



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2023

No. 184

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
November 7, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DALE W. STRONG to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,  
*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.

### AMERICA REMAINS UNITED AND THE BEACON OF LIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY AROUND THE WORLD

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, we are at a seminal moment in world history, comparable to times in the 20th century, like the Depression, World War II, and the 1960s.

The world is on fire with conflict. Democratic countries like Israel, Ukraine, and Armenia are under attack from terrorists and other authoritarian

regimes that want to reshape the world order and take away basic freedoms and human rights.

These authoritarian regimes and these attacks from terrorists are anti-Semitic, they involve hate crimes that are sadly on the rise for other ethnic groups, as well.

Terrorist groups like Hamas and bad actors like President Putin of Russia and Xi of China are spreading misinformation to create discord. We see the impacts of that propaganda here at home.

Our actions today, therefore, will determine the future success of free societies throughout the world, and that is why it is important for us to stand firm in our support of democracies around the world.

We must stand against the attempts to undermine Israel's very existence. It is disturbing to see the chants of "from the river to the sea." This is a phrase used by Hamas—a rallying cry of terrorists calling for the destruction of the Jewish state. It is anti-Semitic, and it is hateful.

Israel has the right to defend itself. It has an obligation to protect its citizens and secure its borders.

Let us not forget the families, the children, and the elderly who were slaughtered in their homes a month ago by the terrorists who carried out a planned, coordinated attack on innocent Israeli civilians on October 7.

We should also hold sorrow for the Palestinian people. Many of those who live in Gaza are equally victims of Hamas and their barbaric actions against humanity in using these Palestinians as human shields.

Hamas, therefore, is responsible for this terror and their suffering. Congress must help the Palestinian people out of this horrific situation, starting with humanitarian aid. The Palestinians have a right to determine their own future.

Congress also must send military and economic resources to Israel. It must

work to expand and strengthen the Abraham Accords, which are critical. We cannot allow Iran and its proxy terrorist groups like Hamas and Hezbollah to disrupt the accomplishments of this diplomacy.

Let's understand what is at stake here. Iran wants to have hegemony over the entire Middle East, and we must be mindful of that with their alliances with Russia and China.

Congress must also send additional aid to Ukraine. These Ukrainians, these brave people, are defending their sovereignty. We must give them everything they need to win their fight for freedom and defeat Putin, who I believe is a war criminal by the actions he has carried out in the last 18 to 19 months. Russia today, really, is a syndicate masquerading as a country, and its mob boss is Putin.

For some of my Republican colleagues who are having second thoughts on funding additional support for Ukraine, I remind you of President Reagan and Senator John McCain who always recognized the threats of Russia's Communism to our democracy. I believe in Putin's heart he is still a Communist.

It is important that we have this bipartisan package to support the President's proposal and the supplemental package that will provide funding for the next year for Ukraine, Israel, Taiwan, additional border security and humanitarian assistance. This could benefit Armenia and the over 120,000 Armenians who have been displaced from their historic homeland as a result of Azerbaijan.

These are all critical issues in the foreign affairs of America and the world security if we are to remain the beacon of light around the world.

These are critical times, to be sure, therefore, America must be together with our allies in Europe. We cannot lose sight of what is at stake if we do not stop these threats against freedom,

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

whether it is in the Middle East, whether it is in Asia, or elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, this is the test of our time. It is the test of our generation, and historians will look back 10 to 20 years from now and they will determine: Did we make more good decisions than poor decisions in standing up for human rights and the freedoms we cherish?

I pray that we make more good decisions than poor decisions and that America remain united and the beacon of light for democracy around the world.

#### DELTA 8

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to address the growing threat of Delta 8 across communities in Nebraska.

For anyone who may not be following this issue yet, Delta 8 is a variant of THC and is derived from cannabis. Today, retailers across Nebraska are selling THC-laced products aimed at kids. For example, a retailer in Madison County has allegedly been selling gummies containing 200 times the level of THC needed to send a kid to the hospital. Delta 8 products are made to look like common types of candy or snacks to appeal to children.

I am glad Nebraska is cracking down on Delta 8, which are illegal even in States that have legalized recreational marijuana. Attorney General Mike Hilgers has filed complaints in 10 counties across Nebraska as he works to confront this challenge.

I commend him and others across the country who are taking action to stop the threat of Delta 8 that is hurting our children.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone watching to visit AGO.Nebraska.gov to learn more.

#### SALUTING NEBRASKA STATE TREASURER TOM BRIESE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the service of newly-appointed Nebraska State Treasurer Tom Briese.

For almost 7 years, Tom honorably served the people of District 41 in the unicameral. I sat next to him on our State's revenue committee. During those years, he fought hard to reform the State's high property taxes and school funding formula.

