pass, but this body was debating and trying to shut down the advice of people who are in pro-life centers who say: I believe in the value of every child.

These pro-life centers, if you have never been to one, they are almost always completely run by volunteers. They provide ultrasounds to individuals who are trying to figure out ''Am I really pregnant?'' They provide free pregnancy tests to be able to help people as they are thinking through it. And, yes, they talk about that they believe in the value in life. But they also provide formula for babies, clothes for babies, diapers for babies. They provide parental advice and counsel for new parents who are terrified, and they say: Hey, we are going to walk with you. If you are considering having an abortion because you are afraid you will be alone and no one will be with you, we will be with you.

Last summer, a bill came to this floor to try to do a $100,000 fine to those folks who are trying to give away free formula, free diapers, and free mentoring, to people who would say: If you keep your baby, we will walk with you through these tough times.

This administration, the Biden administration, has shifted our VA hospitals into abortion clinics. It is against Federal law, but they have done it anyway. Literally, there is a Federal law that was put in place 30 years ago about VA hospitals and abortions, and it doesn't allow them. This administration has told the VA hospitals ''Ignore that Federal law that was passed 30 years ago because we don't like it; we are not going to enforce it'' and is literally taking—because there are not dollars allocated to this—literally taking dollars away from our veterans and their healthcare and moving it to doing abortions in our VA centers instead.

As far as we can tell, there are thousands of abortions that have happened in our VA centers across our country in the last few months, all of them paid for by Federal tax dollars, which is against the law, in a facility that was specifically noted could not perform abortions, which is against the law, using Federal dollars to pay for it.

It should not be a surprise to you that President Biden's budget—every year he has been President, he has asked to take away the Hyde amendment. People may not know what the Hyde amendment is, but the Hyde amendment is what prevents abortion dollars from being used—from Federal tax dollars.

A lot of people across the country, I understand, have completely different opinions about abortion, but almost every person I talked to would say: I have a different opinion about abortion, but I don't think American tax dollars should be used to pay for elective abortions. But every year, President Biden has asked to remove the Hyde amendment so Federal dollars can be used to pay for abortions, elective abortions, across the country.

This administration is so incredibly extreme about increasing the number of abortions in America, it has even extended to our southern border.

The people who are here in this room know that I have come to talk about our southern border multiple times to try to bring solutions. There are solutions that are, quite frankly, nonpartisan solutions for how he we can solve some of the difficult issues of illegal immigration on our southern border. I am a huge fan of legal immigration, but I think unchecked illegal immigration and chaos on our southern border is a bad idea.

This administration, in the middle of what is going on on our southern border right now, has put out what they call Field Guidance 21 out of Health and Human Services to say that if an unaccompanied minor comes across our southern border who happens to be pregnant, that unaccompanied minor is to be relocated to a State that allows abortion. The guidance gives information about how to even transport individuals who are pregnant who cross our border to abortion clinics, and it gives special guidance for those who are in their last weeks of pregnancy on how to be able to take care of those moms as you transport them to get an abortion—late-term abortions. That is in the HHS guidance that is happening right now on our southern border.

This administration created a website to promote abortions with official Federal dollars that is connected to the White House website. In fact, this administration literally put it as a front-page piece on the White House website: Here is how to be able to get an abortion in America. They have given a $1.5 million grant to create a national abortion hotline so that anyone who wants an abortion, it would be easier to be able to get it. They have created a reproductive rights task force to try to evaluate all States and be able to get information out on how to be able to increase abortions.

When the COVID money was done, now a year and a half ago—the previous bipartisan bills on COVID all had a restriction on any of that money being used for abortions until the last partisan bill was actually put out, and that specifically allows for abortion with COVID relief dollars.

The Department of Justice did not engage when pro-life centers were being attacked. They have engaged to be able to go after people who oppose abortion. In the past couple of years, there have been 329 attacks on Catholic churches and 87 attacks on pro-life centers, just since the Dobbs leak came out prior to the actual release in June, but there have been no prosecutions to go after those folks. Apparently, if you attack a Catholic church or a pro-life center, the Department of Justice is not interested.

There are also conscience protections. Again, not all Americans agree on the issue of abortion. Many doctors and nurses go into medical practice because they have a passion about life. We have conscious protections in Federal law right now that if you tell your employer in a hospital that you have a conscience issue on performing an abortion and they compel you to do that, the Federal Government is charged to be able to step in and make that employer protect your conscience rights.

That has happened in the past under past administrations, but under this administration, literally when this administration came in, there was a nurse who had been compelled to perform an abortion against her conscience at the University of Vermont Medical Center. She had told her employer in advance that she did not want to participate in abortions, that she believed in the value of every child.

She came in one day to work. She was called into a surgery area, and the physician looked her in the face and said: Don't hate me for this.

She said: What?

Then she turned and realized that she had been called in and was being compelled—or she would lose her job—to perform an abortion and to be a part of that abortion procedure.

Typically, under previous administrations, that person would have been protected. This HHS dropped the case. Literally, it was midway through. The Department of Justice is no longer prosecuting. They are saying that is not relevant; literally saying: If you have a conscience issue as a nurse or a doctor performing an abortion, too bad. Change your occupation. We are not going to protect you.

Oh, and did I mention that if you are in the U.S. military now, under the new Biden policy, and you went to your commanding officer and said ''Hey, my grandmother passed away. I would like to get 5 days off to go travel, to go to my grandmother's funeral,'' you would be told no. But if you go to your commanding officer and say ''I would like to be gone 5 days to get an abortion,'' not only would your commanding officer, under the Biden administration, be instructed ''Yes, you can have 5 days' paid leave off,'' but they would also say to you ''How far are you going to travel? We are going to pay for your travel to reimburse you while you are gone.''

So if you need to go to your aunt's funeral, you don't get days off because that is too distant of a relative, but if you need to get an abortion, not only will this administration give you 5 days off to go get it, they will literally pay for your travel there and back to be able to go do it, not to mention the change in the Mexico City policy. Now we are paying for abortions overseas currently with Federal dollars.

HHS launched a new web page that actually gave out what they call creative ways for health clinics to advise teenagers on sex, birth control, pregnancy testing, and abortion. HHS, in fact, has proposed a new rule that they are in the process of finalizing which redefines ''reproductive healthcare'' to include abortion. It prohibits entities from cooperating with law enforcement or a court order if an investigation is related to an abortion. It redefines the word ''person'' to ''a human being that is born alive.''

HHS has also changed the billing requirements for the ACA—the Affordable Care Act—and has blatantly ignored the law on how abortion funding is done, in direct opposition to when this body debated that publicly.

If I can just mention one other thing, my State, like every other State, gets grants for what they call title X grants. These are Federal grants for cancer screenings for women, for contraceptives, for those that are in poverty. That is normal. We have that all over the country for every State. It is a typical grant that comes out to be able to have women in poverty get cancer screenings and get access to contraceptives.

My State was just informed that the Biden administration is cutting off our title X funds and will not send Federal dollars to Oklahoma for cancer screenings for women or contraceptives for women in poverty to my State. Do you want to know why?

The reason that the Biden administration cut off my State is because my State would not include an abortion hotline in all of our medical information going out to the citizens of my State. That is right. If my State would not promote ways to get abortion to women in my State, then the women of my State can't get access to cancer screenings or contraceptives for low-income women.

Literally, what they are saying is: You either promote abortion in your State, or women in your State can't get access to screenings. That is this administration's extreme policy on abortion.

Listen, I understand we have differences of opinion. I happen to believe every child is valuable. This administration believes some children are disposable and some children are valuable. I just don't find any child disposable in my world. I think they are all valuable. I think they are all important. I think we look in the eyes of those tens of thousands of children that have been born in the past year post Roe, and we look them in the face and we say, I am glad you are here. What are you going to be? What are you going to invent? What are you going to do? What is life going to be like for you?

And like millions of other Americans, they will have a chance to live out life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, because we are right there looking in their eyes. Let's have this conversation. Let's keep this dialogue going.

We are a nation that should talk about hard things in respectful ways. But let's talk about it, because there is lots of families in the days ahead that are counting on us living out our values and respectfully having dialogue where we disagree, because I think kids are worth it. So let's have that dialogue. One year after the Dobbs decision, we are not resolved, but at least we are talking about it again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

LONELINESS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am on the floor tonight to talk about a topic that rarely, if ever, gets discussed on the Senate floor. I am here to talk about loneliness.

Every single one of us, over the course of our life, has felt lonely, maybe really intensely lonely. I certainly have. It is an awful feeling, right? It creates this pit in your stomach. It creates a consuming melancholy for many. Sometimes intense loneliness can make you physically ill. Often, it makes you really agitated and angry, right? Why is this happening to me?

Now, there are, frankly, a lot of reasons to believe that less Americans today should feel lonely than ever before. More of us live in densely populated parts of the country than ever before. Technology now allows us to connect to friends and family and communities that share interests more easily than ever before at the press of a button.

But evidence from psychology and sociology tells us that the opposite is true. In recent decades, we have seen rising levels of both aloneness, which is defined as having fewer social contacts, and high levels of loneliness, which is defined as feelings of isolation.

We live closer to each other than ever before. We have technologies that allow us to connect to people with more ease than ever before, but people are feeling lonelier. As we look out at a country that seems to be kind of coming apart a little bit at the seams—I mean, people are getting shot at just for ringing the wrong doorbell or pulling into the wrong driveway. Hundreds are dying every day from taking a drug that is designed to deaden their emotions. Thousands of people engaged in violent rebellion right here in the Nation's Capital.

We need to be engaged in this search for the reasons why people are feeling more pessimistic, more frustrated, and angrier than ever before. And so about 8 or 9 months ago, I started talking about what I believed to be one of the most important political issues of our time: loneliness.

Millions of Americans are feeling this way. People report feeling more intense loneliness than ever before in our lifetime. And it is irresponsible for policymakers to just keep ignoring it.

Now, there are a lot of explanations for how we got here, but a few stand out as particularly important for my colleagues to consider.

So it is true that technology does allow us to stay connected to family and friends and find new communities, but on the whole, technology has left many Americans, especially young people, feeling more alone than ever before.

During the height of COVID–19, we learned the hard way that digital communication cannot replace the value of in-person experience. For example, studies show that face-to-face interactions create faster connections to humans and build stronger, more enduring relationships than anything that you can create online.

Of course, staying in touch electronically is better than losing touch altogether, but when Facebook likes and Instagram comments replace in-person experiences, it actually can drive up feelings of loneliness.

Staring at your screen for 6 hours a day, no matter how many people you are looking at, it can be a very lonely experience.

And it doesn't stop there, because there are millions of users with developing minds—children—who spend hours staring at their screens, scrolling through an endless stream of pictures and videos that have been carefully curated to create an illusion of perfection, leaving young people feeling inadequate or wanting.

Constant comparison breeds—in young people especially but in all of us—and can result in more anxiety than fulfillment. Kids are feeling really lousy today, and it is not just because they are spending tons of time on their screens instead of engaging in real in-person experiences. It is also because the content that they are watching is dangerous and corrosive and making them feel more alone in the world because of those feelings of envy.

Now, the second really important factor contributing to this epidemic of loneliness in America is the erosion of local communities. Now, connection sometimes happens randomly; but, mostly, it is facilitated through local institutions: churches, sports teams, civic clubs, labor unions, business organizations. We derive personal meaning as well from those institutions, from the communities that we create or join. We get connection, but we also get meaning.

Those institutions help us construct an identity, a sense of purpose. It connects us to something bigger than ourselves. But in 2023, you would be hard-pressed to find a community with the kind of thriving local institutions of decades ago.

Globalization has erased thousands of healthy, unique downtowns, where people often met each other at local businesses. And that outsourcing of commerce online has also diminished local cultures that facilitate connection, identity, and meaning. Growing up, my identity was really strongly connected to the town that I lived in, and there was no shortage of ways that I could easily connect with the people I lived with.

Back then, we had thriving local newspapers where I could learn really easily about the people in my town, which made it easier to create that connection.

Those local newspapers are drying up by the day. We all get our news from national sources. It was my local grocer who used to slip me a free slice of American cheese when I would visit on the weekend with my grandparents that made me feel like I belonged to a community, that I wasn't alone. But now the local grocer is gone, driven out of business by superstores or food-delivery drivers.

But even if you still had these local institutions to be a part of, who has time any longer? A few decades ago, one job could easily provide a family with a comfortable middle-class life. Today, adults are forced to maintain two or three jobs to match that same income, or work 50 or 60 or 70 hours a week. There is no time any longer for millions of Americans to go to church, to be part of a civic club, or just hang out with your friends or your neighbors or your family.

And so what are you seeing? Participation in youth sports is plummeting. That is in part because overextended parents are just too busy these days to shuttle their kids to games or practices, or they just can't afford the fees

or equipment costs. Yes, kids are more interested in online gaming and their screens, but it is also stressed-out parents who just don't have time to participate in all those extracurricular activities with their kids but also don't have time to join the kind of institutions that used to give them value back when 40 hours a week was enough.

And so here is maybe the most important question: Why should we care? What are the public policy implications of loneliness? Well, first, there are health consequences to loneliness. American suicide rates are rising at an alarming rate, most significantly amongst two key populations: teenagers and rural men, who are both disproportionately affected by the changing landscape of American culture and economics.

Researchers at NYU found a direct correlation between teenage girls' use of Instagram and the corresponding spike in teenage girls' self-harm rates; and teenage rates of sadness are higher than ever.

For rural white men—one of my favorites—Nobel prize-winning economist Angus Deaton, he argues that as the white male dominated ''blue-collar aristocracy'' of 50 to 100 years ago has vanished, with the loss of social and economic status that went with it, those men are struggling. And this feeling of isolation, specifically amongst that population, is rising to epidemic levels as well, with a record number of white men who are struggling in this new world, committing acts of self-harm.

Surgeon General Vivek Murthy does a great job of connecting the dots between widespread loneliness and individual health. It is not just suicide. Last month, he released a detailed advisory with shocking statistics: Social isolation is associated with a 29-percent increase in the risk of heart disease and a 32-percent increase in the risk of stroke. Chronic loneliness can increase the risk of developing dementia in older people by 50 percent. Do we think it is a coincidence that life expectancy rates in this country are falling at the same time that loneliness is spiking?

The second reason that we should care about this epidemic as policymakers is because this growing isolation of Americans is helping to fuel a growing culture of resentment and anger.

I mentioned that young woman who was shot because she pulled up to the wrong driveway; but we see this edginess all over in our culture today. People are strung out. Violence is more common as a means to settle disputes, and fringe groups and conspiracy theories are more popular than ever.

I think loneliness is a big part of the reason why all this is happening. I mentioned that loneliness is often accompanied by a sense of anger. Why do I feel like this? Who is to blame? This anger, coupled with this diminishing availability of positive identities like family, place, or institution, makes negative identities built on hatred and distrust all the more attractive.

And so the newly isolated, the lonely, become targets for demagogues who offer up scapegoats to blame for the decay of these traditional sources of meaning and identity.

In 2017, America was shocked when a huge White Supremacists rally in Charlottesville drew thousands, but this shouldn't have been a surprise. Loneliness drives people to dark, dangerous places. And those young White men carrying tiki torches are only the tip of a giant iceberg of isolated, angry Americans whose search for meaning might lead them to a seething anti-Semitic or racist mob.

Now, the picture I am painting—I get it—is pretty grim, but I am here to tell you, there are reasons to hope. One of the reasons why I really believe Congress can get something done attacking isolation and loneliness and building more social connections is because there is a growing consensus across the aisle about this set of problems that we are dealing with and the solutions, which this problem set may be a little less political than other problems we face in this body.

I think Congress is coming to acknowledge that the consequences of rapidly advancing technology are not value-neutral. We have seen how social media has deepened polarization and addicted a generation of kids to their screens, and in the past few months, we have been involved in a new conversation about generative AI and machine learning and how it has the potential to displace millions of jobs and a whole bunch of basic human functions.

Most Republicans and Democrats agree that we made a big mistake by sitting on the sidelines during the early days of the internet and the development most recently of social media.

The good news is that Republicans and Democrats are working together on this problem. There are a few good pieces of legislation that could start to hold social media companies accountable who are driving kids into lives of increasing loneliness and isolation.

Senators COTTON, SCHATZ, BRITT, and I have proposed a bill to set a minimum age of 13 to use social media, to require parental consent. It also prohibits social media companies from using these highly personalized algorithms to drive dangerous, isolationist-inducing content to kids.

On the issue of AI, Senator SCHUMER has convened a bipartisan group that is beginning its work as well, and I am glad to be a part of it.

A second starting point that I really think really think has bipartisan potential would be to advance policies specifically aimed at restoring the health of our local communities and local institutions.

In Western Connecticut, in my old congressional district, we have got the ''Brass City,'' the ''Silver City,'' the ''Hardware City,'' the ''Hat City.'' For a long time in this country, identity, meaning, and connection were created because we really were proud of the things we made, of the jobs that existed. But the theory of economic neoliberalism sent most of those jobs overseas and assumed that better jobs would replace them. That is not what happened.

So I really believe that industrial policy is part of the solution to decreasing isolation and loneliness. Why? Because so many people get meaning and identity from the things that we make and used to make, from jobs that have meaning and good wages and benefits and pensions attached to them. That is why the CHIPS and Science Act paved the way for a new industrial policy to get the Republicans and Democrats to come together and work on creating more meaning in work which I think leads to isolation and loneliness.

But, as I said before, that only works if a full-time job provides a living wage and you have enough time in the evenings and on the weekends to be able to engage with your friends and your family and your community.

So I am also hopeful that we can make progress across the aisle driving up the minimum wage and incentivizing jobs to pay real living wages.

This week, a conservative group called American Compass released a report that was underlaid by a really scathing critique of modern capitalism. The conference was attended by a bunch of our Republican colleagues here. The report called for policymakers to remake capitalism so that our economic system works to build strong families, healthy individuals, and connected communities instead of just viewing families and individuals as mere pawns of the global market, the grease that makes the wheels of profit move. This is a really interesting development. Serious people on the right are starting to rethink the nature of capitalism to make sure that our economy works for families and individuals to make us more connected and less lonely. So there is real possibility that both parties, the right and the left, can come together to address this crisis of American isolation.

America's epidemic of loneliness is far from terminal. Our retreat into ourselves is a product of economic, cultural, and political choices we have made, but it is not too late to chart a new path. I get it. This is a Congress that has a hard time solving much more straightforward problems, so tackling a metaphysical crisis like loneliness might feel like a Herculean task. So, right now, I would argue that we just need a starting point, an organizing point for some of these discussions.

So I am working on legislation that would just start by establishing a national strategy, a national conversation around loneliness and how to promote connectedness. Every Agency

should have a role to play in this crisis. So I would argue that we just need to start with a dedicated office to coordinate a governmentwide strategy to tackle loneliness and strengthen communities.

I also think we should have guidelines and best practices for public entities to engage in trying to connect people. We have guidelines for nutrition and physical activity and sleep. We should have these guidelines for social connection.

Finally, we can't really address this crisis adequately if we don't understand it. So my legislation would also include some small amounts of funding to support research on the social and health impacts of widespread loneliness.

I look forward to talking to my colleagues about this legislation. It doesn't solve the problem, but I think it is time that we start organizing our work and our thoughts around what is, in many ways, a foundational problem, which explains a lot of the things that people are feeling that drives political instability, bad health outcomes, and just general unhappiness in this country.

Loneliness is one of the few issues that defies traditional political boundaries, cuts across almost every demographic, from teenage girls living in cities, to White men living out in rural areas, blue States to red States, unaffordable cities to left-behind manufacturing towns.

There is a ton of room for us to come together to combat this growing epidemic of loneliness, and I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are eager to be part of this solution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from Colorado.

DIGITAL PLATFORMS

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I am sorry I didn't have the chance to say thank you to our colleague from Connecticut for his speech tonight about loneliness in the United States. I was grateful that he gave it and grateful that he is in the Senate and grateful to know that another parent of young kids has the perspective that he has shared tonight because I think it is so important. And strangely enough, I am here to talk about something similar tonight.

First, Madam President, I will put it away because it is not supposed to be on the floor, but I wanted to come here tonight to talk a little bit about this smartphone and the world of social media, the world of machine learning algorithms and generative AI that has now been put at our fingertips.

The rise of smartphones and social media is one of the most rapid, profound, and, I would argue, poorly understood transformations in American life in our entire history.

If you had asked me when I was the age of the pages who are here, when I was growing up, and you had said to me: Someday, Michael, there is going to be a device—well, here is the device—there is going to be a device that looks like this; it doesn't even have a wire next to it, that would have been astonishing in and of itself. How can an electronic device not have a wire? But it does not have a wire. Not only does it not have a wire, but you can FaceTime anybody on Earth the way Captain Kirk and Mr. Spock FaceTimed each other.

The Presiding Officer knows what I am talking about. These folks may not know who Captain Kirk was or who Mr. Spock was. But the idea that you could reach somebody and communicate with them on video, on a telephone, or a device that had no wires, that alone would have been shocking.

If you had said: Well, let me tell you something else about that device, I would say: OK. What else can you tell me about that device?

And you said: Well, you can buy any book that has ever been written by humans, basically, on that device. And if you want it, you can make a choice. You can have it digitally, and it will just download immediately on your device, or you can order it, and it can be at your house by tonight, if you would rather have a print version of the book rather than getting it digitally. And I will tell you something else, Michael, it will translate any language that you care to hear.

I was, today, with the CEO of Google who was in my office talking about how one of their projects now is to help recover and sustain lost languages or languages we are in danger of losing in this country and around the world, which I think is a worthy project. We definitely, in my State, are at risk of losing Native American languages that really are at risk.

But in any case, if you said to me: You can translate any language or you can translate yourself into any language, and somebody would ask: What do you think that device is worth? In 1983 or 1987, when I was graduating from high school or college, I think I probably would have said that is probably—I can't imagine what it is worth—millions of dollars. Millions of dollars. To have every book that has ever been published that is in every library in the world? Millions of dollars, to be able to translate every language that you can translate? Millions of dollars.

And if you told me that it actually only cost a few hundred dollars, which it does, and that everybody on planet Earth would have one, which is almost in many ways the case, I would have asked what you were smoking. But it is true. It is true. And that is the world we have inhabited for almost 20 years. It is not new: the digital age, the information age, the age of ubiquitous smartphones, social media, and a handful of digital platforms that control them.

And for all of the extraordinary convenience and extraordinary productivity and entertainment that these technologies have allowed, as a country, we still haven't come to grips with the profound cost to our economy, to our society, and to our democracy, and that is before we even consider AI.

This is what everybody around here is talking about, what some would call the most consequential technology for humanity since the invention of fire. But unlike fire, this technology can improve itself, and it has the potential to move faster and transform more than any innovation in our history, for better or for worse.

Even in its early days, generative AI has already demonstrated the power to write the code to animate and even compose in ways that would have been absolutely unimaginable 20 years ago or 10 years ago, to say nothing of when we were in school.

It is easy to forget how different the world was just 20 years ago. Twenty years ago, General Motors topped the Fortune 500 list. Apple was 285, and Amazon didn't even make the cut. Twitter was still an idea somewhere in the recesses of Jack Dorsey's head. Mark Zuckerberg was barely old enough to vote, even though he likely already acquired the undeveloped view of the First Amendment that he seems to hold to this day. No one on this planet had ever heard of Gmail or TikTok or ChatGPT. That was only 20 years ago, but it might as well have been 200 years ago.

Today, Americans spend over 2 hours a day on social media, more time socializing online than in person. The average TikTok user in our country spends 90 minutes a day on the app—more than 3 weeks a year.

Facebook now hosts 2.7 billion friends—a half a billion more souls than Christianity.

Twitter has fewer followers, but they include every single politician—probably almost every single person in this Chamber—every journalist, every TV producer in America, withering our political debate to 280-character effervescent posts.

In just two decades, a few companies—less than a handful, really—have transformed much of humanity's daily life: how we amuse ourselves, how we discover, how we learn, how we shop, how we connect with friends and family and elected representatives, how we pay attention, how we glimpse our shared reality. This transformation is a staggering testament to American innovation.

And we can all think of a dozen ways that platforms have improved our lives. I, for one, have been entirely relieved of the stress of sitting in rush-hour traffic, wondering if there is a better route. I am now confident that Waze is guiding me like my own personal North Star, and that has made an enormous difference to my sense of well-being.

But this dramatic shift from our analog to our digital human existence has never been guided and has never been informed by the public interest. It has

always been dictated by the unforgiving requirements of a few gigantic American corporations and their commercial self-interests. And what are those interests? To make us better informed citizens? To make us more productive employees? To make us happier people? Of course not. It is to turn a profit and protect their profits through their own economic dominance, and they have succeeded beyond their wildest dreams.

This is the market capitalization of some of the largest industries in America. You can see at the top here that this is Apple and Microsoft and Alphabet and Amazon and Meta combined. They are at $9 trillion in market cap. To get to $9 trillion, you basically have to add up our entire banking sector, our entire oil and gas sector, and our entire pharmaceutical sector just to give you a sense of the size of the market cap of these companies alone and the reason they have become so dominant.

Through it all, unlike almost any small business in Boulder, CO, or in any town in New Hampshire, these digital platforms have remained almost entirely unregulated—moving fast and breaking things, as they have famously said, and forcing the rest of us to sweep up the wreckage.

There is another way these companies are different from the brick-and-mortar companies in Boulder, CO, or in New Hampshire. Digital platforms aren't burdened by the fixed costs of an analog world. Beyond the blinking lights of their energy-intensive server farms, their businesses are on the cloud, a place where no one works and that requires little physical investment. They have no need to use their profits to invest in America by building the kind of infrastructure these other industries do or had.

Unlike their industrial forbearers, today's platforms have devised a new digital barrier to entry to protect their profits. It is different from the way it was in the past. They have figured out how to protect their profits and economic dominance, and we know that digital barrier as the network effect.

The network effect means that platforms become exponentially more valuable as more people join and spend more of their waking moments there—more valuable to users because their friends and families are on it; more valuable to the platforms themselves, which hoover up our identities for their profits and train their machine-learning algorithms; more valuable for advertisers, who pay the platforms for our identities to barrage us with ads; and so valuable—so valuable—to the markets, where the top tech companies now equal, roughly, a quarter of the entire S&P 500.

In the name of building this barrier to entry—this network effect—they have stolen our identities and our privacy, and they have addicted us to their platforms. The platforms' imperative to grow big and stay big poses a very basic question: How do you get people on your platform, and how do you keep them there?

For platforms like Apple and Amazon, it is to sell products that people want, to offer subscriptions, and, if they are lucky, to enmesh them in your closed ecosystems. For social media platforms with free services, like Meta and Twitter and TikTok, the answer is more sinister, I am afraid—to harvest as much data on your users as you can, to feed that data to your algorithms to serve up whatever content it takes to keep people hooked so you can keep selling ads.

That is the core business model. That is the model that has led to these market caps. Although this particular business model has bestowed enormous value on a few companies, it has imposed profound costs on everybody else, even in places we don't necessarily expect it.

A senior law enforcement official just told me, within the last couple of weeks, that social media is the ''last mile of every fentanyl and meth transaction in America.'' The Presiding Officer knows that in being from New Hampshire. It took my staff 20 seconds to find illegal drugs for sale on Instagram.

I would ask the pages, please, to avert your eyes here. The image on the left appears to be pills of MDMA. The image on the right shows you how to contact the dealer through Whatsapp and pay him through another app called Wickr. Below that are all of the places you can purchase this stuff, including in Denver, CO, where we are having a terrible, terrible problem with fentanyl and with methamphetamines.

Even though the vast majority of Americans never interact with content like this, we all pay a price. Millions of Americans have surrendered to private companies an endless feed of data on their lives, all for the convenience of being served up self-gratifying political content on YouTube, less traffic, or better movie recommendations. Most Americans have made that trade without ever really knowing it.

The young people who are here today don't know a world where that trade was something that wasn't automatically made. Any suggestion that we have made that trade fairly, I think, is ludicrous. It mocks any sense of consent. These are contracts of adhesion, really. As a society, we have never asked how much of our identity or our privacy we are willing to trade for convenience and entertainment. We have never had a negotiation with Mark Zuckerberg about that. Until today, these questions have been resolved entirely to the benefit of the platforms' bottom lines.

I suppose it would be one thing if the only consequences of the digital platforms' use of our data were to sell better advertising—although even that would be a fairly pathetic concession, I think, of our own economic interests and of the precious value of our data and our privacy and our identities. But, as every parent knows and as every kid suspects, better advertising is not the only consequence of this model.

Over the years, digital platforms have imported features from gaming and from gambling—from brightly covered displays to flashing notifications, to likes—and they unleash secret algorithms to reverse-engineer our most basic human tendencies, which are to seek out tribe approval, conformity, and to create an almost irresistible feed of content.

Americans now spend a third of their waking hours on their phones, which we check an average of 344 times a day. In speaking as a parent who has raised three daughters in this era, we certainly have not agreed to run a science experiment on our children with machine-learning algorithms and generative AI chatbots that the companies themselves barely understand at all.

While we are still coming to understand the specific role social media plays in the epidemic of teen mental health, the early evidence gives us plenty of reason to worry. Here is what we do know:

In 2006, Facebook became available to the general public. The following year, Apple released the iPhone. By 2012, just 5 years later, half of Americans had a smartphone. Today, everyone has one. Everybody has got one, I think, except for CHUCK SCHUMER, the majority leader, who is still using a flip phone.

A similar story unfolded with teens and with social media. By 2012, about half of teens used social media. Today, 95 percent of teens use it. When my parents excoriated me—and they did, just like your parents excoriated you for being glued to the television in the 1970s—the average American teen watched TV for 4 hours a day. Today, teens are on their screens for twice as long. Half are online almost constantly, they say. More than one in five 10th grade girls spend 7 or more hours a day on social media. That is 35 hours a week. In France, that is a full-time job.

As our children retreat into the digital world of someone else's making, they pay for it. They are paying for it with less sleep and exercise and time with their friends, as my colleague from Connecticut was talking about. All of this has contributed to an epidemic of teen anxiety, to depression, and to loneliness, especially among teenage girls.

Today, girls who use social media heavily are two to three times as likely to say they are depressed, compared to those who use it less often or not at all. And since the introduction of smartphones and social media, we have seen a dramatic and unprecedented rise in serious depression among Americans under 25.

To be fair, I am not saying social media is the only cause of this. But as the father of three daughters who have

grown up in its shadow, I know it has played a role.

Kids are in despair in our country. Today, almost half of teens believe they can't do anything right. Almost half of teens say: I don't enjoy life, and my life is not useful.

All of these numbers began to rise around the time that smartphones and social media began to pervade the country and hook a generation to their screens.

Over this same period, we have tragically seen the suicides of young people increase 60 percent compared to 2007.

I see this crisis of teen mental health everywhere I go in Colorado—everywhere I go in Colorado. Parents tell me about how social media has undermined their children's sense of well-being and especially—especially—a girl's body image and sense of self.

A teenager recently told me that the ''electronic bullying follows me home.''

''There is no escape,'' she said, ''at any hour, on any day.''

And I felt the panic. I felt the panic of a parent who can't fix it and make it better. It felt like there was nothing that I could do. It was beyond my control to make it better.

It has become common now, at the end of my townhalls, for parents to come up to me. They are usually not people—or they are often not people—who have come to the townhall to listen to the townhall; they are people who might be working the slide projector or who might have set the chairs out for people to sit in. They come to me after the talk is over, the conversation is over, and they will say something like: My daughter is 5 feet 10 inches, she is 105 pounds, and her confidence is in tatters because of the way she has interacted with social media and the way it has shredded her body image.

All of my young staff and my two eldest daughters universally say how lucky they are to have avoided middle school in the age of social media or to have gone to middle school before there was social media. Their younger siblings aren't so lucky, and they know that about their younger siblings.

Maybe the most poignant expression of this concern were the moms whom I met in the Mississippi Delta, in my wife's hometown of Marianna, AR, which is the county seat of Lee County, AR. One after the other of these moms told me that their kids in this rural, poor county in America just don't read because no book can compete with their phone—even as the Silicon Valley executives who designed these phones send their kids to social media detox camps every single summer. That is not something that is available to these parents in Marianna. These parents work two or three jobs. They can't afford childcare. And they have to compete for their child's attention against algorithmic poison. They have never stood a chance, and neither have their kids. Now these parents also have to compete with generative AI, virtual reality, and the power they bestow to fully immerse yourself in the digital world.

My constituents in Colorado are most worried about what digital platforms have done to their kids and their families. I will tell you, I don't have a bunch of data tonight about the causal link between social media and the phones and the mental health epidemic that is going on in America, especially among American youth, but there is no doubt that we are having that epidemic. There is no doubt that it correlates to the advent of the phone and social media. There is no doubt it has been compounded by COVID and the effects of that.

This has been a hard time to be a young person in our country, to be a high school student, to be a college student, to have your life interrupted by a once-in-a-generation, once-in-100-years pandemic on top of everything else. I just think about all the kids like my daughter Anne, who spent so much of that time in her room at home on that phone.

When I was superintendent of the Denver public schools 15 years ago, we were working, focused so much on student achievement. It is amazing the way things have changed. When I was asked about this—about education in America—long after I had been superintendent but before COVID happened, I had an easy answer back then. My answer was mental health. Mental health. Mental health. And that was pre-COVID. There isn't anybody in America who thinks things have gotten better since then.

This is a tough time to be a kid in our country. It is a tough time to be a kid because of this dynamic. It is a tough time to be a kid because we haven't, as the Senator from New Hampshire has told us here over and over again, figured out how to stop this epidemic of fentanyl in this country, so that we are living in a time now, unlike when I was superintendent, where kids have to lobby their school nurses to be able to put antidotes in the nurse's office so their friends don't die because they took one pill that was labeled a prescription drug, and that pill killed them or almost killed them. We didn't do that—worry about that when I was superintendent 15 years ago.

This is off-topic tonight, but add on to that the fact that in America—this is the only country in the world where the leading cause of death for kids is guns, and two-thirds of that is people killing people, other people, assaults or suicides. Only 5 percent are accidents.

This is a tough time to be a kid in America.

I would argue that a lot of what we are dealing with here is manmade, human-made. It is not just a natural occurrence out there, somehow, in the world. We have to come to grips with it. We have to understand it.

Among other things, we need these companies, like other companies in the past, to share their data so that independent researchers can help us make the assessments we need to make in order to make the judgments we need to make to provide oversight—kind of like the tobacco companies finally had to cough up the data way back when.

As I say, my constituents are most worried about this, these issues, about their kids and about their families, but they also worry a lot about the effect on our democracy, and they have a lot of reason to be concerned about that too.

When I first joined the Senate, it was around the time of the so-called Twitter revolutions in Egypt and Libya and Tunisia that we then heralded as the Arab Spring. At the time, people in Washington and around the world hailed social media as a powerful tool for democracy. It didn't take long, though, for tyrants to turn those tools against democracy. The dictators who once feared social media soon harnessed it for their purposes—to track opponents, to dox critics, and to flood the zone with propaganda.

Vladimir Putin understood this better than most. He saw the vast and unregulated power of social media over our democracy, and he wielded social media as a digital Trojan horse to inflame our divisions and undermine trust in our democracy. The damage inflicts us to this day.

Ahead of the 2016 elections, Putin flooded our social media with disinformation. According to the Mueller report, the Russians ''conducted social media operations . . . with the goal of sowing discord in the U.S. political system.'' We know that, of course, now.

They sought to fracture our country along every conceivable line—race, religion, class, sexuality, politics—playing both sides. They didn't care. Half this stuff is pro-immigrant, for example; half is anti-immigrant. Half of it is pro-Muslim; half is anti-Muslim. What they wanted was to divide this country, to divide this democracy.

By the way, it took us more than a year to figure out this was Russian propaganda and not just our own political discourse, which says a lot about our own political discourse, where we might want to reflect on that.

The Russians played both sides over 10 million tweets and nearly 4,000 fake accounts. Imagine what Putin would have done with generative AI or could do with generative AI and the power to create fake images and videos that most of us would fail to distinguish from reality.

Back in 2016, as I said, we let it all happen because we couldn't tell the difference between this discourse and our discourse.

I published a book during my not-very-well-noticed campaign for President about this because I kept running into people—I can remember I ran into a senior at a nursing home in New Hampshire who was repeating stuff that I knew was Russian propaganda.

He was saying: What are you going to do about it?

I am not saying that you couldn't find something on the internet that is true. Obviously, there is a lot there. But he was repeating Russian propaganda, and he didn't have any idea.

When I joined the Senate Intelligence Committee after that, I began to realize that this problem extended far beyond our borders and that it was serious. That is why 3 years ago I wrote to Mark Zuckerberg, warning him—warning him—that Facebook had become authoritarians' ''platform of choice'' to suppress their opposition around the world.

The consequences have been horrific. In Myanmar, the United Nations named Facebook ''a significant factor'' in stoking communal violence against the Rohingya after it repeatedly ignored calls to remove hate speech and hire more staff who actually knew the country.

Around the world, we have seen fake stories on these platforms spark violence—in India, in Sri Lanka, in Kenya, and on January 6, 2021, here in the United States of America.

In the weeks before January 6, President Trump—our first President who ran his campaign and administration through Twitter—incited a mob to invade this Capitol. I remember sitting in a windowless room with the Presiding Officer in the Capitol on the 6th. We watched CNN as our fellow citizens invaded the U.S. Capitol with their racist banners and with their anti-Semitic t-shirts to ''save'' an election, they said, that had not been stolen.

In these moments, we cannot bury our heads in our digital feeds. All of us are called upon to defend this democracy and to burnish our example at home. We can help—the people in this body can help by reining in the vast power of digital platforms and reasserting the interests of the American people and our public interest.

The Americans who came before us would never have known about algorithms. They wouldn't have known about network effects. But they would recognize the challenge that we face, and their example should guide our way.

The Founders themselves designed one of the most elegant forms of checks and balances to guard against tyranny.

After Upton Sinclair exposed ghastly conditions in meatpacking facilities, in 1906, Teddy Roosevelt joined Congress to create the Food and Drug Administration. As broadcasting became more central to American life, in 1934, FDR and Congress created the Federal Communications Commission. After the 2009 financial crisis, President Obama and Congress established the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. In each case, Congress knew it lacked expertise to oversee complex new sectors of the economy, so it created independent bodies to empower—to empower—the American people.

Today, we have no dedicated entity to protect the public interest, and we have been powerless as a result. That is why last year, I introduced a bill to create a Federal Digital Platform Commission. I reintroduced it earlier this month with our colleague Senator WELCH from Vermont.

We have essentially proposed an FCC for digital platforms—it is not really more complicated than that—an independent body with five Senate-confirmed Commissioners empowered to protect consumers, to protect competition, and to defend the public and the public's interest. The Commission would hold hearings, conduct research, pursue investigations, establish commonsense rules for the sector, and enforce violations with tough penalties. Most important, the Agency would finally put the American people in a negotiation with digital platforms that have amassed vast power beyond our imagination and over the American people's lives and the lives of our children.

Previous Congresses knew they would never have the expertise to approve or disapprove new drugs, for example.

We didn't have a debate on this floor about that because we knew that expertise would better lie with the FDA. We don't write the safety guidelines for airlines on this floor either. We have a commission that will do that.

Why would we expect Congress to be able to regulate technologies that are moving at quantum speed like AI? It is not possible.

And perhaps this is why Sam Altman, the creator of ChatGPT, testified that we urgently need a new regulator—assuming that he wasn't a deep fake.

Some may say: We don't need a new government Agency. We already have the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice.

These Agencies are staffed by hardworking public servants, but they don't have the expertise or the tools or the time to regulate this brandnew sector. And that was before generative AI.

And I want to say, on that note, I am very grateful to CHUCK SCHUMER, the majority leader, for his remarks earlier today. I completely agree that we need to chart a responsible course between promoting innovation in AI and ensuring the safety of our children and our democracy.

And while I think a dedicated, expert Agency is the best solution, and I believe others will come to that judgment as well, I welcome the debate that we are going to have on this. And I am the first to admit that I don't have a monopoly on wisdom on anything but certainly on this.

But whatever we do, we cannot accept another 20 years of digital platforms transforming American life with no accountability to the American people. We are still coming to terms with the harm from 20 years of unregulated social media. And we haven't come to grips with that. Every parent knows that. I shudder to imagine what our country will look like if we allow the same story to work its way out with AI.