Over the course of time in the legislature, he worked with both Governor Ricketts and Governor Pillen to deliver historic tax relief.

Earlier this year, Governor Pillen announced that he would appoint Senator Briese to fill a vacancy in the role of State treasurer.

Tom brings with him a wealth of experience in working with the legislature and State senators to shape public policy. He leads an office that manages the State's college savings plan and unclaimed property programs while watching over the State's resources.

I know Tom will do an outstanding job in his new role and I wish him all the best as he takes on this new challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the treasurer best wishes in the years ahead.

#### CONGRATULATING HAMPTON ENTERPRISES ON 75 YEARS OF BUSINESS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Hampton Enterprises on 75 years of business. The late Joe Hampton opened the real estate and construction company in Lincoln, Nebraska, in 1948 when he was just 22 years old.

Throughout the past 75 years, Hampton has constructed everything from houses to offices to the Pinnacle Bank Arena. Hampton has an impressive and extensive list of arenas, schools, and offices, and with all of these buildings comes numerous tenants and customers.

One tenant has been renting office space from Hampton for nearly 40 years. He says they offer a complete spectrum of services. Hampton prides themselves on maintaining their core values of integrity, quality, work ethic, relationships, and stewardship, which is likely why they have found so much success.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Nebraska's First Congressional District, I congratulate Hampton Enterprises on 75 years.

#### BIDEN-XI MEETING

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the upcoming meeting between President Joe Biden and China's President Xi Jinping.

President Biden and President Xi are expected to meet later this month during the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Summit. Leading Biden Cabinet members have been meeting with high-level officials from the Chinese Communist Party in recent months.

The focus of these meetings has been framed as "engagement." While that might sound nice, the Biden administration's approach has weakened America's position in relation to China.

The CCP respects strength, and America must project it if we are going to succeed in this new era of competition. If President Biden wants to find success in this policy area, he needs to be willing to communicate clear principles around national security, trade, and human rights as he meets with their President. Failure to do this will only mean America's ability to compete against China will fade away.

Mr. Speaker, I wish President Biden all the best as he takes on this challenge. I hope he is up to it.

#### RECOGNIZING BECKENHAUER CONSTRUCTION ON 145 YEARS IN BUSINESS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Beckenhauer Construction of Norfolk, Nebraska, on 145 years in business.

Since 1878, Beckenhauer has built everything from churches to schools to hospitals and community projects built around the good life. Today, it is still a family business being run by the fourth and fifth generations.

They have been involved in the Box Butte General Hospital and the Boone County health clinic. The University of Nebraska had them renovate the UNL Barkley Memorial Center in Lincoln just last year.

Beckenhauer Construction's reach extends beyond Nebraska. They recently broke ground on a new law enforcement center in Clay County, South Dakota.

The Beckenhauer commitment is to hold the standards of quality, reliability, integrity, safety, and honesty to provide unparalleled service to their clients. That is why they are likely to grow for another 145 years and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Beckenhauer Construction and wish them the best in the years to come.

#### SECOND AVENUE SUBWAY

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank President Joe Biden for the investment of \$1.2 trillion—that is right, Mr. Speaker—trillion with a t, of the Bipartisan Infrastructure and Jobs Act.

We hear a lot of noise from the other side every single day, but when we see those shovels going in the ground and when we see those major projects coming forward across the Nation, those same Members that are making noise on the other side of the aisle will show up to the ribbon-cutting, Mr. Speaker, and some of them may be there to take credit for the project.

The biggest investment in the history of our Nation with regard to infrastructure and jobs. It is not just infrastructure; it is an economic development machine that will generate hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of jobs across our Nation.

I thank our President for his investment in our Nation, and particularly in the 13th Congressional District, which is an iconic district that has Harlem; East Harlem, also known as El Barrio; Washington Heights—yeah, some of you may have seen the movie "In the Heights"—Inwood; and the Northwest Bronx. The second phase of the Second Avenue subway just kicked off this past weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our Secretary of Transportation, Pete Buttigieg, for coming to our district to kick off the second phase of the Second Avenue subway right in East Harlem. This phase is such an important phase for a community that has for far too long been subjected to a transportation desert.

On Saturday, the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Transit Administration stood hand in hand with East Harlem leaders to sign off on a \$3.4 billion Full Funding Grant Agreement.

□ 1015

This was part of the capital investment grant program that received

record funding under the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. I thank the Secretary for coming to my district.

The funding will help support a 1.8-mile extension of the Q line. Some people seem to think that America cannot build a subway anymore. Yes, we can. Yes, we can when we put people over politics.