That particular technology may be new, but we face a familiar American juncture. We have been here before. In the late 19th century, when Gilded Age robber barons abused their dominance of the coal, steel, and railroad industries to stifle competition, to exploit workers and undermine democracy, government stepped in to assert the public interest.

And, looking back, it is hard to imagine American life without the victories of that era—from basic antitrust laws and consumer protections to the direct election of Senators and the income tax. And I think, looking forward, we have similar questions to answer.

What will our response be to the digital robber barons of our era that addict our children, that corrode our democracy and plunder our privacy, our identity, and our attention? Will we allow them to continue transforming American life according to their self-interest, or will we step up to safeguard the interests, civil liberties, and the freedoms of the American people?

You know, especially for young people that are listening to this who might say: There is nothing you can do; the cat is out of the bag; you can't hold back the ocean—my answer to that is not very helpful because it is to recall something that young people here won't remember, but it is in my mind when I am talking to families and to young people in my State and I am listening to them talk about the mental health impacts of what they are facing.

It reminds me of when the Cuyahoga River caught on fire in Cleveland. And that moment, for those of us who were around then, was so extraordinary because that unbelievable image of a river in America burning, catching on fire, flames shooting into the sky, that is what finally forced us to come to grips with the pollution that we were allowing to flow freely into our watersheds and into our communities. The same thing with our air. And we finally did something about it, and the country is better as a result.

This is another case, by the way, just like those environmental regulations, where I think it is critically important for the United States, with our set of values and our commitments to democracy, to help set the international standards here and to not take standards from authoritarian regimes like China, for example.

And that is a big risk if we don't act here. But I think we will, and I think we can. And I think that is going to not only give the American people a chance to negotiate with these companies but give America the chance to lead on questions that are fundamentally important for humanity.

None of this is going to be easy. It never is. But when the stakes are nothing less than the health of our children and the health of our democracy, we have no choice but to try. And we

should try. I think we have a unique responsibility to lead here, not just for the reasons that I just said but also because, after all, it was American companies that blazed the trail into the digital age and invited all of humanity to follow. And we now live in the world that they created, for better and for worse, with its wonders and with its conveniences but also with its risks and dangers and difficult questions.

The same platforms that amplify a protester's cry for freedom in Iran also equip tyrants around the world to suppress democratic movements. The same technologies that liberated anyone to say anything also unleashed a perpetual cacophony, leaving all of us screaming louder to be heard. The dazzling features that brought the world online have also trapped us there, more connected but more alone, more aware but less informed—enthralled to our screens, growing more anxious, more angry and addicted by the day.

Overcoming all of this will not be easy, but we can't simply hide under our covers or scroll through TikTok and hope these problems are going to solve themselves. That is our job. The health and future of our children lie in the decisions that we make or the decisions that we fail to make.

Our objective, my objective to being here tonight, is not to hold the world back. In Colorado, we have always welcomed innovation, but we also understand that not all change is progress and that it is our job to harness these changes toward a better world.

We are the first generations to steer our democracy in the digital age, and it is an open question whether democracy can survive in the world that digital platforms have created. I may be wrong, but the evidence so far does not fill me with confidence. It fills me with urgency—urgency to reassert the public interest; to reclaim our public square and exercise in self-government; to level the playing field for America's teens, for our parents, for teachers and small businesses who, for 20 years, have battled alone against some of the most powerful companies in human history.

This is a fight worth having. This is a fight worth winning. And if we succeed, we may help save democracy not just in this country but around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and 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.

BUDGET ENFORCEMENT LEVELS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023, P.L. 118–5, which Congress passed earlier this month, resolved a manufactured default crisis and avoided an economic catastrophe. In addition, the bipartisan bill provided a congressional budget for 2024.

Specifically, the legislation instructs the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget to file enforceable budgetary levels in the Senate consistent with current law. Today, I submit the required filing.

Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 requires the chairman to file a spending allocation for the Committee on Appropriations for 2024; spending allocations for other committees for 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033; an aggregate spending level for 2024; aggregate revenue levels for 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033; and aggregate levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033. Section 121 also requires the chairman to include a list of accounts eligible for advance appropriations.

The amounts included in this filing are consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's May 2023 baseline, adjusted for the passage of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023, including the discretionary spending limits established by that act. Because the legislation does not include budget enforcement for fiscal year 2023, it will not be possible to submit reports required by section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act until fiscal year 2024.

In addition, section 121 allows the deficit-neutral reserve fund in section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14—117th Congress—to be updated by 2 fiscal years. Pursuant to that authority, that reserve fund shall be considered updated and available for use for legislation which does not increase the deficit for the time period of fiscal year 2024 to fiscal year 2033.

For purposes of enforcing the Senate's pay-as-you-go rule, which is found in section 4106 of the fiscal year 2018 congressional budget resolution, I am resetting the Senate's scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.

Section 111 of the act requires my counterpart, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, to file similar enforceable budgetary levels in the House of Representatives consistent with the discretionary limits in the act. That filing will help both Houses uphold the bipartisan agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 and Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

($ in billions)

	Budget Authority	Outlays
Appropriations:		
Revised Security Category/Defense	886.349	N/A
Revised Nonsecurity Category/Nondefense	703.651	N/A
General Purpose Discretionary	N/A	1,813.382
Memo:		
On-budget	1,583.271	1,806.643
Off-budget	6.729	6.739
Mandatory	1,473.002	1,452.200

N/A = not applicable. Budgetary changes related to program integrity initiatives and other adjustments pursuant to section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, as amended by the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023, will be held in reserve until consideration of legislation providing such funding. ''Revised security category'' means discretionary appropriations in budget function 050, while ''revised nonsecurity category'' means discretionary appropriations other than in budget function 050.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEE OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS

(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 and Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

($ in billions)

	2024	2024–2028	2024–2033
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:			
Budget Authority	190.758	1,002.518	2,088.798
Outlays	191.517	972.954	1,974.649
Armed Services:			
Budget Authority	277.969	1,193.836	2,117.074
Outlays	272.144	1,192.368	2,114.710
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:			
Budget Authority	34.273	161.597	333.779
Outlays	7.051	−12.803	−70.708
Commerce, Science, and Transportation:			
Budget Authority	24.239	107.446	196.019

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEE OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 and Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

($ in billions)

	2024	2024–2028	2024–2033
Outlays	20.356	101.673	185.182
Energy and Natural Resources:			
Budget Authority	8.811	39.714	77.966
Outlays	12.920	68.359	113.543
Environment and Public Works:			
Budget Authority	63.847	325.494	654.349
Outlays	12.649	60.869	87.739
Finance:			
Budget Authority	3,449.522	19,587.982	46,205.916
Outlays	3,458.376	19,589.956	46,199.103
Foreign Relations:			
Budget Authority	43.978	220.169	440.898
Outlays	39.915	215.035	435.773
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:			
Budget Authority	59.175	254.652	504.747
Outlays	85.410	295.186	521.242
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:			
Budget Authority	178.828	941.599	1,986.949
Outlays	182.794	937.140	1,965.386
Indian Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0.456	2.329	4.303
Outlays	1.445	4.304	6.252
Judiciary:			
Budget Authority	20.322	102.547	212.588
Outlays	24.903	109.571	217.340
Rules and Administration:			
Budget Authority	0.045	0.225	0.460
Outlays	0.024	0.124	0.275
Intelligence:			
Budget Authority	0.514	2.570	4.112
Outlays	0.514	2.570	4.112
Veterans' Affairs:			
Budget Authority	210.295	1,243.056	2,961.841
Outlays	197.725	1,246.361	2,963.470
Small Business:			
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000
Outlays	0.120	0.130	0.130
Unassigned to Committee:			
Budget Authority	−1,267.733	−6,910.352	−15,632.915
Outlays	−1,257.765	−6,854.818	−15,493.532

Memorandum: Includes entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts. Budgetary effects of the Fiscal Responsibility Act are assigned to the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, which has jurisdiction over the majority of the rescissions included in that law.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 and Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

($ in billions)

	2024	2024–2028	2024–2033
Spending:			
Budget Authority	4,878.570	N/A	N/A
Outlays	5,056.741	N/A	N/A
Revenue	3,651.838	20,174.716	45,331.678
Social Security:			
Outlays	1,322.667	7,504.648	17,473.681
Revenue	1,195.545	6,540.268	14,442.782

N/A = not applicable. Figures represent current law, including CBO's May 2023 baseline and the enactment of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE SENATE

($ in billions)

	Balances
Fiscal Year 2023	0
Fiscal Year 2024	0
Fiscal Years 2024–2028	0
Fiscal Years 2024–2033	0

ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS

(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023)

Financial Services and General Government:
- Payment to the Postal Service Fund

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education:
- Employment and Training Administration
- Education for the Disadvantaged
- School Improvement Programs
- Career, Technical, and Adult Education
- Special Education

Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development:
- Tenant-based Rental Assistance
- Project-based Rental Assistance

CELEBRATING THE RENOVATION OF THE PLATTE COUNTY COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I rise today in recognition of the distinct history of Wyoming's Platte County Courthouse. The courthouse reopens this summer following its first significant renovation in over a century. For 105 years, the residents of Platte County have recognized the courthouse as an important landmark and testament to the county's history. Located in the county seat of Wheatland, WY, the roots of this historic courthouse are tied to the wild frontier.

After the county's incorporation in 1911, the Platte County Board of Commissioners agreed to lease office space in the Stock Growers Bank for $55 per month. Five years later, the commission recognized the need for a permanent structure to house both the court and jail. Eager to start, commissioners issued $50,000 in county bonds to finance construction, subject to voter approval. Residents were passionate about the campaign for a new courthouse and jail. There were well-reasoned arguments on both sides. On November 7, 1916, the will of the people won: Platte County would build a new courthouse and jail.

Construction progressed quickly. Commissioners contracted with architectural firm Baerreson Brothers, based in Denver and Cheyenne, for initial design plans. By April 6, 1917, the county approved Archie Allison's bid for general construction. State Grand Master of the Masonic Lodge, Herbert King of Laramie, dedicated the building's cornerstone on June 20, 1917. In January 1918, the county completed work on the courthouse and jail. The total cost, including furnishings, was $85,000. Since then, generations of dedicated civil servants have preserved and enhanced the building. The National Park Service recognized the rich historical value of the courthouse on October 15, 2008, when the building was listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Today, the courthouse acts as an archive for the history of Platte County. It provides a sense of community for its citizens and is an important gathering place for public activities. Remarkably, in its 105-year history, the Platte County Courthouse has undergone only small renovations to adapt to changing technology and workplace standards. That changed in 2018, when voters authorized the county to collect $4.7 million in Specific Purpose Excise Tax—more commonly known as a sixth-penny sales tax. This, plus other reserve funds and grants, allowed the county to complete $6.5 million in extensive renovations. For the past 18 months, county officials have been temporarily displaced while the building underwent massive changes. In addition to a brandnew HVAC and electric system, the renovation includes added insulation, new plumbing, and a new elevator. The county implemented all of these designs with an intent to increase efficiency and accessibility.

On July 1, 2023, residents of Platte County will gather to celebrate this impressive achievement. Officials will host a county-wide celebration. They plan to commemorate the history of the county and the generosity and commitment of its citizens.

Platte County is led by these dedicated individuals:

Steve Shockley, Commissioner
Kayla Mantle, Commissioner
Ian Jolovich, Commissioner
Malcolm Ervin, Clerk
Kristi Rietz, Treasurer
David Russell, Sheriff
Doug Weaver, Attorney

Phil Martin, Coroner
Danette Eppel, Assessor
Hal Hutchinson, Engineer
Terry Stevenson, Emergency Management
Jim DeWitt, Maintenance Supervisor
Doug Dumont, Planning Director
Penny Simonton, Public Health
Beal Angle, Road and Bridge
Mona McAuley, Clerk of the Court
Honorable Edward Buchanan, 8th Judicial District Court Judge
Honorable F. Scott Peasley, 8th Judicial District Court Judge
Honorable Nathaniel Hibben, 8th Judicial Circuit Court Judge
Honorable Clark Allan, 8th Judicial Circuit Court Judge
Magistrate Scott Cole, 8th Judicial District

It is an honor to rise in recognition of this significant milestone for Platte County. Bobbi joins me in extending our congratulations to the citizens of Platte County on the lasting legacy of their newly renovated courthouse.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROCHELLE P. WALENSKY, M.D., M.P.H.

Mr. WARNOCK. Madam President, today I have the honor and privilege to recognize Dr. Rochelle Walensky for her unwavering dedication, service, and contributions to public health.

Before her time at the CDC, Dr. Walensky's groundbreaking work in understanding the transmission, prevention, and treatment of HIV/AIDS was paramount in addressing disparities in access to care, vaccine efficacy, and distribution among underserved communities while addressing gaps in knowledge, earning her widespread recognition and acclaim.

With a drive toward making a difference, Dr. Walensky began her tenure as Director of the CDC in 2021, in the midst of the unprecedented global COVID–19 pandemic. Despite this challenge, Dr. Walensky boldly stepped into the role, bringing her years of experience and perspective to the Georgia-based Agency. As evidenced by the CORE Health Equity Science and Intervention Strategy, which she unveiled within months of starting, and declaration that racism is a serious public health crisis, Dr. Walensky's passion for health equity has ensured that equity is baked into the CDC's mission.

Dr. Walensky's pursuit of truth and dedication to the well-being of others has left an indelible mark on the field of public health. Her leadership during the most challenging public health crisis of this generation saved lives. She has displayed true servant leadership by prioritizing science, empathy, and public welfare during heightened times of distrust and misinformation.

As we reflect on Dr. Walensky's remarkable achievements before she begins the next chapter in her career, I am proud to honor her as a pioneer for health equity. Her commitment to public health and pursuit of the idea that we all have inherent value, combined with her tireless efforts to protect and improve the lives of all individuals, will forever inspire future generations of healthcare professionals. Thank you, Dr. Walensky, for your great service to the American people.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLANCHARD SPRINGS CAVERNS

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Blanchard Springs Caverns on its 50th anniversary. Blanchard Springs Caverns—BSC—opened to the public in 1973 after decades of underground exploration and development to share this natural wonder with the community and the entire world.

Blanchard Springs Caverns is the second-largest commercial cave in the country and is often described as one of the most beautiful. This is, in part, thanks to U.S. Forest Service—USFS—employees, community advocates, and outdoor enthusiasts who ensure they are maintained in their natural state—helping Arkansas live up to its own proud title as a home of spectacular outdoor elements and resources.

Although the first documented visit to the cave system was in 1934 by Civilian Conservation Corps planner Willard Hadley, its name is derived from the nearby spring that formed it and had been used by John H. Blanchard, a Civil War veteran who called the area home, to power a gristmill.

The Dripstone Trail Tour was the first to launch for recreational use, and as time went on, two other tours, the Discovery Trail and the Wild Cave, opened as well. BSC is referred to as a ''living'' or ''active'' cave, as it is constantly changing. The caverns include an underground river, delicate ''soda straw'' formations, stalactites, stalagmites, columns, and huge areas of flowstone. Along with the unique formations, it is also home to a number of species of cave animals. The USFS has demonstrated its commitment to ensuring preservation and conservation of the habitants including the Ozark blind salamander native to BSC. In addition to what is happening underground, there is also the amazing landscape of the Ozark National Forest. As people from all across the globe are attracted to the area for its splendor, they are driving the local economy. This popular destination helps support area businesses, spurring critical development and commerce.

I am pleased to recognize all those helping to maintain Blanchard Springs Caverns over the last five decades. This natural wonder is accessible and engaging because of their dedication to preserving it for all Arkansans and visitors to enjoy.●

REMEMBERING JOE A. GARCIA

● Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, across more than five decades in public service, Governor Joe A. Garcia of Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo was a leader among leaders, for his community and all of Indian Country. He was also a dear friend and close mentor. In so many ways, New Mexico will not be the same without him.

Governor Garcia was a three-time Governor of Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, where he oversaw the Self Governance Initiative, under which the Pueblo now runs all of its Bureau of Indian Affairs programs. He was serving as the Pueblo's Head Councilman at the time of his death.

Governor Garcia served for two terms as the president of the National Congress of American Indians, the oldest and largest American Indian and Alaska Native organization serving sovereign Tribal Nations. He also served as the vice president of the Board of Trustees of the Santa Fe Indian School and as the chairman of the All Indian Pueblo Council—now named the All Pueblo Council of Governors—which represents 20 Pueblos located in New Mexico and Texas.

In addition, Governor Garcia was a member of the Tribal Leaders Task Force, where he served as cochair for 3 years for the Federal Communications Commission. He was also a cochair of the Tribal Technical Advisory Committee for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—SAMHSA—and cochair of the Tribal Transportation Self Governance Program Negotiated Rulemaking Team.

As a young man, Governor Garcia served in the U.S. Air Force. After his military service, he earned a bachelor of science in electrical engineering from the University of New Mexico. Governor Garcia worked on the technical staff at Los Alamos National Laboratory for 25 years, working on electronics design and development for data acquisition systems. He also taught courses in computers, electronics, lasers, and math at the Northern New Mexico College from 1979 to 1983.

Governor Garcia fought to advance the mission of Tribal sovereignty over education through his leadership at the Santa Fe Indian School—SFIS. The SFIS became the first former Federal Indian boarding school where a Tribal organization—the All Indian Pueblo Council—contracted for the education of their children.

Since the signing of the Santa Fe Indian School Act in 2000, the Pueblo Governors have held the school's land in trust and established an educational program based on the right and responsibility to educate New Mexico Indian children in a way that supports their cultural and traditional belief system. Governor Garcia championed both increased funding and support for SFIS and the establishment of Tribally controlled educational systems across Indian Country.

On a personal note, I was fortunate to be among the many who learned from Governor Garcia—his wise counsel and advice and the example he set

for all of us to follow. I will never forget sitting down with him years ago when he first encouraged me to run for the U.S. Senate to represent our great State. My thoughts are with his wife, Oneva, his daughters Melissa and MorningStar, his six grandchildren, two great-grandchildren, and all those in Ohkay Owingeh, New Mexico, and Indian Country who knew and loved him.

The legacy that Governor Garcia built over decades of steadfast advocacy for Tribal sovereignty, educational sovereignty, and the cultural preservation of Pueblo communities will be felt for generations to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KURT NEWMAN, M.D.

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise today to honor the career of Kurt Newman, M.D., president and chief executive officer of Children's National Hospital on the occasion of his retirement. For nearly four decades, Dr. Kurt Newman has made outstanding contributions to pediatric healthcare for children and families in Maryland, the greater DC metropolitan region, nationally, and internationally.

Dr. Newman joined Children's National Hospital as a surgical fellow in 1984 and became surgeon-in-chief and senior vice president for Joseph E. Robert, Jr. Center for Surgical Care in 2003. Inspired by the bold vision of making surgery for children minimally invasive and pain-free, Dr. Newman was instrumental in developing the vision for the Sheikh Zayed Institute for Pediatric Surgical Innovation at Children's National where he served as founding vice president in 2009.

In 2011, Dr. Newman became president and chief executive officer of Children's National Hospital, a 323-bed pediatric acute care hospital. Under his exemplary leadership, Children's National has risen in the ranks of U.S. News & World Report to be consistently ranked among the very best children's hospitals in the Nation. Under Dr. Newman's leadership, Children's National led the critical COVID–19 response by opening one of the Nation's first drive-thru and walk-up COVID testing center for children, offering a critical resource for children in the region and beyond.

Through a culture of patient-centered care, Dr. Newman has championed innovation in research, operations, and clinical care. He has strengthened and diversified the economy of the region by growing pediatric medical research at Children's National and the high-wage jobs that support that field by turning Children's National into one of the top-funded pediatric institutions in terms of National Institutes of Health funding. Additionally, Dr. Newman has worked tirelessly to draw more funding and attention to the youth mental health crisis through robust advocacy efforts.

As the majority of Children's National Hospital's patient population hails from Maryland, Dr. Newman has continuously expanded care into our State, including the opening of Children's National Prince George's County on July 23, 2020. This facility, among more than 20 care locations throughout the State, makes it easier for Maryland patients and families to receive high-quality care. I want to personally thank Dr. Newman for keeping members of Congress, especially those of us in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, informed about critical healthcare needs in our region and throughout the country.