This new initiative on the East Side of Manhattan will connect the Q line from 96th Street to 125th Street to Harlem and will relieve an over-crowded Lexington Avenue line which is the most overcrowded line in the Nation, if not the world. It will transport over 200,000 riders on a daily basis in the most heavily used transit corridor in America.

Saturday marked the start of a vibrant economic future for families across East Harlem, and we worked with the Charles B. Rangel Infrastructure Workforce Initiative at City College that Congressman Rangel and I have been working on to ensure that we train those young people in our communities so they can have access to prevailing wage jobs.

This project is also called Uptown Grand Central. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, we will have a transportation hub that will connect Harlem to the rest of the world. You can see the lines here that will go from 125th Street to 96th Street.

Now, the first phase went uptown right through the Silk Stocking District, the richest ZIP Codes in the country. Maybe they weren't too open about the jobs, but we are laser focused on making sure that the second phase creates thousands of jobs.

The first phase created 16,000 jobs and generated \$142 million in wages and produced \$2.87 billion in economic activity during the construction. This second phase will lift that district, East Harlem, not only producing jobs but injecting oxygen to our economy.

Yes, we can when we put people over politics.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here to tell you that this project will connect Harlem to the rest of the world. It will connect the Second Avenue Subway to the Metro-North line and 14 counties outside of New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here to say we have a bright future.

#### CELEBRATING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF CORPORAL LEONARD TURNER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the achievements of Corporal Leonard Turner who recently celebrated his 100th birthday.

Corporal Turner is a World War II veteran who was part of the revered Marine Raiders, an elite infantry group that took on the most dangerous tasks during the war.

As his 100th birthday approached, his children decided to honor him and celebrate his very special birthday by inviting an array of veterans, generals, colonels, and dignitaries from the State.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Corporal Turner on reaching this incredible milestone of 100 years. His journey through life, including his valiant service during World War II, is an inspiration to us all.

His dedication, courage, and sacrifices have left an indelible mark on history, and we will be forever grateful for his service to our country.

#### CONGRATULATING WILLIAM "BILL" EASTERLIN

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Queensborough National Bank president William Easterlin on receiving the James Collier Award from the Georgia Bar Foundation at their annual grants meeting in July.

The James Collier Award is reserved for individuals, lawyers or nonlawyers, who make exceptional efforts to advance the foundation's primary objective of providing legal assistance to Georgians in need.

Mr. Easterlin has shown extraordinary support for the foundation through his counsel as a banker and dedication to assisting disadvantaged Georgians.

From growing his family-owned bank's assets from \$106 million to \$2 billion and expanding to 27 locations, he is committed to providing exceptional financial services and giving back to the community he serves.

Mr. Speaker, Bill has done great work. I look forward to seeing what else he achieves.

#### REMEMBERING ARLINE MAXTON MCNEILL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Arlie Maxton McNeill, a resident of Brunswick, Georgia, who passed away on August 16, 2023, surrounded by his family after battling cancer.

Arlie was born in Seagrove, North Carolina, in 1936. He joined the U.S. Navy in 1955 where he became a dental assistant and soon realized he wanted to be a mortician.

In 1961 he married his wife, Sheila McNeill, and the following year he graduated from John A. Gupton College mortuary school in Nashville, Tennessee.

Arlie returned to Brunswick and started working at Edo Miller and Sons Funeral Home where he served for over 50 years and became part owner with Johnny Wilson.

Arlie was a well-known auctioneer and a 50-year Mason at Lodge 214 F&AM. In 1977 he became an ordained deacon at Norwich Street Baptist Church. He also served on the Georgia State Board of Funeral Services from 1998 to 2004. He was the area manager for the Loewen Funeral Group for 5 years and was a devout Christian.

He will be remembered by all, including his family and the community that he served well.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. GEORGE SKARPALEZOS, SR.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. George Skarpalezos, Sr., an American hero and a father to three children.

Upon graduating from basic training at Fort Benning, Georgia, First Lieutenant George Skarpalezos led a platoon of the U.S. Army's 82nd Airborne during the Vietnam war.

After serving in the military, George returned to his roots of Brunswick, Georgia, to raise three children.

Mr. Skarpalezos was also a musician. He performed at many local establishments on St. Simons Island. He also played in several bands, including the Ascots, the Gypsies, and The Fabulous Sixty Minute Men.

He also found enjoyment in real estate, leading him to open his own real estate company called Skarpalezos Realty.

While we are all sad that he is no longer with us, we will remember the life of Mr. Skarpalezos, his service to the United States, and the contributions to the State of Georgia.

#### UAW TENTATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH THE BIG THREE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as a grateful and proud daughter of the United Auto Workers, I am heartened to see General Motors, Ford, and Jeep Stellantis reach tentative agreements with the hardworking brothers and sisters of the UAW.