Children's National and its many supporters will celebrate Dr. Newman on his retirement on June 30, 2023, and Children's National will continue to build upon his legacy to provide high-quality pediatric healthcare across the Washington, DC, metropolitan region.

As a nationally recognized leader in pediatric health, I commend Dr. Kurt Newman for his exemplary leadership and dedication to Children's National over nearly four decades. I congratulate him and wish him a well-earned, enjoyable, and fulfilling retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO LEAH BRENGLE

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Leah Brengle, an intern in my Rapid City, SD, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Leah is a graduate of Sturgis Brown High School in Sturgis, SD. Currently, she is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where she is pursuing a degree in criminology. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Leah for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO NOAH GREBLE

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Noah Greble, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Noah is a graduate of O'Gorman High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending Augustana University in Sioux Falls, SD, where he is pursuing degrees in government and marketing. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Noah for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KEELY LARSON

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Keely Larson, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Keely is a graduate of Harrisburg High School in Harrisburg, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of Arizona in Tucson, AZ, where she is pursuing a degree in philosophy, politics, economics, and law. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Keely for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO TAYLOR NEELY

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Taylor Neely, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Taylor is a graduate of O'Gorman High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in Lincoln, NE, where she is pursuing a degree in nutrition, exercise, and health sciences. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Taylor for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO NATALIA STYS

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Natalia Stys, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Natalia is a graduate of Creighton University in Omaha, NE, having earned a degree in psychology. Currently, she is pursuing a law degree at the University of South Dakota Knudson School of Law in Vermillion, SD. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Natalia for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Kelly, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:52 a.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 bill, without amendment:

S. 30. An act to authorize major medical facility projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1606. An act to amend the Small Business Act to codify the Boots to Business Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3672. An act to designate the clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Indian River, Michigan, as the ''Pfc. Justin T. Paton Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic''.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 20 U.S.C. 2103(b), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress on the part of the House of Representatives for a term of 6 years: Mrs. Heather Obernolte of Big Bear Lake, California.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Canada-United States lnterparliamentary Group: Mr. Huizenga of Michigan, Chair, Mr. Bergman of Michigan, Mr. Stauber of Minnesota, Mr. Tenney of New York, Mr. Finstad of Minnesota, and Mr. Langworthy of New York.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Mexico-United States lnterparliamentary Group: Mr. McCaul of Texas, Chair, Mr. Valadao of California, Mr. Giminez of Florida, Mr. Ciscomani of Arizona, and Ms. De La Cruz of Texas.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276l, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the British-American lnterparliamentary Group: Mr. Latta of Ohio, Chair, Mr. Aderholt of Alabama, Mr. Cole of Oklahoma, Mr. Meuser of Pennsylvania, Mr. Smucker of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Kim of California, and Mr. Kean of New Jersey.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 7:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 30. An act to authorize major medical facility projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1606. An act to amend the Small Business Act to codify the Boots to Business Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 3672. An act to designate the clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Indian River, Michigan, as the ''Pfc. Justin T. Paton Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 277. An act to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

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–1538. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1539. A communication from the Security Officer II of the Office of Senate Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report regarding fiscal year 2022 Annual Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Assessments (OSS–2023–0589); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1540. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1541. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1542. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1543. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a legislative proposal to establish the Secretary of Energy's authority to set increased pay pursuant to the Department's EJ pay plan authority and to update related obsolete text; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1544. 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 ''Guidance Relating to the Employee Plans Compliance Resolution System'' (Notice 2023–43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2023; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Leonard F. Anderson IV, to be Lieutenant General.

*Marine Corps nomination of Gen. Eric M. Smith, to be General.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 5. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2062. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to international organizations that advocate for sexual activity by persons who are younger than the domestically prescribed minimum age of consent; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2063. A bill to authorize the payment of a travel or transportation allowance for a member of the uniformed services to travel to obtain professional development training only if such training relates to the military occupational specialty of the member and not to the sex, sexual orientation, race, or religion of the member; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2064. A bill to ensure that Foreign Service officers are evaluated and given opportunities for advancement based on their conformance to merit system principles, to require the review of Performance Improvement Plans during tenure and promotion appraisals of Foreign Service officers, and to eliminate the requirement for the inclusion of a public member on selection boards; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 2065. A bill to authorize a study on educator workforce data to advance teaching and learning and a program to support increasing access to well-prepared and diverse

educators; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 2066. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards under the Department of State's rewards program relating to information regarding individuals or entities engaged in activities in contravention of United States or United Nations sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2067. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to nonprofit organizations to assist such organizations in carrying out programs to provide service dogs to eligible veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2068. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2069. A bill to require the review by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States of greenfield investments by the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 2070. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from replacing physician anesthesiologists with certified registered nurse anesthetists under the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 2071. A bill to amend section 11101 of title 49, United States Code, to ensure that rail carriers provide transportation or service in a manner that fulfills the shipper's reasonable service requirements; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 2072. A bill to establish a pilot program to provide mental health check-ups for students at schools operated by the Department of Defense Education Activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 2073. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require agencies to include a list of outdated or duplicative reporting requirements in annual budget justifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2074. A bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by establishing appropriate limits on the federally compelled disclosure of information obtained as part of engaging in journalism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FETTERMAN:

S. 2075. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to modify the Safe Streets and Roads for All program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2076. A bill to adjust the definition of service in the uniformed services with respect to readmission requirements for servicemembers under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2077. A bill to amend the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to ensure that producers who rely on acequia systems have access to drought protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2078. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take actions necessary to ensure that certain individuals may update the burn pit registry with the cause of death of a registered individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2079. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the label of a drug intended for human use to identify each ingredient in such drug that is, or is derived directly or indirectly from, a major food allergen or a gluten-containing grain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2080. A bill to reauthorize and improve the pilot program to support State medical stockpiles, to ensure that State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments or officials are consulted by the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2081. A bill to amend section 485 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require venue-specific heat illness emergency action plans for any institution of higher education that is a member of an athletic association or athletic conference, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RICKETTS, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2082. A bill to make technical corrections relating to the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2083. A bill to direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment to submit to Congress a report on incinerators and waste-to-energy waste disposal alternatives to burn pits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2084. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish an outreach program to inform members of the Armed Forces assigned to work near burn pits of the risks of toxic exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2085. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2086. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Sea Turtle Rescue Assistance Grant Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 2087. A bill to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2088. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to complete all actions necessary for certain land to be held in restricted fee status by the Oglala Sioux Tribe and Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mrs. BRITT):

S. 2089. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to prohibit the Administrator of General Services from constructing or acquiring public buildings or entering into leases based on the legality or availability of abortion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 2090. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prevent the elimination of the sale of motor vehicles with internal combustion engines; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2091. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BUDD):

S. 2092. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a child tax credit for pregnant moms with respect to their unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2093. A bill to establish a program at BARDA for developing medical countermeasures for viral threats with pandemic potential; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 2094. A bill to reauthorize the Interagency Committee on Women's Business Enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2095. A bill to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to enforce its own forfeiture penalties with respect to violations of restrictions on the use of telephone equipment; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2096. A bill to enhance the eligibility of India for Foreign Military Sales and exports

under the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2097. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to improve a program that provides livestock disaster assistance, and for other programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 2098. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a military training program with the Government of Mexico in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2099. A bill to establish an Office of Community Financial Institutions within the Small Business Administration that will strengthen the ability of Community Financial Institutions to support the development of small business concerns in underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2100. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to modify fees and funding for certain small business refinancing loans and loans to qualified State or local development companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. LEE, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2101. A bill to provide for an earlier effective date for the requirement of Senate confirmation of the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2102. A bill to provide for drought preparedness and improved water supply reliability; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KAINE:

S.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution redesignating the Robert E. Lee Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery as the ''Arlington House National Historic Site''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 259. A resolution recognizing the importance of United States-India relations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 260. A resolution recognizing Tunisia's leadership in the Arab Spring and expressing support for upholding its democratic principles and norms; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. Res. 261. A resolution commending and congratulating the Vegas Golden Knights on winning the 2023 Stanley Cup Final; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. Res. 262. A resolution authorizing the printing of a collection of the rules of the committees of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. Res. 263. A resolution commemorating June 19, 2023, as ''Juneteenth National Independence Day'' in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which news of the end of slavery reached the slaves in the Southwestern States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 264. A resolution designating June 2023 as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month'' and June 27, 2023, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 134

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 134, a bill to require an annual budget estimate for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to reports and recommendations made under the National Alzheimer's Project Act.

S. 140

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 140, a bill to combat organized crime involving the illegal acquisition of retail goods for the purpose of selling those illegally obtained goods through physical and online retail marketplaces.

S. 412

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to provide that it is unlawful to knowingly distribute private intimate visual depictions with reckless disregard for the individual's lack of consent to the distribution, and for other purposes.

S. 414

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 414, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and to expand eligibility for dependency and indemnity compensation paid to certain survivors of certain veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 626

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors 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. 672

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 672, a bill to enable the payment of certain officers and employees of the United States whose employment is authorized pursuant to a grant of deferred action, deferred enforced departure, or temporary protected status.

S. 806

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 806, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish a grant program to assist with the purchase, installation, and maintenance of point-of-entry and point-of-use drinking water quality improvement products, and for other purposes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor 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. 838

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) 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. 985

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 985, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure campus access at public institutions of higher education for religious groups.

S. 1036

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1036, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to streamline nutrition access for older adults and adults with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1091

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 1091, a bill to provide for automatic renewal protections, and for other purposes.

S. 1189

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1189, a bill to establish a pilot grant program to improve recycling accessibility, and for other purposes.

S. 1201

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1201, a bill to reform the labor laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1266

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1266, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United State Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) 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. 1318

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to provide enhanced protections for election workers.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1349, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 1387

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1387, a bill to reauthorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act of 2018, and for other purposes.

S. 1424

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1424, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve health care coverage under vision and dental plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1457

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1457, a bill to authorize negotiation and conclusion and to provide for congressional consideration of a tax agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO).

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1457, supra.

S. 1465

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1465, a bill to establish the Baltic Security Initiative for the purpose of strengthening the defensive capabilities of the Baltic countries, and for other purposes.

S. 1529

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) 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. 1573

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1573, a bill to reauthorize the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, a bill to prohibit taxpayer-funded gender transition procedures, and for other purposes.

S. 1743

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1743, a bill to amend the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 to modify the forest inventory and analysis program.

S. 1829

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1829, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons engaged in the import of petroleum from the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 1837

At the request of Mr. FETTERMAN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1837, a bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to include spotted lanternfly control research and development as a high-priority research and extension initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 1839

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1839, a bill to improve Federal population surveys by requiring the collection of voluntary, self-disclosed information on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics in certain surveys, and for other purposes.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1856, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to improve the administration of antidumping and countervailing duty laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1885

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1885, a bill to eliminate employment-based visa caps on abused, abandoned, and neglected children eligible for humanitarian status, and for other purposes.

S. 1905

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1905, a bill to expand the categories of forfeited property available to remediate harms to Ukraine from Russian aggression, and for other purposes.

S. 1916

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1916, a bill to establish in the Department of State the Office to Monitor and Combat Islamophobia, and for other purposes.

S. 1933

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) were added as cosponsors of S. 1933, a bill to enhance flight options for consumers flying to and from Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

S. 1963

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1963, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure College for All.

S. 1985

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator

from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1985, a bill to prohibit the flying, draping, or other display of any flag other than the flag of the United States at public buildings, and for other purposes.

S. 1999

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1999, a bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

S. 2019

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2019, a bill to prevent States and local jurisdictions from interfering with the production and distribution of agricultural products in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 2025

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2025, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the provision of any foreign assistance for state sponsors of terrorism.

S. 2029

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2029, a bill to appropriate amounts to carry out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

S. 2053

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2053, a bill to protect freedom of travel and reproductive rights.

S.J. RES. 25

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) 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''.

S.J. RES. 31

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 31, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Federal 'Good Neighbor Plan' for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards''.

S. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 20, a resolution condemning the coup that took place on February 1, 2021, in Burma and the Burmese military's detention of civilian leaders, calling for an immediate and unconditional release of all those detained, promoting accountability and justice for those killed by the Burmese military, and calling for those elected to serve in parliament to resume their duties without impediment, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 75, a resolution reaffirming the state of Arunachal Pradesh as Indian territory and condemning the People's Republic of China's provocations in South Asia.

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 106, a resolution condemning Beijing's destruction of Hong Kong's democracy and rule of law.

S. RES. 258

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 258, a resolution reaffirming the importance of the United States promoting the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons in the United States and around the world.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 2072. A bill to establish a pilot program to provide mental health check-ups for students at schools operated by the Department of Defense Education Activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to introduce the Supporting Mental Health for Military Children Act. This legislation would establish a routine mental-health and well-being checkup pilot program in Department of Defense Education Activity, DODEA, Schools.

In response to the growing youth mental health crisis in America, this bill would establish a biannual mental health screening program to ensure students have the resources they need to support their mental health, combat the stigmatization of seeking help, and promote healthy lifestyles.

Our Nation's young people are facing an unprecedented mental health crisis. An estimated 49.5 percent of American adolescents have had a mental health disorder at some point in their lives, with 50 percent of all lifetime mental illnesses beginning by age 14; 75 percent by age 24. This state of affairs was only worsened by the pandemic.

While these numbers are already staggering, military children are at even greater risk of mental/behavioral health problems than the general population given their unique vulnerability to adverse childhood experiences. As such, early screening and treatment are essential to decreasing the risk of suicide and improving management of/recovery from mental health conditions amongst this vulnerable segment of youth.

The evidence is clear: Ubiquitous mental health screening and education protocols, offered by 55 percent of U.S. public schools in 2019 to 2022, are well-tested, relatively low-resource, and high-impact ways to swiftly diagnose and treat mental health conditions amongst youth.

I would like to thank Congressman MOULTON for his leadership and efforts on the House side. I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact the Supporting Mental Health for Military Children Act as quickly as possible.

By Mr. KAINE:

S.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution redesignating the Robert E. Lee Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery as the ''Arlington House National Historic Site''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, today, I am introducing legislation to remove ''Robert E. Lee Memorial'' from the official name of Arlington House.

This legislation is partially inspired by requests from descendants of General Robert E. Lee and people who were enslaved at Arlington House. This is an effort to promote a society that is more just and equitable for all, regardless of race, by moving on from a public symbol that honors a figure that fought to protect slavery.

Arlington House is the first name of the historic mansion, which sits on Federal land within Arlington National Cemetery. The property is administered by the National Park Service and overlooks the Potomac River and the Nation's Capital. The house was built by Martha Custis Washington's grandson, George Washington Parke Custis, as the Nation's first memorial to George Washington. Later, his daughter married Robert E. Lee and the couple lived in the home until the Civil War, when Federal forces occupied the house and surrounding property. During that period, the site was chosen to serve as a national military cemetery in part to prevent Lee from returning.

Only in the 20th century, in 1955 and again in 1972, did Congress add the commemorative text honoring Robert E. Lee to the site's formal name in Federal statute. This was part of a retrograde effort across the former Confederacy to bestow public recognition on prominent Confederate figures as heroes while minimizing or whitewashing their roles in taking up arms

against the United States to preserve slavery. As Senator from the State that has among the most difficult histories when it comes to slavery, civil rights, and Confederate monuments, I believe these symbolic proposals matter, that the Federal Government should reserve honorifics for individuals whose lives advanced American values and ideals, not detracted from them.

Today, the National Park Service is dedicated to telling the story of those who were enslaved at the Arlington House. I am hopeful that this name change will help to do just a little bit more to encapsulate the full history of the site, which included the presence of many families and generations throughout history, such as the Syphax, Burke, Parks, and Gray families.

I am pleased that companion legislation is also being introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by my colleague, Representative DON BEYER, who has led this effort for years.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 259—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF UNITED STATES-INDIA RELATIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 259

Whereas the Republic of India achieved its independence on August 15, 1947, and is celebrating 75 years of its independence;

Whereas the United States-India Comprehensive Global Strategic Partnership is critical for regional and global prosperity;

Whereas, according to United Nations population estimates, India will become the most populous country in the world in 2023, with an estimated population of more than 1,425,000,000 people;

Whereas strong people-to-people and educational exchanges between the United States and the Republic of India cement our nations' ties and serve as the foundation for deeper cooperation;

Whereas students from the Republic of India comprise nearly 20 percent of all international students studying in the United States, that this community is expected to soon become the largest foreign student community in the United States, and in 2022, the United States Mission in India issued more than 82,000 Indian student visas, a record-breaking amount;

Whereas, according to International Monetary Fund data, India is the fifth largest economy in the world;

Whereas the furthering of trade and investment between the United States and the Republic of India, two of the world's largest economies, is in the interest of both countries as well as the broader global economy;

Whereas the United States became India's largest trading partner in 2022, with bilateral goods and services trade almost doubling since 2014, and exceeding $191,000,000,000 in 2022;

Whereas the Republic of India hosted the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework for Prosperity (IPEF) negotiating round in February 2023;

Whereas the United States designated India as a Major Defense Partner in 2016, and a strong United States-India defense partnership is critical for United States and Indian interests in the Indo-Pacific region;

Whereas military-to-military ties between our two countries have deepened, with both countries undertaking bilateral and multilateral military exercises across air, land, and maritime domains, and are taking steps to strengthen defense industrial base collaboration;

Whereas the Republic of India's G20 presidency reflects its economic rise and demonstrates its commitment to furthering multilateral coordination and progress in the areas of inclusive growth, environmental protection, technology and knowledge-sharing, women-led development, and more;

Whereas the United States and India have coordinated closely in numerous multilateral forums such as the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (''the Quad''), the I2U2 Group, and the G20, to address issues ranging from energy and food security to space, infrastructure, health, and critical and emerging technologies;

Whereas the United States and India have been partners in advancing global health security, especially during the COVID–19 pandemic, during which India assisted other countries, including in the developing world through the deployment of vaccines and medicines;

Whereas there are significant opportunities to work together to develop emerging technologies through private sector and academic and research partnerships to achieve shared energy goals;

Whereas the United States and India announced the Initiative on Critical and Emerging Technology (iCET) in May 2022, as a significant line of partnership to expand defense industrial and technological cooperation, including in areas such as artificial intelligence, quantum and high-performance computing, space, next generation telecommunications, and semiconductor supply chains; and

Whereas the diverse Indian American community, which numbers over 4,000,000 individuals, is critical to the strong people-to-people ties between India and the United States and has made critical contributions to the culture and economy of the United States, and forms one of the strongest bonds linking our two countries together: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the strong and long-standing partnership between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of India, rooted in people to people ties, strategic interests, including upholding peace, security, and prosperity in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) encourages the United States and India to continue and expand cooperation for a free, open, and resilient Indo-Pacific, including through the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue;

(3) welcomes the Republic of India's participation in economic initiatives, including through bilateral and multilateral forums, its participation in the Quad, and other venues of cooperation;

(4) supports the United States and the Republic of India identifying further opportunities to deepen engagement and further defense, commercial, and investment ties;

(5) affirms the importance of technology cooperation between the United States and India, including through the Initiative on Critical and Emerging Technology;

(6) recognizes the importance of expanding people-to-people programs between the United States and India, particularly between educational institutions;

(7) appreciates the contributions of Americans of Indian origin, and desires closer relations between the people of the United States and the people of India; and

(8) views the bilateral relationship as holding the potential to bring significant benefit to the citizens of both nations, and to make considerable contributions to addressing the global challenges of the 21st century.

SENATE RESOLUTION 260—RECOGNIZING TUNISIA'S LEADERSHIP IN THE ARAB SPRING AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR UPHOLDING ITS DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES AND NORMS

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 260

Whereas Tunisia gained its independence from France on March 20, 1956, with Habib Bourguiba serving as Prime Minister, before becoming Tunisia's first President in 1957;

Whereas President Bourguiba led Tunisia through independence and the ensuing 30 years, a period that included vast social reforms and restrictions on civil society and democratic participation;

Whereas, in 1987, Prime Minister Zine El Abdine Ben Ali deposed President Bourguiba and named himself President of Tunisia, citing Bourguiba's incompetence and failing health to justify his undemocratic actions;

Whereas President Ben Ali was subsequently elected in 1989 and 1994 without genuine opposition, and was re-elected in 1999, 2004, and 2009 by implausibly high vote margins in election processes that were widely deemed as neither free nor fair;

Whereas President Ben Ali's rule was marred by gross human rights violations and a lack of democratic freedoms;

Whereas, the 2003 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, released by the Department of State on February 25, 2004, stated, referring to Tunisia—

(1) ''Elections are regularly characterized by notable irregularities, including voter intimidation, and there is no secret ballot.'';

(2) ''Security forces physically abused, intimidated, and harassed citizens who voiced public criticism of the Government.'';

(3) ''The Government continued to impose significant restrictions on freedom of speech and the press.''; and

(4) ''The Government remained intolerant of public criticism and used physical abuse, criminal investigations, the court system, arbitrary arrests, residential restrictions, and travel controls (including denial of passports) to discourage criticism by human rights and opposition activists.'';

Whereas, on December 17, 2010, 26-year-old fruit and vegetable street vendor Mohamed Bouazizi lit himself on fire in desperate protest in Sidi Bouzid, Tunisia, an act that was largely seen as the beginning of the Arab Spring movement that spread throughout the region;

Whereas ensuing popular protests in Tunisia in response to corruption, repression, and economic failure—

(1) forced the resignation of President Ben Ali from the office of president;

(2) ended his 23-year rule; and

(3) further inspired similar pent up democratic demands throughout the Arab world;

Whereas Tunisia emerged from the Arab Spring as one of the most hopeful and promising reformed democracies in the region, including with an interim government and a

Constituent Assembly responsible for drafting a new constitution and fostering political compromise for a future democratic government;

Whereas, in February 2011, Senator John McCain urged United States support for Tunisia's democratic transition, noting ''The revolution in Tunisia has been very successful and it has become a model for the region.'';

Whereas, in March 2011, United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon pledged full support for Tunisia's transition to democracy, hailing the country's revolution as the spark that lit ''the profound and dramatic changes'' sweeping the Arab world;

Whereas, on January 26, 2014, the Constituent Assembly of Tunisia adopted a new constitution demonstrating consensus for building a democracy founded on freedom and equality;

Whereas the new constitution of Tunisia includes Articles that—

(1) give equal rights to men and women;

(2) protection freedoms of assembly, peaceful demonstration, expression, and publication; and

(3) outline an electoral system and representation for the Tunisian people with checks and balances;

Whereas, in November 2014, Tunisia held its first genuinely free and fair presidential election since its independence in 1956, with 27 candidates freely competing for the office of president;

Whereas longtime politician Beji Caid Essebsi won the election in a runoff with 55 percent of the vote, becoming Tunisia's first legitimately elected president since independence;

Whereas President Essebsi faced many difficult challenges, including economic turmoil, terrorist attacks, and public expectations for change;

Whereas public disillusionment with the country's political elites increased amid continued corruption and devastating acts of terrorism that severely hurt the tourism industry and larger economy;

Whereas political outsider and constitutional law professor Kais Saied won the presidential election held on October 13, 2019, and was sworn into office 10 days later in a peaceful transfer of power;

Whereas, by 2021, protests in response to worsening economic conditions, further exacerbated by the COVID–19 pandemic, occurred across cities in Tunisia, to which the police responded violently;

Whereas, in July 2021, President Saied capitalized on unrest to unilaterally seize power by—

(1) dismissing Prime Minister Hichem Mechichi;

(2) suspending Parliament for 30 days; and

(3) assuming full executive authority without first consulting the government;

Whereas in late 2021, President Saied indefinitely suspended Parliament and transferred all legislative powers to himself;

Whereas, in early 2022, President Saied continued to undermine Tunisia's democratic institutions, including by taking control of the Independent High Authority for Elections and dissolving the High Judicial Council;

Whereas, in July 2022, President Saied unilaterally put to a referendum a new draft constitution, which—

(1) consolidated power to the presidency;

(2) limited parliamentary authority; and

(3) diminished judicial independence;

Whereas the new draft constitution was approved despite remarkably low voter turnout and heavy domestic and international criticism surrounding the lack of genuine debate throughout the drafting process;

Whereas, between 2021 to 2023, Tunisia experienced—

(1) a dramatic drop in voter participation and public confidence in the political process; and

(2) an escalation in politically motivated arrests of political opponents, judges, lawyers, journalists, and business leaders; and

Whereas President Saied's actions have dramatically undermined and threatened Tunisia's nascent democratic institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes Tunisia as the symbolic birthplace of the historic Arab Spring movement and the country's notable democratic reforms that emerged during the Arab Spring period;

(2) commends the Tunisian people for their courage and democratic achievements made in the immediate years following the Arab Spring;

(3) expresses deep concern for more recent reversals of such democratic gains, including—

(A) the erosion of judicial independence;

(B) political repression and arrests; and

(C) the undemocratic consolidation of power;

(4) urges the Government of Tunisia—

(A) to release all political prisoners; and

(B) to respect the rights of the people to free exercise of peaceful assembly, expression, and the press; and

(5) calls on the Government of Tunisia to support a transparent and open 2024 presidential election process.

SENATE RESOLUTION 261—COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING THE VEGAS GOLDEN KNIGHTS ON WINNING THE 2023 STANLEY CUP FINAL

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 261

Whereas, on June 13, 2023, the Vegas Golden Knights won the 2023 National Hockey League (referred to in this preamble as the ''NHL'') Stanley Cup Final;

Whereas the 2023 Stanley Cup Final is the first Stanley Cup Final won by the Vegas Golden Knights in the 6 years in which the franchise has competed in the NHL;

Whereas, on their way to winning the 2023 Stanley Cup Final, the Vegas Golden Knights defeated—

(1) the Winnipeg Jets in the first round of the playoffs;

(2) the Edmonton Oilers in the second round of the playoffs;

(3) the Dallas Stars in the Western Conference Finals to win the Clarence S. Campbell Bowl; and

(4) the Florida Panthers in the Stanley Cup Final;

Whereas, during the 2022-2023 NHL Season, the Vegas Golden Knights—

(1) won a franchise record 51 games during the regular season and set a new team record with 111 points scored to clinch their third Pacific Division Championship; and

(2) had Head Coach Bruce Cassidy and 2 All-Stars, Logan Thompson and Chandler Stephenson, represent the franchise at the 2023 NHL All-Star Game in Sunrise, Florida;

Whereas, during the 2023 Stanley Cup Playoffs—

(1) Adin Hill of the Vegas Golden Knights set a NHL Playoff record by achieving 11 wins in a single postseason after making his debut in the second round; and

(2) Jonathan Marchessault of the Vegas Golden Knights won the 2023 Conn Smythe Trophy, which is awarded to the most valuable player in the Stanley Cup Playoffs;

Whereas the entire Vegas Golden Knights roster contributed to the 2023 Stanley Cup victory: Mark Stone, Alex Pietrangelo, Reilly Smith, Adin Hill, Michael Amadio, Ivan Barbashev, Teddy Blueger, William Carrier, Paul Cotter, Jack Eichel, Brett Howden, William Karlsson, Phil Kessel, Keegan Kolesar, Jonathan Marchessault, Nicolas Roy, Chandler Stephenson, Nicolas Hague, Ben Hutton, Alec Martinez, Brayden McNabb, Brayden Pachal, Shea Theadore, Zach Whitecloud, Laurent Brossoit, Jire Patera, Jonathan Quick, and Logan Thompson;

Whereas behind the Vegas Golden Knights roster is a team of coaches and support staff committed to enriching the Las Vegas community on and off the ice;

Whereas the Vegas Golden Knights deserve special recognition for their continued work to provide hope and unity to a grieving Las Vegas community since their inaugural season in 2017-2018, following the Route 91 tragedy that occurred on October 1, 2017; and

Whereas the Vegas Golden Knights represent their loyal fans, the Las Vegas community, and the entire State of Nevada with a commitment to excellence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Vegas Golden Knights and its loyal fan base for becoming the 2023 National Hockey League Stanley Cup champions; and

(2) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to members of the Vegas Golden Knights' ownership, management, and coaching staff, namely—

(A) the Chairman, Chief Executive Officer, and Governor of the Vegas Golden Knights, Bill Foley;

(B) General Manager Kelly McCrimmon; and

(C) Head Coach Bruce Cassidy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 262—AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A COLLECTION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 262

Resolved, That a collection of the rules of the committees of the Senate, together with related materials, be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed 250 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATE RESOLUTION 263—COMMEMORATING JUNE 19, 2023, AS ''JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY'' IN RECOGNITION OF JUNE 19, 1865, THE DATE ON WHICH NEWS OF THE END OF SLAVERY REACHED THE SLAVES IN THE SOUTHWESTERN STATES

Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr.

CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 263

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach the frontier areas of the United States, in particular the State of Texas and the other Southwestern States, until months after the conclusion of the Civil War, more than 2½ years after President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and the enslaved were free;

Whereas African Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as ''Juneteenth National Independence Day'', as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas African Americans from the Southwest have continued the tradition of observing Juneteenth National Independence Day for more than 150 years;

Whereas Juneteenth National Independence Day began as a holiday in the State of Texas and is now a Federal holiday and celebrated by Americans from many walks of life as a special day of observance in recognition of the emancipation of all slaves in the United States;

Whereas Juneteenth National Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves and the descendants of former slaves remain an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race;

Whereas slavery was not officially abolished until the ratification of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States in December 1865; and

Whereas, over the course of its history, the United States has grown into a symbol of democracy and freedom around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates June 19, 2023, as ''Juneteenth National Independence Day'';

(2) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth National Independence Day to the United States;

(3) supports the continued nationwide celebration of Juneteenth National Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the United States; and

(4) recognizes that the observance of the end of slavery is part of the history and heritage of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 264—DESIGNATING JUNE 2023 AS ''NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH'' AND JUNE 27, 2023, AS ''NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 264

Whereas the brave men and women of the Armed Forces, who proudly serve the United States—

(1) risk their lives to protect the freedom, health, and welfare of the people of the United States; and

(2) deserve the investment of every possible resource to ensure their lasting physical, mental, and emotional well-being;

Whereas, since the events of September 11, 2001, nearly 2,800,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed overseas and served in places such as Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the current generation of men and women in the Armed Forces has sustained a high rate of operational deployments, with many members of the Armed Forces serving overseas multiple times, placing those members at high risk of enduring traumatic combat stress;

Whereas, when left untreated, exposure to traumatic combat stress can lead to severe and chronic post-traumatic stress responses, which are commonly referred to as post-traumatic stress disorder or post-traumatic stress injury;

Whereas many men and women of the Armed Forces and veterans who served before September 11, 2001, live with mental health needs from post-traumatic stress and remain at risk for responses to that stress;

Whereas many post-traumatic stress responses remain unreported, undiagnosed, and untreated due to a lack of awareness about post-traumatic stress and the persistent stigma associated with mental health conditions;

Whereas post-traumatic stress significantly increases the risk of post-traumatic stress responses, including anxiety, depression, homelessness, substance abuse, and suicide, especially if left untreated;

Whereas the Secretary of Veterans Affairs reports that—

(1) approximately 20 percent of veterans who served in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom have post-traumatic stress in a given year;

(2) approximately 12 percent of veterans who served in the Persian Gulf War have post-traumatic stress in a given year; and

(3) approximately 30 percent of veterans who served in the Vietnam era have had post-traumatic stress in their lifetimes;

Whereas public perceptions of post-traumatic stress as a mental health disorder create unique challenges for veterans seeking employment;

Whereas the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, veterans service organizations, and the private and public medical community have made significant advances in the identification, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of post-traumatic stress and the symptoms of post-traumatic stress, but many challenges remain;

Whereas increased understanding of post-traumatic stress can help eliminate stigma attached to the mental health issues of post-traumatic stress;

Whereas additional efforts are needed to find further ways to eliminate the stigma associated with post-traumatic stress, including—

(1) an examination of how post-traumatic stress is discussed in the United States; and

(2) a recognition that post-traumatic stress is a common injury that is treatable;

Whereas timely and appropriate treatment of post-traumatic stress responses can diminish complications and avert suicides;

Whereas post-traumatic stress—

(1) can result from any number of stressors other than combat, including rape, sexual assault, battery, torture, confinement, child abuse, car accidents, train wrecks, plane crashes, bombings, natural disasters, or global pandemics; and

(2) affects approximately 8,000,000 adults in the United States annually;

Whereas traumatic events such as the COVID–19 pandemic could—

(1) increase the number of individuals impacted by post-traumatic stress; or

(2) exacerbate the responses of post-traumatic stress;

Whereas the diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder was first defined by the American Psychiatric Association in 1980 to commonly and more accurately understand and treat survivors of physical and psychological trauma, including veterans who had endured severe traumatic combat stress;

Whereas the word ''disorder'' can perpetuate the stigma associated with combat stress, so the more general term ''post-traumatic stress'' is often preferred; and

Whereas the designation of a National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month and a National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day raises public awareness about issues relating to post-traumatic stress, reduces the stigma associated with post-traumatic stress, and helps ensure that individuals suffering from the invisible wounds of war receive proper treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates—

(A) June 2023 as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month''; and

(B) June 27, 2023, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day'';

(2) supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Defense, and the entire medical community to educate members of the Armed Forces, veterans, the families of members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and the public about the causes, symptoms, and treatment of post-traumatic stress;

(3) supports efforts by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to foster—

(A) cultural change around the issue of post-traumatic stress; and

(B) understanding that personal interactions can save lives and advance treatment;

(4) welcomes the efforts of local Vet Centers (as defined in section 1712A(h) of title 38, United States Code) to provide assistance to veterans who are suffering from the effects of post-traumatic stress;

(5) encourages the leadership of the Armed Forces to support appropriate treatment of men and women of the Armed Forces who suffer from post-traumatic stress;

(6) recognizes the impact of post-traumatic stress on the spouses and families of members of the Armed Forces and veterans; and

(7) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to—

(A) the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and

(B) the Secretary of Defense.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I have 16 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 2:30 p.m.

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, June 21, 2023, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 9:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

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, June 21, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 10 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 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, June 21, 2023, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 9 a.m.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 11 a.m.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in open session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 11:15 a.m.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

The Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 10 a.m.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 9:30 a.m.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following set of resolutions: S. Res. 261, S. Res. 262, S. Res. 263, and S. Res. 264.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to; the preambles, where applicable, 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 (S. Res. 261, S. Res. 263, and S. Res. 264) were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

The resolution (S. Res. 262) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, into the House Chamber for the joint meeting at 4 p.m. on Thursday, June 22, 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 277

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The clerk will read the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 277) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

Mr. BENNET. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2023

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that following the conclusion of morning business, notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 100, H.J. Res. 44, and that at 11:45 a.m., the joint resolution be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage; further, that following disposition of the joint resolution, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of treaty document 112–8, postcloture, and that at 1:45 p.m., amendment No. 136 be withdrawn, and all time be considered expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:57 p.m., adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JEFFREY PRESCOTT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

CHARLOTTE A. BURROWS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2028. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES F. PORTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BETH A. SALISBURY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

ANDREW R. UPDIKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 7064:

To be major

VEGAS V. COLEMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

ERICA L. KANE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSHUA T. ADE
KEITH L. ADERHOLD
LYDE C. ANDREWS
STEPHAN H. BUCHANAN
JAMES D. DICE
JONATHAN R. FISHER
CHARLES G. GILBERTSON
JONATHAN L. GINDER
CHAN Y. HAM
JOSEPH E. HAMILTON
JASON E. HESSELING
CURTIS E. HULSHIZER
WALLACE A. JACKSON IV
BENJAMIN H. JUNG
BRADLEY D. KATTELMANN
SCOTT G. KENNIS
HERBERT A. LEMKE
SEAN A. LEVINE
KENNETH R. MAY
BRIAN M. MINIETTA
DAVID T. MORRISON
WILLIE J. NEWTON
SAMUEL RICO
ISMAEL O. SERRANO
CHARLES E. SHIELDS, JR.
JOHN F. SMITH
MARK A. SMITH
MICHAEL N. SMITH
DARREN D. TURNER
JARED L. VINEYARD
EVERETT E. ZACHARY

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

WILLIAM M. SCHWEITZER

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

GEORGE A. AYACHE, OF TEXAS
SCOTT A. BENNETT, OF MISSOURI
SYEDA S. BORCHMEYER, OF NEW YORK
THOMAS S. CLEVER, OF TEXAS
ERIN M. COLE, OF IOWA
JA'NEL M. EDENS, OF VIRGINIA
DURRA R. ELMAKI, OF VIRGINIA
SCOT B. GONZALES, OF VIRGINIA
CLINTON L. HARPER, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW J. KOHNER, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN P. KIM, OF TEXAS
KERRY F. LEPAIN, OF ALASKA
ANNETTE K. LIPP, OF IDAHO
CARA L. LOFARO, OF MARYLAND
DEBRA K. MARTIN, OF WEST VIRGINIA
JOHN P. MCCADAMS, OF TENNESSEE
JOHN C. MUELLER, OF FLORIDA
SICHAO NI, OF FLORIDA
SARAH E. NICKEL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LAWRENCE T. OUTLAW, OF LOUISIANA
DAVID A. PASQUINI, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER D. PRIDDY, OF VIRGINIA
AISHA N. SALEM–HOWEY, OF FLORIDA
ROBERT E. SCULLY III, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS A. STRAUSS, OF MISSOURI
HALEY M. SUND, OF CALIFORNIA
DONALD E. TOWNSEND, JR., OF FLORIDA
JUSTIN D. TAPP, OF TENNESSEE
NATHAN C. TRAURIG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MATTHEW T. WESTERBERG, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

SANTIAGO DAVILA, OF CALIFORNIA
FREDERICK HELFRICH, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MELISSA HILL, OF CALIFORNIA
SETH OPPENHEIM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IRWIN ROBERTS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ALULA ABERA, OF NEVADA
STEPHANIE L. ALTMAN, OF MARYLAND
ANN BACON, OF OHIO
MUSTANSIR BARMA, OF NEBRASKA
JENNIFER BERGESON-LOCKWOOD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHAD BERKOWITZ, OF NEW YORK
AMANDA BOACHIE, OF MARYLAND
DANIELLE BROOKS, OF TEXAS
JOLISA BROOKS, OF MICHIGAN
JEANNE CHOQUEHUANCA, OF TEXAS
LEA CLAYE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARYLIN COICOU, OF HAWAII
SARAH COOPER, OF CALIFORNIA
NATHAN CUTLER, OF TEXAS
JACQUELINE SCHUMACHER CUTTEN, OF WASHINGTON
LORI DU TRIEUILLE, OF CALIFORNIA
DENNIS E. FOSTER, OF TEXAS
BRIAN FRIEDMAN, OF ALASKA
PETER GAUTHIER, OF TEXAS
MARK GRAY, OF WASHINGTON
BERHAN HAGOS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FRANCIS A. HALL, OF TEXAS
FAYE E. HASELKORN, OF CALIFORNIA
KEISHA HERBERT, OF OHIO
DAVID HOWLETT, OF NEVADA
FARIDA IBRAHIM, OF FLORIDA
HENOCK KEWENDBELAY, OF COLORADO
PETER KHAEMBA, OF FLORIDA
JOYCE KIM, OF CALIFORNIA
JULIE M. LAMADRID, OF NEW MEXICO
BENJAMIN LAWRENCE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BRIAN LECUYER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANGELIQUE MAHAL, OF NEW YORK
KAREEM MANSOUR, OF FLORIDA
DAVID MARTZ, OF FLORIDA
MARIELA MEDINA CASTELLANOS, OF CALIFORNIA
TIMOTHY MELVIN, OF FLORIDA
ALINA MENICUCCI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRYAN MOODY, OF NEVADA
BRIAN MURPHY, OF FLORIDA
CEARA O'CARROLL, OF WISCONSIN
CORY O'HARA, OF WYOMING
JAZMIAN ALLEN OHANYERE, OF CALIFORNIA
KRINA PATEL, OF VIRGINIA
MERON PAULOS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREA PAVLICK, OF PENNSYLVANIA
NATHAN PIPER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DAVID RAWSON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
VANN ROLFSON, OF MARYLAND
KRISTOPHER ROWELL, OF MISSOURI
STEVEN RYNECKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KEVIN SAMPSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
AARON SCHUBERT, OF ALASKA
BRYCE S. SMEDLEY, OF OHIO
NOAH SPRAFKIN, OF NEVADA
SARA SULIMAN, OF FLORIDA
ANDREEA SURDU, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHAEL O. TAURAS, OF CALIFORNIA
SUMMER TUCKER, OF MICHIGAN
KION TURNER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STEPHANIE M. ULLRICH, OF WASHINGTON
PATRICIA A. VIALA, OF VIRGINIA
MEGHAN E. WATERS, OF COLORADO
HOWARD M. WESTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
VANESSA WILKS, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 25, 2022:

DALE TASHARSKI, OF VIRGINIA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 21, 2023:

THE JUDICIARY

NATASHA C. MERLE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW K. BERKEY AND ENDING WITH BRANDON WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 17, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JACQUELYN P. SMITH, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID B. BARKER AND ENDING WITH JOCELYN M. WHALEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF DANIEL J. WITTMER, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MARINA F. PEREZ, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEPHEN DAVID ALBERT AND ENDING WITH JAMIE TAYLOR ZIMMERMANN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT D. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH NICOLAS H. ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER K. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH RAYMOND P. ZHANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICHOLAS F. ALIOTTA AND ENDING WITH JASON J. ZUMMO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW D. AHN AND ENDING WITH OYUNCHIMEG YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARAH E. ABEL AND ENDING WITH MICHELLE E. WYCHE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. ALFARO AND ENDING WITH SARA M. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF CANDICE L. PIPES, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL A. GROWDEN AND ENDING WITH HSIENLIANG R. TSENG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF CRAIG A. AMBROSE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF BIBEK JOSHI, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ADRIAN K. WILLIFORD, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL D. COLE AND ENDING WITH EDWARD F. LEONARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KYLE D. AEMISEGGER AND ENDING WITH D017212, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 27, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AILEEN R. CABANADALOGAN AND ENDING WITH JOHN F. UNDERWOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 27, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HARRY T. AUBIN AND ENDING WITH D016621, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 17, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA A. AKERS AND ENDING WITH SHENICE L. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 17, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALEXANDRA M. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH D016620, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 17, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREA C. BAEDER AND ENDING WITH PETER S. YOON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 17, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HEATHER R. ALSUPMORTON AND ENDING WITH JUDIZA L. ZELAYA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BOMA O. AFIESIMAMA AND ENDING WITH D016999, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMIE D. BELL AND ENDING WITH JUSTIN ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RACHEL A. ACCIACCA AND ENDING WITH LAURA E. RIDDLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMILIA M. ADAMSHENDERSON AND ENDING WITH JOHN E. WILSON, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH COREBRIANS A. ABRAHAM AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER R. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AARON CROMBIE AND ENDING WITH LARRY A. WYATT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES E. BANE AND ENDING WITH THOMAS R. TUCKER III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATION OF THOMAS A. SUMMERS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS J. NORTON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ARTREESE R. ADAMS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF WARREN N. WASHINGTON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JACOB W. CAVENDER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JUSTIN M. FOWLER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JASON P. PANCOE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN F. IVERSON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARK G. KAPPELMANN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LEAH H. GEORGIEVA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS R. YETMAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KEVIN L. MONTGOMERY, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID J. BEDELLS AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL D. ZULTAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MOLLY E. KEITH AND ENDING WITH DALLAS D. MCMULLEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN D. BRYANT AND ENDING WITH D011339, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOSEPH A. ST PIERRE II, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY A. BANKS AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY R. WEINSTEIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ISAAC A. GUTIERREZ, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RICK J. MATA, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF D016094, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF DUSTIN B. KOSAR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF STEVEN E. ANDERSON, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRYCE D. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW A. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDWARD A. CARLTON AND ENDING WITH GENEVIEVE G. UBINA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREA H. CAMERON AND ENDING WITH WARREN W. TOMLINSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MYLENE R. ARVIZO AND ENDING WITH ASHLEY S. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARAH E. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH JOHN A. WALSH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CURTIS BROWN AND ENDING WITH GARY M . SHELLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK K. CORBLISS AND ENDING WITH ANTOINE D. THORNTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HANNAH L. BEALON AND ENDING WITH STANLEY C. WARE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CAMERON M. BALMA AND ENDING WITH MELINDA K. SCHRYVER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALAN M. BRECHBILL AND ENDING WITH DAVID J. TEBBE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROSS M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH ROGER D. HORNE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HOMER F. HENSY AND ENDING WITH GREGORY F. NOTARO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TOMMIE G. CRAWFORD AND ENDING WITH SHANNON P. THOMPSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN E. FAGE AND ENDING WITH REBECCA L. REBARICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GAVIN H. CLOUGH AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW G. ZUBLIC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER J. LANDRY AND ENDING WITH JONATHAN A. SAVAGE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRADLEY H. ABRAMOWITZ AND ENDING WITH CHELSEY L. ZWICKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC J. ADLER AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW A. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LUCAS R. ARGOBRIGHT AND ENDING WITH SARAH E. TURSE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF PATRICK C. LAZZARETTI, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT A. PAYNTER, JR. AND ENDING WITH TODD C. WINN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STANLEY J. BENES IV AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL SULLIVAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES P. MCDONNELL AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH E. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DONNA M. CHUBA, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ANTON B. ALLEN, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADAM M. CLAMPITT AND ENDING WITH GUSTAVO PEREZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER P. COOK AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW E. HOBBS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DEMETRIO A. CAMUA III AND ENDING WITH ARTHUR C. FONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF LOREN C. HOELSCHER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW T. CHATIGNY AND ENDING WITH KEVIN C. LIEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA C. GETTLE AND ENDING WITH GERARDO TORRES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN J. BRIDGES AND ENDING WITH MARK H. OVERSTREET, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RYAN H. METZLER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DENNIS L. AVERY AND ENDING WITH BRIAN D. WUESTEWALD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KHRISTIANNOE C. CAINDOY AND ENDING WITH DIMITRY P. VINCENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW D. GLEASON AND ENDING WITH EMILY Y. ROYSE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JACOB S. THARP, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER E. BARNES AND ENDING WITH CHADWICK Y. YASUDA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KENRIC T. ABAN AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY C. WORTHLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL R. ANDERSEN AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DOMINIC J. ANTENUCCI AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER C. SWAIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM H. ABBITT AND ENDING WITH THOMAS W. ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH ALEXANDER G. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID L. AGUILAR AND ENDING WITH DANIEL J. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SEAN A. BROPHY AND ENDING WITH JESUS A. URANGA, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANCIS G. COYLE AND ENDING WITH DANIEL A. TANTILLO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REBECCA L. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH JOHN L. VINCENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICK AVILA AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL P. WOLCHKO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL K. BEALL AND ENDING WITH ALANNA B. YOUNGBLOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FORREST N. BUSH AND ENDING WITH NATHAN J. RICHARDSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT B. AARON AND ENDING WITH CLINTON M. WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JESSICA L. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH CRYSTAL R. WARRENE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SUZANNE T. ALFORD AND ENDING WITH ERIC R. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICHOLAS D. CHIUDIONI AND ENDING WITH JULIAN G. WILSON III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARVIN E. BARTHOLOMEW AND ENDING WITH KIRTLEY N. YEISER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH QUENTIN ALBEA AND ENDING WITH EDWARD E. WEEKLEY, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL M. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH THOMAS H. WILLIAMS, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT P. ADER AND ENDING WITH PHILIP R. SAULNIER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ERIKA M. MESZAROS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARY R. ANKER AND ENDING WITH BRANDON K. WOLF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID W. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH JOHN C. VANDYKE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER S. CASNE AND ENDING WITH JUSTIN D. SPINKS, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN L. BORKERT AND ENDING WITH BLAKE A. WHITTLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THEODORE G. CAVOORES, JR. AND ENDING WITH CHRISTY L. ROUSSEAU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW E. CARMICHAEL AND ENDING WITH DAVID N. STOCK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KIRSTEN M. BETAK AND ENDING WITH SUZANNE J. WOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARAH E. DAVIS AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY J. ROCKWOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRYAN T. ALVAREZ AND ENDING WITH JENNIFER J. VOGT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RODNEY M. BONNER AND ENDING WITH CHARLES C. THOMPSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JULIE K. MOSS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LUIS E. ALDERMAN II AND ENDING WITH MELINDA S. L. ZALMA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY W. GLEASON AND ENDING WITH CORY A. WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

SPACE FORCE NOMINATION OF ROBIN J. GLEBES, TO BE MAJOR.

SPACE FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LISA T. GREEN AND ENDING WITH KEITH D. VAN DYCK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

SPACE FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PHOENIX L. HAUSER AND ENDING WITH DUSTIN L. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING OFFICER RALPH BROWN'S CAREER OF SERVICE

HON. MIKE GARCIA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Officer Ralph Brown on the occasion of his retirement from a distinguished career with the Los Angeles Police Department. For more than 25 years, Officer Brown faithfully executed his duty as a sworn defender of his fellow officers and of the people of Los Angeles with grit, courage, and professional exceptionalism.

Officer Brown joined the Los Angeles Police Department at the peak of the 1990s crime wave, when police officers were frequently put in harm's way while protecting their community with rampant gang activity and violent crime. Despite the considerable risks, Officer Brown decided to join the department in 1998 as a way to serve his community. Upon his graduation from the academy, he quickly ascended the ranks of the LAPD and began focusing on cracking down gang related criminal activity. After several years of law enforcement excellence, so valued was his expertise that he was promoted to Police Officer III and selected to become a Field Training Officer. In this new role, Officer Brown was responsible for training police officers on how to go after gangsters that threatened public safety.

Officer Brown rounded out his career assigned to Van Nuys patrol as a Field Training Officer, retiring on June 28, 2023. He ended his career as a highly respected police officer who time and time again demonstrated his commitment to the core tenet of the Los Angeles Police Department: ''To Protect and Serve.''

Once again, I want to extend my sincerest congratulations and well wishes to Officer Brown on his well-deserved retirement. We are grateful as a community for his more than 25 years of public service and wish him all the best.

COMMENDING THE LEADERSHIP OF EL PASO COUNTY SHERIFF RICHARD D. WILES

HON. VERONICA ESCOBAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the 43 years of public service of Richard D. Wiles, Sheriff of El Paso County, and a distinguished law enforcement leader in our community.

Richard Wiles was raised in El Paso and is an Andress High School alum. After graduating, he joined the El Paso Police Department in 1982 and worked his way up the ranks from a Patrol Officer to Chief of Police. Wiles was elected Sheriff to the El Paso County Sheriff's Office in 2009 where he has made important improvements to the safety of our community.

As Sheriff, Wiles has significantly improved the technology and training that officers receive. Sheriff Wiles implemented the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) that works with Emergence Health Network (EHN) to respond to calls and aid high-risk situations that may involve a person suffering a behavioral or mental health crisis. Under this program, officers are learning how to respond to mental health cases and help divert people from our criminal justice system when appropriate.

Sheriff Wiles was also an outspoken leader following the deadly domestic terrorist shooting that happened on August 3, 2019. He stood up and called out the blatant racism that motivated an individual to drive hundreds of miles with the intention to kill immigrants and Hispanics. Sheriff Wiles understands the strength and significance of our diversity and has embraced it within the El Paso County Sheriff's Office.

He has robust knowledge of the criminal justice system both in theory and practice. He received his bachelor's degree in criminal justice from the University of El Paso (UTEP) and earned his master's degree in criminal justice from Sul Ross State University. He also attended the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) National Academy and the Bill Blackwell Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas. Sheriff Wiles has always sought to be the best leader by continuously learning.

Today, it is my privilege to honor Sheriff Richard D. Wiles, thank him for his dedication, and wish him and his family the best upon his upcoming retirement.

CELEBRATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF CORAL SPRINGS

HON. JARED MOSKOWITZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 60th Anniversary of the City of Coral Springs.

Coral Springs is one of Florida's first truly planned cities. It was first incorporated on July 10, 1963, as ''the last piece of gold on the gold coast'' and has since become home to more than 134,000 residents. Now a thriving city with ''Everything Under the Sun,'' the Coral Springs community is proudly celebrating the city's past, present, and future during this Diamond Anniversary year with memorable family events, limited-edition merchandise production, and yearlong initiatives that aim to promote a sense of community pride and historical appreciation.

Comprising 24 square miles and nestled in the northwest corner of Broward County, Coral Springs is known for its family atmosphere, thriving business community, a vast array of parks and recreational facilities, and top-rated schools. As one of the fastest growing cities, and now considered fully ''built-out,'' it is hard to believe the same land was merely a green bean farm on the edge of the Florida Everglades just over 60 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in recognizing the 60th Anniversary of the City of Coral Springs and a special thanks to the residents, past and present, for making it the thriving community it is today.

HONORING GRACIELA GARCIA CANDIA'S RETIREMENT

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of Graciela Garcia Candia.

Graciela Garcia Candia is an esteemed educator and leader who has dedicated 41 years of her life to Jobs for Arizona's Graduates, a program that empowers youth to achieve academic, personal, and professional success in Arizona. Raised in Arizona after her family immigrated from Mexico when she was only three years old, Graciela's personal journey fuels her passion for championing the educational needs of the state's youth.

Graciela's connection with Jobs for Arizona's Graduates began in 1982 when she joined as the Program Coordinator at Tolleson Union High School. Her exceptional performance garnered numerous local and national awards, highlighting her commitment and effectiveness in helping students succeed. In 1999, Graciela took on the role of Program Manager, where she played a pivotal role in enhancing program management and services for the organization.

In 2003, Graciela's unwavering dedication and desire to make a lasting impact led her to assume the position of president of Jobs for Arizona's Graduates. It was under her leadership the program flourished. Graciela has been instrumental in securing millions of dollars in financial support, establishing valuable partnerships, expanding program sites, and forging strong relationships with key stakeholders such as businesses, government entities, educational institutions, and community leaders.

Graciela's genuine ''students come first'' attitude has been a guiding principle throughout her career. Her unwavering commitment to serving and providing quality services to underrepresented students in Arizona has been the driving force behind Jobs for Arizona's Graduates' success. Her leadership has propelled Jobs for Arizona's Graduates to receive the highest honor awarded by Jobs for America's Graduates for the past 21 years.

As Graciela Garcia Candia enters a well-deserved retirement, her profound impact on the lives of countless young individuals in Arizona

● 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.

will forever be remembered. Her legacy as an educator and leader will serve as an inspiration for future generations, and her dedication to empowering underserved youth will continue to shape the future of education in Arizona.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COLONEL TERRY WAYNE PARTIN

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplishments of Terry Wayne Partin, retiring as Colonel, having served as a Chaplain with over two decades of military service. A decorated Officer, he worked as a dual-status military technician, climbing to the State Chaplain of Mississippi National Guard.

Colonel Partin is an Officer for both the Mississippi National Guard and the U.S. Army. Chaplain Partin graduated from all professional military education courses for chaplains and religious support leaders. He is decorated with the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, the Combat Action Badge, and many other awards and decorations. He served in many tactical, operational, and strategic assignments, including two overseas combat tours to Iraq in 2005 and again in 2010, where I personally served alongside him. Chaplain Partin's career culminated with his promotion to the grade of Colonel and his selection as the Mississippi Army National state chaplain, where he donned the stole for three years. He has worked at and served the service members of Camp Shelby Joint Forces Training Center for many years in the areas of religious support, mental health, resiliency, and counseling.

He is a true American hero and a proud Mississippian who always made his family, friends, and fellow soldiers proud; we are immensely grateful for his dedication to our country and the great state of Mississippi.

CELEBRATING NEW HAMPSHIRE'S 235TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish a very happy birthday to the greatest state in our union: New Hampshire.

For 235 years, New Hampshire has been a pillar of freedom and democracy. From our beautiful streams and scenic lakes to the stunning peaks of Mount Washington, the 'Live Free or Die' state has so much to offer.

And in 235 years, New Hampshire has been home to some incredible people and places: trailblazing explorers, including Alan Shepard and Christa McAuliffe; innovative artists and inventors like Ken Burns, Dan Brown, and Dean Kamen; and impressive centers for education and research like the University of New Hampshire, Plymouth State University, Keene State College, and my alma mater, Dartmouth College.

Happy 235th birthday, New Hampshire. Here's to many more.

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF EL PASO

HON. VERONICA ESCOBAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the rich history, culture, and community that the City of El Paso has built over the last 150 years.

The City of El Paso was officially incorporated in May 1873 by the Texas Legislature. Since the inception of the city, we have been inextricably linked with Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua and communities in Southern New Mexico. We are home to the Ysleta del Sur Tigua tribe, the University of Texas at El Paso, the Texas Tech Health Sciences Center, and Fort Bliss, our nation's second largest military installation. We are a dynamic region, a vibrant metroplex where cultures and traditions blend.

El Paso is known as the 'Sun City,' where people can enjoy a Chihuahuas or Locomotives game, go on a hike or bike ride on a scenic trail in Franklin Mountains State Park, walk through our historic downtown, or enjoy the poppies in the spring at the Castner Range National Monument. The beauty of our Chihuahuan desert is unmatched. And at night, the Star on the Franklin Mountain always shines bright.

The City of El Paso is one of a kind. Our people are known to be warm, friendly, and hardworking. Our city comes together for unifying events, as we did for the Chamizal Treaty of 1963 when the United States and Mexico came into a peaceful settlement of a century-long dispute. We are a community of kindness and good will, one that always welcomes the stranger. But we also come together to love and help each other during times of great challenge, as we did after the domestic terrorist shooting on August 3, 2019 that took 23 souls. El Pasoans are resilient, and we have never lost touch with our humanity. '

I am proud to call the City of El Paso my home and it is my privilege to honor the 150th anniversary of our beautiful city. The future is bright for our community.

HONORING THE AFIYA CENTER OF DALLAS, TEXAS

HON. JASMINE CROCKETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the Afiya Center, a Dallas-based reproductive health organization that has been at the forefront of providing refuge, education, and resources to address the unique needs of Black women and gender-expansive individuals. Established in response to the disproportionate impact of the HIV–AIDS epidemic on Black women and girls in Texas, the Afiya Center stands as the only Black women-led, Black women-centered, and Black women-inclusive reproductive justice organization in the state.

Through their life-enriching programs, the Afiya Center has worked tirelessly to address socioeconomic disparities among Black women at risk, or living with, HIV–AIDS. The organization has also been instrumental in promoting birth justice and improving Black maternal health outcomes in Dallas and throughout Texas. As a safety network, collaborator, resource center, and info-hub, the Afiya Center has played a pivotal role in mobilizing grassroots organizing and advocating for policy changes throughout the state.

The Afiya Center's ''Get Tested, Grab a Bite'' community HIV testing day event, celebrating its 10th year, demonstrates the organization's commitment towards decreasing HIV, destigmatizing HIV–AIDS within the community, and addressing the social determinants of health that disproportionately affect Black women in Texas by providing free HIV testing. Moreover, this year's event goes beyond HIV testing by providing additional resources such as COVID–19 vaccines and boosters, Medicaid enrollment, and other services. Given that an estimated one-in-seven people living with HIV unaware of their status, testing events like the Afiya Center's are vital to not only raise awareness and promote responsible relations but also to encourage individuals to prioritize their health and destigmatize this preventable disease.

Texas, and particularly Dallas County, continues to face significant challenges regarding HIV prevalence. Over 18,000 people in the Dallas area are living with HIV, and despite advances in testing and medicine, the United States still experiences high rates of new infections. Black women and girls bear a disproportionate burden, with more than half of Black Texans living with HIV being women. The Afiya Center's unwavering dedication to addressing these disparities and providing support to those affected is commendable.

I urge my colleagues and the public to recognize the crucial work that organizations like the Afiya Center provide and support their ongoing efforts. Together, we can promote HIV awareness, eliminate stigma, and ensure that all individuals have access to the necessary resources and care they need to lead healthy and fulfilling lives.

I commend the Afiya Center for their tireless advocacy, their commitment to reproductive justice, and their transformative influence on the countless lives they have touched. Their remarkable achievements and the impactful work they do each and every day is a testament to their mission of empowering individuals, eliminating stigma, and striving for a healthier and more equitable future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, due to a family obligation, I was unable to attend session on June 20, 2023. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA Roll Call No. 272, and YEA on Roll Call No. 273.

HONORING SHAUN MARIE LEVINE'S LIFETIME OF SERVICE

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Shaun Marie Levine, Executive Director of the New York State Conservative Party.

Shaun Marie Levine was born in Massachusetts in 1947. Raised in New York, Shaun Marie would go on to graduate from the Academy of the Sacred Heart of Mary in Sag Harbor and attend the Queens Hospital Center School of Nursing with a Regents Scholarship. During the 1964 presidential election, she campaigned for the first time for Republican candidate Barry Goldwater (R–AZ).

Shaun Marie shifted her focus from national politics to local politics, centering herself in New York City. Beginning as an associate district leader, she rose in the ranks to become a member of the New York State Conservative Party's statewide committee, eventually running as a Party nominee for the New York Assembly in 1986. She earned a position working for Conservative Party Executive Director Serphin R. Maltese and followed him to the New York State Senate where she worked on policies ranging from veterans' issues, consumer protection, law enforcement, to constitutional rights.

Shaun Marie remained an active member of the Conservative Party in the decades that followed, serving on statewide campaigns before accepting the role of Executive Director in 1995, a position she held for the next twenty-eight years. A capstone of Shaun Marie's tenured career was serving as the Executive Director for her longtime mentor, New York State Conservative Party Chairman Michael Long. Shaun Marie served as Chairman Long's right hand, confidant, sounding board, advisor, and deeply respected friend. She has held integral concurrent roles with the Conservative Party since, including as the first female State Vice Chair, the Regional Vice Chair, and the Executive Vice Chair. Throughout her decades of service to New York, Shaun Marie has worked closely with nearly every national, state, county, and local elected official and candidate in the conservative movement.

Shaun Marie has dedicated her entire professional life to serving the people of New York with unwavering principles and commitment. She has made significant contributions that have positively impacted the lives of countless individuals across New York State and the nation. Shaun Marie will always remain a beacon of light and a backbone of steel in the conservative movement. During this lifetime of service, Shaun Marie proudly raised her three children as a single mother while balancing the demands of professional and political work for decades. Today, she is a proud mother, dedicated grandmother, hard-working New Yorker, and patriotic American who is deeply respected by all who know her.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, it is my honor to recognize the extraordinary lifetime achievements of my dear friend, Shaun Marie Levine.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HALEY M. STEVENS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on the Legislative Day of June 20, 2023 on H.R. 1606—the Veteran Entrepreneurship Training Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 272.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO COLONEL JASON A. CLARKE ON THE OCCASION OF CHANGE-OF-COMMAND AT FORT IRWIN

HON. JAY OBERNOLTE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colonel Jason Clarke, the outgoing Garrison Commander at Fort Irwin National Training Center in California's 23rd Congressional District. Colonel Clarke has served our country since he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in 1998. He started his military career as a platoon leader in the 95th Military Police Battalion before transitioning to Special Forces. Colonel Clarke has served in many military roles and deployed for operations in Africa, Europe, the Middle East and elsewhere.

During his tenure, Colonel Clarke successfully led Fort Irwin NTC through challenging times following the COVID–19 pandemic. Long-term solutions implemented under his command led to an improvement in quality of life for those stationed at this remote and isolated base. Under his leadership, numerous projects were completed at Fort Irwin such as: renovated community spaces, multiple new vendor services, and an energy resilience project. We are thankful for Colonel Clarke's service in California's 23rd District and across the world. I wish Colonel Clarke, his wife Dejeun, and their 4 daughters continued success as he becomes 2nd Security Force Assistance Brigade Commander at Fort Liberty.

HIGHLIGHTING TERRI STILLSON'S COMMITMENT TO STUDENTS

HON. MIKE GARCIA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a dedicated teacher and community member who consistently goes above and beyond what is normally expected of educators today. Terri Stillson is a reading teacher at Castaic Elementary School whose passion for education and inspiration have encouraged her to take a unique and creative approach to rewarding academic achievement. The result of these efforts is increased motivation for students and teachers alike.

Every Wednesday, Mrs. Stillson mounts the ''Treat Trike'', a decorated tricycle with Castaic Elementary School swag and a cart filled to the brim with toys and prizes. She rides around the school's campus playing cheerful music and going classroom to classroom to reward children for their academic work. But she doesn't just reward the top of each class, she utilizes an online program that captures students' performance to recognize different types of progress and praise students of all different stripes. Mrs. Stillson also motivates teachers to do their best by using stuffed plushies to award the educator in each grade level who passed the most lessons each week, encouraging playful competition among staff.

Now more than ever, children are struggling to remain engaged in their education, as the effects of prolonged lockdowns and Zoom learning continue to be felt. It is heartening to see Mrs. Stillson lead other educators across the nation by example and offer a roadmap for how teachers can make the classroom a fun place to be while also driving students' success. All it takes is a little creativity and whimsy.

Once again, I want to recognize and thank Mrs. Stillson for all the work that she does to make Castaic Elementary School a shining example of educational excellence in our community. Her creativity and hard work are a blessing to her students, and we look forward to all she will accomplish throughout the rest of her career as a teacher.

HONORING MRS. SUSAN SPANNAGEL

HON. DOUG LaMALFA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Susan Spannagel and wish her a happy 100th birthday. Mrs. Spannagel is my Chief of Staff's Grandmother and former constituent of mine. She will celebrate her 100th birthday on June 22nd. Susan Spannagel was born June 22, 1923, in Harvey, Illinois to Annie Inglis Wilson and George Drummond Wilson.

Her parents immigrated from Glasgow to New York in 1923 and left for Harvey, Illinois after two weeks in America. Susan grew up in Harvey, Illinois and attended Whittier school until the completion of the 8th grade when they moved to Pacific Grove, California. She attended Pacific Grove High School and graduated in 1941 at the age of 18. After High School Susan then moved with her parents to South San Francisco where she lived and worked in the Post Office. During this time, a handsome sailor named ''Robert (Bob) Spannagel'' came into the post office to pick up the squadron mail and they became friends.

After dating for a short while, Bob and Susan married in South San Francisco on April 8, 1944. Soon after their marriage, Bob received orders and shipped out to Ford Island at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Bob worked as an ''Aviation Mechanist Mate'' on airplanes for the war and Susan continued to work at the post office in South San Francisco. Bob returned from the service in 1945 and the couple continued to live in South San Francisco. Bob and Susan's first child, David Wilson Spannagel, was born in July 22, 1946.

Soon after in 1950, Susan, Bob and David along with Susan's mother Annie, moved to Concord, California. Bob worked at the Pacific Gas and Electric power station in Pittsburg, California. In 1953 their 2nd child Peggy was born. During her children's school years, Susan was very active and president of the Parent Teacher Association'' (PTA) for many years as well as becoming the secretary for the Clayton Valley Presbyterian Church. In 1964, the family moved the Clayton, California where Susan went to work for Contra Costa County, Farm Bureau, ultimately becoming the Contra Costa County Farm Bureau Secretary.

Bob passed away suddenly in 1976 and Susan continued to work there until her retirement from Farm Bureau in 1995 at the age of 72. Susan moved to Grass Valley, California after retirement and became active with the Elks Lodge, the Sierra Presbyterian Church and other friends, until the age of 85. At age 85, Susan moved down to Lincoln, California to Del Webb's Sun City Lincoln Hills to be closer to her son and daughter. Susan's son David, passed away in 2016 at the age of 69. Susan is doing well and is now living in Rocklin near her family. She has 4 grandsons and 9 great grandchildren. I ask my colleague to join me in honoring her and celebrating Susan Spannagel's 100th birthday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal family matter, I was unable to be in D.C. and vote on June 20, 2023. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 272, and YEA on Roll Call No. 273.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALEXANDER X. MOONEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 272, and YEA on Roll Call No. 273.

RECOGNIZING OFFICER KAREN FROST'S CAREER OF SERVICE

HON. MIKE GARCIA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Detective Karen Frost on the occasion of her retirement from a distinguished career with the Los Angeles Police Department. For nearly 30 years, Officer Frost served as an exemplary police officer, earning numerous accolades and distinctions while working with her colleagues to keep the citizens of Los Angeles safe.

Detective Frost began her career with the Los Angeles Police Department in 1994 as a recruit. In the police academy, she distinguished herself from her contemporaries with her professionalism and passion for public service. After graduating the academy, she began serving the San Fernando Valley and ascending the ranks of the LAPD, eventually reaching the rank of sergeant before becoming a detective. During this time, she worked everything from patrol officer to a DARE Instructor to an Academy instructor. Regardless of her position or role at any given time, Detective Frost exemplified the qualities of hard work, sense of duty, and public service.

Throughout her career, Detective Frost consistently went beyond the traditional call of duty in service of her community. One example is when she was new to the force in 1996, when she heroically rescued a woman who had attempted suicide by leaping into the Los Angeles River from a bridge. Detective Frost and her partner, at great personal risk to themselves, made their way down to the embankment of the river and jumped in to pull the woman to safety. For this action, she was awarded the LAPD Police Star, the first of many commendations and recognitions over her distinguished career.

Once again, I want to extend my sincerest congratulations and well wishes to Detective Frost on her retirement. I am sure she is looking forward to the opportunity to spend more time with her loving family after a career of protecting the people of Los Angeles. I thank Detective Frost for all of her hard work and sacrifice.

HONORING LANCE CORPORAL JOHN J. HURON

HON. DIANA HARSHBARGER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent Lance Corporal John J. Huron of Bristol, Tennessee for his dedicated service in the United States Marine Corps.

LCPL Huron enlisted in September of 1968, and attended Advanced Infantry Training in Camp Pendleton following his graduation from Marine Boot Camp. After a brief leave, LCPL Huron then attended and graduated from Sea School in San Diego, CA, where he received training on the day-to-day operations of naval ships. After completing his sea training, LCPL Huron was assigned to the USS *Long Beach,* at that time docked in its home port of Long Beach, California. LCPL Huron's Marine shipboard duties included providing security for the ship's two missile houses and brig and acting as an orderly for the ship's Captain and Executive Officer.

In July of 1969, following his marriage that has lasted to this day, the USS *Long Beach* was deployed to Southeast Asia with its supply port at Subic Bay in the Philippines. Over the course of the next 9 months, the USS *Long Beach* and its 1,200 officers, men and Marines rotated on and off their duty station in the Gulf of Tonkin, Vietnam, contributing significantly to the air control of Southeast Asia.

After nearly a year, LCPL Huron returned to the USS *Long Beach's* home port and proceeded north to Mare Island. In August 1971, his Sea Duty came to an end and LCPL Huron was reassigned to Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego once more, where he concluded his service escorting prisoners as a Brig Chaser. Please stand with me to celebrate and recognize LCPL Huron's distinguished and heroic military service to our great Nation.

RECOGNIZING ARITON HIGH SCHOOL AS THE 2023 2A STATE BASEBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. BARRY MOORE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Ariton High School as the 2023 Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA) Class 2A Baseball Series Champions. It is my honor to congratulate all the players and coaches on an outstanding season.

The Ariton High School Purple Cats won the second and final game 5–4 against Vincent High School during the state championship, bringing its first state baseball championship to the community. The Purple Cats ended their season 31–12–1.

Verse 1 Peter 4:10 says, ''And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men.'' Coach Bob Pickett and the men of the Ariton High School Purple Cats have embodied what it means to work heartily and confidently to achieve this goal.

In addition to this outstanding achievement, Bob Pickett was named 2A State Coach of the Year, and Caden Collier, a junior shortstop/second baseman, was named 2A State Hitter of the Year.

The Second Congressional District of Alabama is blessed to have men with their dedication and determination. I extend my congratulations to them for achieving this accomplishment.

RECOGNIZING PRIME MINISTER MODI'S TRIP TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. A. DREW FERGUSON IV

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Narendra Modi, on his upcoming visit to Washington, D.C. The relationship between the United States and India is a strategic and global partnership that's guided by shared interests and strong political will on both sides. It is built on mutual respect for democracy, freedom, and the rule of law. This partnership is crucial for fostering peace, prosperity, and stability around the globe—especially in the Indo-Pacific region. In 2022, India celebrated 75 years of independence and marked the anniversary of the United States—India diplomatic relations.

Our partnership has made significant progress in the last few years and India continues to be a strategic trading partner of the United States. As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee which has jurisdiction over trade policy, I look forward to continuing to work on growing this important global partnership. I thank Prime Minister Modi for

hsis continued leadership, and I hope he has a prodctive visit.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR JAN PEPPER ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jan Pepper, CEO of Peninsula Clean Energy, for her groundbreaking work to bring 100 percent renewable energy to San Mateo County. Jan is retiring after more than 30 years of energy and utility experience dedicated to making clean energy accessible to all. Since 2016, she has led Peninsula Clean Energy, a Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) program made up of San Mateo County and all twenty of its component jurisdictions, serving more than 300,000 people.

As CEO of Peninsula Clean Energy, Ms. Pepper negotiated for 300 MW of new solar projects in the Central Valley of California. In 2021, Peninsula Clean Energy started providing 100 percent emission free power to all its customers, and Jan Pepper's vision has prepared the organization to provide 100 percent renewable energy 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, as early as 2025.

Ms. Pepper is a registered professional engineer with a B.S. and M.B.A. from Stanford University. Prior to her leadership of Peninsula Clean Energy, she worked at Silicon Valley Power, APX, and Clean Power Markets. At APX, she and her team implemented the first use of renewable energy credits which are the basis of our Nation's clean energy metrics today. With Clean Power Markets, Jan developed the Solar Renewable Energy Credit (SREC) program for the State of New Jersey. She is recognized as a national leader in renewable energy, winning the Green Power Leader of the Year Award from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Center for Resource Solutions in 2017.

Ms. Pepper served on the Los Altos City Council from 2012 through 2020, and as Mayor in 2015 and 2020. She believes transparency, integrity and consensus building are essential for good governance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the career of an extraordinary woman, Jan Pepper. Our Nation has been bettered because of her superb work.

HONORING CAPTAIN CHRIS PARSONS

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a Saint Paul firefighter who was taken from us much too soon. Captain Christopher Parsons was just 48 years old when he sustained a major medical event shortly after completing his shift and passed away late last week. His untimely passing is a deep and profound loss for his loved ones, fellow firefighters, and our entire City.

Chris was born in Keokuk, Iowa, and grew up in Minneapolis in the Marcy-Holmes neighborhood near a fire station in a two-bedroom apartment, sharing a bedroom with his brother. He attended Minneapolis South and Columbia Heights high schools and was recruited to play football at the University of Wisconsin-River Falls. Chris graduated with a degree in Psychology.

A firefighter for over 20 years, Chris started his career as a Saint Paul firefighter in 2000 and was promoted to captain in 2007, serving our community at Station 22 at Front Ave. and Marion Street in Saint Paul's North End. In addition to fighting fires, Chris served in leadership roles for IAFF Local 21, the Minnesota Professional Fire Fighters, the Minnesota Fire Service Foundation, and Firefighters United Association of Saint Paul, which represents the city's Black firefighters.

Chris was well known at the Minnesota State Capitol, where he was a tireless champion for the safety and wellness of all firefighters. He worked to advance legislation banning cancer-causing chemical flame retardants, to secure financial relief for firefighters injured in their work, for measures to protect first-responders from PTSD and COVID and sought to raise awareness of the dangers faced by firefighters.

Chris had an impact on so many, myself included. Captain Parsons was a guide for me as I learned more about firefighting and the needs of the Saint Paul Fire Department. I was so fortunate to call him a friend.

He fought to save lives during his time on earth and continues to do so even now through the gift of organ donation.

Chris will be greatly missed by the IAFF Local 21 members, the Saint Paul Fire Department, the Minnesota Fire Service, and his friends and family. Flags at the state Capitol will be flown at half-staff to honor Chris until sunset on Wednesday, June 21. His funeral is scheduled for Wednesday on Nicollet Island in Saint Paul.

Minnesota has lost a stalwart firefighter, a tireless public safety advocate, and dedicated family man. I extend my deepest condolences to Captain Parsons' family and my gratitude for all those who put their lives on the line day after day to keep our community safe.

COMMEMORATING THE INCREDIBLE SERVICE OF DHRUV SURYADEVARA

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give special recognition to Dhruv Suryadevara of Ellington, Connecticut on his receiving The Congressional Award Gold Medal. This is a truly remarkable, once-in-a-lifetime achievement, and one that he worked incredibly hard for.

Those who receive Congressional Award Gold Medals have undertaken a rigorous course of community service and self-improvement. This involves four components: 400 hours of Voluntary Public Service, 200 hours of Personal Development, 200 hours of Physical Fitness, and a five-day, four-night Expedition/Exploration. By completing this process, participants learn new skills which they will utilize to make the world a better place. I would like to outline Dhruv's activities to show my colleagues the remarkable kind of young man he is.

For his public service, Dhruv worked with the New Hartford Voluntary Ambulance, where he took vitals, managed medical equipment, and documented calls. He exhibited personal development by enrolling in Northwestern University's Center for Talent Development's Psychology course, which he passed with flying colors, as well as obtaining his EMT certification.

Dhruv's physical fitness was demonstrated through his membership of the Founders League's JV baseball team, as well as being wide receiver and cornerback on the Kingswood Oxford varsity football team. Lastly, he backpacked through Olympic National Park in Washington state for his expedition, inspired by his family's tradition of visiting different national parks across the Nation.

Clearly, Dhruv has shown himself to be exceptional, as well as fully deserving of The Congressional Award Gold Medal. I urge my colleagues to pay tribute to his accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 277.

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 22, 2023 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 23

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2024.

SR–222

JULY 12

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SR–428A

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2151–S2195

Measures Introduced: Forty-two bills and seven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 5, 2062–2102, S.J. Res. 35, and S. Res. 259–264.

Pages S2184–86

Measures Passed:

Commending and Congratulating the Vegas Golden Knights: Senate agreed to S. Res. 261, commending and congratulating the Vegas Golden Knights on winning the 2023 Stanley Cup Final.

Page S2190

Authorizing the Printing of Committee Rules: Senate agreed to S. Res. 262, authorizing the printing of a collection of the rules of the committees of the Senate. **Page S2190**

Juneteenth National Independence Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 263, commemorating June 19, 2023, as ''Juneteenth National Independence Day'' in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which news of the end of slavery reached the slaves in the Southwestern States. **Pages S2190–91**

National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month and Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 264, designating June 2023 as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month'' and June 27, 2023, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day''.

Page S2191

Veto Messages:

Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards: By 50 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 167), two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, not having voted in the affirmative, S.J. Res. 11, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards'', upon reconsideration failed of passage, and the veto of the President was sustained. **Pages S2151–56**

Escort Committee—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, into the House Chamber for the joint meeting at 4:00 p.m., on Thursday, June 22, 2023. **Page S2192**

Chile Tax Convention Treaty—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of Treaty Doc. 112–8, 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, after taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S2157, S2157–68**

Pending:

Schumer Amendment No. 136, to add an effective date. **Page S2158**

During consideration of this treaty today, Senate also took the following action:

By 97 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. EX. 170), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the treaty.

Pages S2157–58

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, June 22, 2023, notwithstanding Rule XXII, Senate begin consideration of H.J. Res. 44, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives relating to ''Factoring Criteria for Firearms with Attached 'Stabilizing Braces' ''; that at 11:45 a.m., Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution; that following disposition of S.J. Res. 44, Senate continue consideration of TD 112–8, post-cloture, and that at 1:45 p.m., Schumer Amendment No.

136 (listed above) be withdrawn, and all time be considered expired. Page S2192

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. EX. 169), Natasha C. Merle, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 50 nays, Vice President voting yea (Vote No. EX. 168), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Pages S2156–57, S2157

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Space Force. Pages S2168–70

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Jeffrey Prescott, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Representative to the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture, with the rank of Ambassador.

Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2028.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army, Foreign Service, and Marine Corps. Page S2193

Messages from the House: Page S2184

Measures Referred: Page S2183

Measures Placed on the Calendar: Page S2184

Executive Communications: Page S2184

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S2184

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S2186–88

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S2188–92

Additional Statements: Pages S2182–83

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S2192

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—170) Pages S2156–58

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:57 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 22, 2023. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2192.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2024.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2024.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2024.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2024.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2024.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported S.822, to terminate the Department of Defense memorandum relating to access to abortions, to prohibit the use of travel and transportation allowances, medical convalescent leave, and administrative absences to travel to obtain abortions, with an amendment.

Also, Committee began consideration of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2024.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

S. 1271, to impose sanctions with respect to trafficking of illicit fentanyl and its precursors by transnational criminal organizations, including cartels, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

An original bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase bank executive accountability and to improve financial stability.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Philip Nathan Jefferson, of North Carolina, to be Vice Chairman, and Lisa DeNell Cook, of Michigan, and Adriana Debora Kugler, of Maryland, who was introduced by Senator Menendez, both to be a Member, all of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

FOSSIL FUEL THREATS TO CLIMATE

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine fossil fuel threats to climate and the Federal budget, after receiving testimony from Naomi Oreskes, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Christine Arena, Generous Films, San Francisco, California; Richard W. Painter, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Roger Pielke Jr., University of Colorado, Boulder; and Scott Walter, Capital Research Center, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Joel Matthew Szabat, of Maryland, Anthony Rosario Coscia, of New Jersey, and Christopher Koos, of Illinois, each to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, and Alvin Brown, of Florida, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, who was introduced by Senator Scott (FL), after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NATIONAL PARKS LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 284, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to include on the engravings on the Taras Shevchenko Memorial in the District of Columbia the name of Vincent Illuzzi, Sr., who carved the statue, S. 351, to designate 6 creeks in the State of North Carolina in honor of the lives lost in a plane crash in Carteret County, North Carolina, on February 13, 2022, S. 384, to establish the Springfield 1908 Race Riot National Monument in the State of Illinois, S. 432, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Nulhegan River and Paul Stream in the State of Vermont for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system, S. 507, to establish the Ralph David Abernathy, Sr., National Historic Site, S. 527, to establish the African Burial Ground International Memorial Museum and Educational Center in New York, New York, S. 562, to establish the Emmett Till and Mamie Till-Mobley and Roberts Temple National Historic Site in the State of Illinois, S. 594, to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to prioritize the completion of the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, S. 608, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the Deerfield River for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system, S. 886, 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, S. 924, to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, S. 961, to redesignate the Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Salem, Massachusetts, as the "Salem Maritime National Historic Park", S. 1059, to adjust the boundary of Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, S. 1097, to establish the Cesar E. Chavez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park in the States of California and Arizona, S. 1277, to modify the boundary of the Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and S. 2018, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an assessment to identify locations in National Parks in which there is the greatest need for broadband internet access service and areas in National Parks in which there is the greatest need for cellular service, after receiving testimony from Michael A. Caldwell, Associate Director, Park Planning, Facilities, and Lands, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorization of the Economic Development Administration, focusing on state and local perspectives, after receiving testimony from Patricia A. Cannon, Delaware Department of State Division of Small Business Director of Special Projects and Grantee Administrator Foreign Trade Zone No. 99, Dover; Michael R. Graney, West Virginia Department of Economic Development Executive Director, Charleston; Eileen Higgins, Miami-Dade County Commissioner, Miami, Florida, on behalf of the National Association of Counties; Chris Fetzer, Northern Arizona Council of Governments, Flagstaff; and Bryan Day, Little Rock Port Authority, Little Rock, Arkansas.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Kara C. McDonald, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lithuania, Jack A. Markell, of Delaware, to be Ambassador to the Italian Republic, and to serve

concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of San Marino, who was introduced by Senator Carper, Dorothy Camille Shea, of North Carolina, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador and the Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, Vernelle Trim FitzPatrick, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic, and Lisa Peterson, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Burundi, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 728, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex;

S. 1664, to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; and

S. 567, to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

CIVIL RIGHTS OF LGBTQ+ AMERICANS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine defending the civil rights of LGBTQ+ Americans, after receiving testimony from Kelley Robinson, Human Rights Campaign, Washington, D.C.; Matt Sharp, Alliance Defending Freedom, Atlanta, Georgia; Riley Gaines, Independent Women's Voice, Gallatin, Tennessee; Ximena Lopez, Dallas, Texas; and Harleigh Walker, Auburn, Alabama.

OFFICE OF INTEGRATED VETERAN CARE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the effectiveness of the Office of Integrated Veteran Care, after receiving testimony from Shereef Elnahal, Under Secretary for Health, Miguel H. LaPuz, Assistant Under Secretary for Health for Integrated Veteran Care, and Hillary P. Peabody, Deputy Assistant Under Secretary for Health for Integrated Veteran Care, all of the Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

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: 42 public bills, H.R. 15, 4230–4270; and 9 resolutions, H.J. Res. 76–77; H. Con. Res. 53; and H. Res. 530–535, were introduced. **Pages H3069–71**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3073–74**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4004, to approve and implement the Agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States regarding Trade between the United States of America and Taiwan, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–116); and

H. Res. 529, relating to the resolution (H. Res. 503) impeaching Joseph R. Biden, Jr., President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors (H. Rept. 118–117). **Page H3069**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Collins to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2995**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:52 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H3001**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:06 p.m. and reconvened at 1:15 p.m. **Page H3011**

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"—Presidential Veto: The House voted to sustain the President's veto 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", by a yea-and-nay vote of 221 yeas

to 206 nays, Roll No. 277, (two-thirds of those present not voting to override). **Pages H3036–44**

Subsequently, the veto message (H. Doc. 118–46) and the joint resolution were referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce. **Page H3044**

Custom Health Option and Individual Care Expense Arrangement Act: The House passed H.R. 3799, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for health reimbursement arrangements integrated with individual health insurance coverage, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 209 nays, Roll No. 282. **Pages H3003–11, H3011–12, H3022–36, H3044–48**

Rejected the Doggett motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means, by a yea-and-nay vote of 209 yeas to 220 nays, Roll No. 281. **Pages H3046–47**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118–9, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill. **Pages H3030–32**

Agreed to:

Molinaro amendment (No. 2 printed in part D of H. Rept. 118–115) that ensures that the Secretary notifies employers of the availability of tax-advantaged flexible health insurance benefits, with an official focus on small businesses, particularly in rural areas (by a recorded vote of 281 ayes to 151 noes, Roll No. 279); and **Pages H3033–34, H3045**

Roy amendment (No. 3 printed in part D of H. Rept. 118–115) that expresses the sense of Congress that healthcare freedom is the future of healthcare (by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 206 noes, Roll No. 280). **Pages H3034–36, H3045–46**

Rejected:

Hayes amendment (No. 1 printed in part D of H. Rept. 118–115) that sought to delay implementation of bill until Secretary of Labor certifies that legislation would not result in higher premium rates for older workers (by a recorded vote of 211 ayes to 220 noes, Roll No. 278). **Pages H3032–33, H3044–45**

H. Res. 524, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3564) and (H.R. 3799) and the resolution (H. Res. 461) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 215 ayes to 211 noes, Roll No. 275, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 215 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 274. **Pages H3003–11, H3011–12**

Censuring Adam Schiff, Representative of the 30th Congressional District of California: The House agreed to H. Res. 521, censuring Adam Schiff, Representative of the 30th Congressional District of California, by a yea-and-nay vote of 213 yeas to 209 nays with six answering ''present'', Roll No. 283. Earlier, the House failed to agree to the Clark (MA) motion to table the resolution by a recorded vote of 208 yeas to 218 nays, Roll No. 276. Subsequently, the House has resolved: that Representative Schiff be censured; that Representative Schiff forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; that Representative Schiff be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker; and that the Committee on Ethics shall conduct an investigation into Representative Adam Schiff's falsehoods, misrepresentations, and abuses of sensitive information. **Pages H3013–21, H3048**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, June 22nd. **Page H3048**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Employer Reporting Improvement Act: H.R. 3801, amended, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to streamline and improve the employer reporting process relating to health insurance coverage and to protect dependent privacy; **Pages H3048–50**

Paperwork Burden Reduction Act: H.R. 3797, amended, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an alternative manner of furnishing certain health insurance coverage statements to individuals; and **Pages H3050–51**

United States-Taiwan Initiative on 21st-Century Trade First Agreement Implementation Act: H.R. 4004, amended, to approve and implement the Agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States regarding Trade between the United States of America and Taiwan. **Pages H3051–54**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3011–12, H3012–13, H3013–14, H3043–44, H3044–45, H3045, H3046, H3046–47, H3047, and H3048.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:58 p.m.

Committee Meetings

CLOSING THE DIGITAL DIVIDE IN RURAL AMERICA

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Closing the Digital Divide in Rural America''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on the Homeland Security FY 2024 Appropriations Bill; and the Legislative Branch FY 2024 Appropriations Bill. The Homeland Security FY 2024 Appropriations Bill and the Legislative Branch FY 2024 Appropriations Bill were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 2670, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024''; and H.R. 1282, the ''Major Richard Star Act''.

COMPETITION AND TRANSPARENCY: THE PATHWAY FORWARD FOR A STRONGER HEALTH CARE MARKET

Committee on Education and Workforce: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled ''Competition and Transparency: The Pathway Forward for a Stronger Health Care Market''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RESPONDING TO AMERICA'S OVERDOSE CRISIS: AN EXAMINATION OF LEGISLATION TO BUILD UPON THE SUPPORT ACT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Responding to America's Overdose Crisis: An Examination of Legislation to Build Upon the SUPPORT Act''. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Health and Human Services officials: Christopher Jones, Director, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Tom Coderre, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; Diana Espinosa, Principal Deputy Administrator, Health Resources and Services Administration; and Jonathan Blum, Principal Deputy Administrator and Chief Operating Officer, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission''. Testimony was heard from the following Federal Communications Commission officials: Jessica Rosenworcel, Chairwoman; Brendan Carr, Commissioner; Geoffrey Starks, Commissioner; and Nathan Simington, Commissioner.

MICROVAST AND MORE: OVERSIGHT OF PRESIDENT BIDEN'S ENERGY SPENDING SPREE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Microvast and More: Oversight of President Biden's Energy Spending Spree''. Testimony was heard from David Howell, Principle Deputy Director, Office of Manufacturing and Energy Supply Chains, Department of Energy.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE'S SEMI-ANNUAL MONETARY POLICY REPORT

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Federal Reserve's Semi-Annual Monetary Policy Report''. Testimony was heard from Jerome H. Powell, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

HUD OVERSIGHT: TESTIMONY OF THE HUD INSPECTOR GENERAL

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance held a hearing entitled ''HUD Oversight: Testimony of the HUD Inspector General''. Testimony was heard from Rae Oliver Davis, Inspector General, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H. Res. 488, calling on the Biden administration to immediately provide Army Tactical Missile Systems to Ukraine; H.R. 3033, to repeal the sunset provision of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, and for other purposes; H. Res. 492, condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of the Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights; H.R. 4039, to prohibit the use of funds supporting any activities within Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China; H.R. 4132, to provide for the imposition of sanctions with respect to forced organ harvesting within the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1150, to establish the John Lewis

Civil Rights Fellowship to fund international internships and research placements for early- to mid-career professionals to study nonviolent movements to establish and protect civil rights around the world. H.R. 3033, H. Res. 492, H.R. 1150, H. Res. 488 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 4039 and H.R. 4132 were ordered reported, as amended.

COUNTERING THREATS POSED BY NATION-STATE ACTORS IN LATIN AMERICA TO U.S. HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism, Law Enforcement, and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''Countering Threats Posed by Nation-State Actors in Latin America to U.S. Homeland Security''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HEARING ON THE REPORT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL JOHN DURHAM

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Hearing on the Report of Special Counsel John Durham''. Testimony was heard from John Durham, Special Counsel, Department of Justice.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 615, the ''Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act of 2023''; H.R. 1380, the ''Protecting America's Rock Climbing Act''; H.R. 1726, the ''Continued Rapid Ohia Death Response Act of 2023''; H.R. 2872, to amend the Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2013 to allow States to issue electronic stamps under such Act, and for other purposes; H.R. 3324, to extend the authority to collect Shasta-Trinity Marina fees through fiscal year 2029; and H.R. 3397, to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw a rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to conservation and landscape health. H.R. 615, H.R. 1380, H.R. 1726, H.R. 2872, and H.R. 3397 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 3324 was ordered reported, without amendment.

CHURCHES VS. CASINOS: THE CONSTITUTION IS NOT SUSPENDED IN TIMES OF CRISIS

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic held a hearing entitled ''Churches vs. Casinos: The Constitution is Not Suspended in Times of Crisis''. Testimony was heard from Andrew Bailey, Attorney General, Missouri; Elizabeth Murrill, Solicitor General, Louisiana; and public witnesses.

CLEARING THE AIR: EXAMINING THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY'S PROPOSED EMISSIONS STANDARDS

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Energy Policy, and Regulatory Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Clearing the Air: Examining the Environmental Protection Agency's Proposed Emissions Standards''. Testimony was heard from Joseph Goffman, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency.

PLEASE LEAVE YOUR MESSAGE AT THE TONE: ADDRESSING POST-PANDEMIC BACKLOGS AND DELAYS AT FEDERAL AGENCIES

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Subcommittee on Government Operations and the Federal Workforce held a hearing entitled ''Please Leave Your Message at the Tone: Addressing Post-Pandemic Backlogs and Delays at Federal Agencies''. Testimony was heard from Rena Bitter, Assistant Secretary of State for Consular Affairs, Department of State; Scott Levin, Director, National Personnel Records Center, U.S. National Archives and Records Administration; and Chad M. Poist, Deputy Commissioner for Budget, Finance, and Management, U.S. Social Security Administration.

LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE RESOLUTION JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on legislation Relating to the resolution (H. Res. 503) impeaching Joseph R. Biden, Jr., President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors. The Committee granted, by a record vote of 9–3, a rule that hereby re-refers House Resolution 503 to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 369, the ''NIST Wildland Fire Communications and Information Dissemination Act''; H.R. 4090, the ''Fire Grants and Safety Act of 2023''; and H.R. 4143, the ''National Construction Safety Team Act of 2023''.

REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES REPORT 'THE COAST GUARD'S NEXT DECADE: AN ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING CHALLENGES AND STATUTORY NEEDS'

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled ''Review of the National Academy of Sciences Report 'The Coast Guard's Next Decade: An Assessment of Emerging Challenges and Statutory Needs' ''. Testimony was heard from Admiral Steve Poulin, Vice Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard; Heather MacLeod, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on H.R. 3520, the ''Veterans Care Improvement Act of 2023''; H.R. 1182, the ''Veterans Serving Veterans Act of 2023''; H.R. 1774, the ''VA Emergency Transportation Act''; H.R. 2683, the ''VA Flood Preparedness Act''; H.R. 2768, the ''PFC Joseph P. Dwyer Peer Support Program Act''; H.R. 2818, the ''Autonomy for Disabled Veterans Act''; H.R. 3581, the ''Caregiver Outreach and Program Enhancement Act''; H.R. 1278, the ''DRIVE Act''; H.R. 1639, the ''VA Zero Suicide Demonstration Project Act of 2023''; and H.R. 1815, the ''Expanding Veterans' Options for Long Term Care Act''. Testimony was heard from Representative González-Colón; the following Department of Veterans Affairs officials: Colleen Richardson, Executive Director, Caregiver Support Program; Scotte Hartronft, M.D., Executive Director, VA Office of Geriatrics and Extended Care, Veterans Health Administration; Mark Hausman, M.D., Executive Director, Integrated Access, Office of Integrated Veteran Care, Veterans Health Administration; and Erica Scavella, M.D., Assistant Under Secretary for Health for Clinical Services, Veterans Health Administration; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2023

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to consider 302(b) Subcommittee allocations, an original bill entitled, ''Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2024'', and an original bill entitled, ''Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2024'', 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Armed Services: closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2024, 9:30 a.m., SR–222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Fara Damelin, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, and Brendan Carr, of Virginia, Anna M. Gomez, of Virginia, and, Geoffrey Adam Starks, of Kansas, each to be a Member, all of the Federal Communications Commission, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine cattle supply chains and deforestation of the Amazon, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine United States and global commitments to combatting human trafficking, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, markup on the Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government FY 2024 Appropriations Bill, 8:30 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on the Defense FY 2024 Appropriations Bill; and the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies FY 2024 Appropriations Bill, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Reigniting American Growth and Prosperity Series: Incentivizing Economic Excellence Through Tax Policy'', 12 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Competencies Over Degrees: Transitioning to a Skills-Based Economy'', 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials, hearing entitled ''Driving Affordability: Preserving People's Freedom to Buy Affordable Vehicles and Fuel'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''MACRA Checkup: Assessing Implementation and Challenges that Remain for Patients and Doctors?'', 10:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the SEC'', 9 a.m., 2220 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Capital Markets, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the SEC's Division of Trading and Markets'', 10:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, hearing entitled ''Examining the Fiscal Year 2024 State and Foreign Operations Budget Request for Africa'', 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Subcommittee on Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled "Responding to Anti-Semitism and Anti-Israel Bias in the UN, Palestinian Authority, and NGO Community", 11 a.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe, hearing entitled "The Vilnius Summit and War in Ukraine: Assessing U.S. Policy towards Europe and NATO", 1 p.m., HVC–210.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection, hearing entitled "Growing the National Cybersecurity Talent Pipeline", 10 a.m., 310 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Transportation and Maritime Security, hearing entitled "An Examination of TSA's FY 2024 Budget and Priorities", 2 p.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Responsiveness and Accountability to Oversight, hearing entitled "Hearing on Compliance with Committee Oversight", 2 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Crime and Federal Government Surveillance, hearing entitled "Examination of Clemency at the Department of Justice", 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Examining the Council on Environmental Quality Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Request and Related Policy Matters", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing on H.R. 2997, the "Clifton Opportunities Now for Vibrant Economic Yields Act"; H.R. 3025, to provide for no net increase in the total acreage of Federal land in the Virgin Islands National Park on St. John, United States Virgin Islands; H.R. 3049, the "Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration Exchange Act of 2023"; H.R. 3250, the "National Museum of Play Recognition Act"; and H.R. 4141, to provide that certain communications projects are not subject to requirements to prepare certain environmental or historical preservation reviews, and for other purposes, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Accountability, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation, hearing entitled "Using Cutting-Edge Technologies to Keep America Safe", 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, continue markup on H.R. 369, the "NIST Wildland Fire Communications and Information Dissemination Act"; H.R. 4090, the "Fire Grants and Safety Act of 2023"; and H.R. 4143, the "National Construction Safety Team Act of 2023", 9:40 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled "Artificial Intelligence: Advancing Innovation Towards the National Interest", 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Reviewing the SBA's Office of Advocacy Report on the Regulatory Flexibility Act", 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing entitled "Review of Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Request: Agency Perspectives (Part I)", 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Member Day: Testimony and Proposals on the Department of Veterans Affairs", 10 a.m., 360 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, business meeting on Documents Protected under Internal Revenue Code Section 6103, 8 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

10 a.m., Thursday, June 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will begin consideration of H.J. Res. 44, Factoring Criteria for Firearms with Attached 'Stabilizing Braces', and vote on passage of the joint resolution at 11:45 a.m.

Following disposition of H.J. Res. 44, Senate will continue consideration of TD 112–8, Chile Tax Convention Treaty, post-cloture, and vote on adoption of the resolution of ratification at 1:45 p.m.

(At 3:20 p.m., Senators should gather in the Senate Chamber to proceed as a body to the House Chamber for a Joint Meeting of Congress to receive a message from His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India.)

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Thursday, June 22

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Joint Meeting to receive His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India. Consideration of H. Res. 461—Condemning the use of elementary and secondary school facilities to provide shelter for aliens who are not admitted to the United States.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Courtney, Joe, Conn., E595
Crockett, Jasmine, Tex., E592
Escobar, Veronica, Tex., E591, E592
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E595
Ferguson, A. Drew, IV, Ga., E594
Garcia, Mike, Calif., E591, E593, E594
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E591
Harshbarger, Diana, Tenn., E594
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E592
Kuster, Ann M., N.H., E592
LaMalfa, Doug, Calif., E593
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E595
Mooney, Alexander X., W.Va., E594
Moore, Barry, Ala., E594
Moskowitz, Jared, Fla., E591
Obernolte, Jay, Calif., E593
Posey, Bill, Fla., E592
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E595
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E593
Stevens, Haley M., Mich., E593
Williams, Roger, Tex., E594

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are 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.