This historic strike is deeply personal to me. I know firsthand from my parents and constituents the difficult jobs they do day in and day out, sometimes 10 hours a day 6 days a week.

While too many manufacturing jobs have been shipped overseas to penny wage havens, I salute companies inside our borders, the largest consumer market in the world, for agreeing to pay fair wages with good benefits that our hardworking American autoworkers have earned.

Firms in other nations should follow suit. Our trade negotiators should focus on reciprocal contracts for market access to achieve fair trade globally to stop the exploitation of workers in the automotive industry in the Third World.

Let's recall after the United Auto Workers conceded major benefits during the 2008 Great Recession to literally save the Big Three from bankruptcy. These agreements represent a monumental step toward finally making these workers whole again.

They say that when unions fight, all workers win. Last week we saw Toyota raise wages for their workers knowing they must now compete.

RECORD profits should mean record contracts. Americans must honor people who work hard hour by hour building the economic prosperity of our great Nation.

From Toledo to Wayne to Wentzville to Belvedere, their vigilance, fortitude, and guts have made this new progress possible. I salute those in our unions who have fought so hard and have dedicated their lives to building our middle class from the middle out and the bottom up.

Onward.

#### BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my priorities for protecting America's future. We need to reduce and reprioritize government spending, secure the border, and end the weaponization of the Federal Government.

The Biden administration's spending has created massive inflation and increased our national debt to \$33 trillion, and \$2.4 trillion of that debt has accrued over just the last 365 days. That is over \$76,000 every second.

The Biden administration's spending is out of touch with what Americans want, and it is crushing our economy. We are all feeling it, especially in middle America where new and costly regulations are forcing small businesses to close, gas is nearly \$4 a gallon, and people's paychecks are overtaxed.

House Republicans have offered commonsense solutions to these problems. We have passed the Limit, Save, Grow Act to stop wasteful taxpayer spending, reclaim unspent COVID relief money and promote pro-growth economic policies, and we must stand firm in our commitment to reducing and reprioritizing government spending.

While the Biden administration is burning through taxpayer dollars like there is no tomorrow, there is also a humanitarian crisis raging at our southern border, and it is getting worse every day. This is a national security emergency. As we speak, fentanyl is flooding American streets, victims of human trafficking rings are getting abused and killed, and our brave border patrol agents are overwhelmed.

The funding to secure the border had already been appropriated by Congress before President Biden even took office, and then he killed the completion of the border wall by executive order. In response, House Republicans passed H.R. 2, the Secure the Border Act, which would force the Biden administration to resume construction of the border wall, increase the number of Border Patrol agents, protect unaccompanied children from human trafficking, and terminate catch-and-release policies.

We also passed the Schools Not Shelters Act and the HALT Fentanyl Act. We must keep pressing to secure the border and protect Americans.

In addition to wasting taxpayer dollars and ignoring the border crisis, the Biden administration is overseeing and directing an unprecedented

weaponization of the Federal Government. President Biden's Department of Justice refuses to apply justice equally, and House Republicans are constantly fighting back against overreaching government regulations that are hurting agricultural producers and small business owners.

Even the Supreme Court had to step in and declare the Biden administration's definition of Waters of the United States was unconstitutional.

When government grows, freedom shrinks. So we must stop the weaponization of the Federal Government to protect our freedoms. The appropriations process is a critical opportunity to address all of these concerns. We must restore fiscal sanity. Americans deserve to have their taxpayer dollars used wisely, and giving the President endless, no-limit credit cards is no way to govern in a democracy.

It is hard for me to imagine how anyone would love \$33 trillion of debt or love the open border or love losing to China or love \$200 billion of unaccounted for COVID relief dollars so much they would be willing to shut down the Federal Government to maintain them.

We have 10 days to pass the remaining appropriations bills in a fiscally responsible way. We owe it to the American people to work tirelessly toward that end and to get our country back on track.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF BISHOP EMERITUS TOD BROWN

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of my good friend Bishop Emeritus Tod Brown, who recently passed away at the age of 86.

Bishop Brown led our diocese for 14 years in a community that is now 50 percent Roman Catholic. Under his leadership, the diocese more than doubled in its membership, and by the year 2012, there were more than 1.2 million Roman Catholics in Orange County, California.

In recognizing the diversity of our church, Bishop Brown ordained the Nation's first Vietnamese Roman Catholic bishop in 2003 and one of the first Hispanic bishops in the United States in the year 2000.

On a personal note, Bishop Brown administered first communion to my children in the good old days.

Bishop Brown will be remembered. God bless him. We thank my good friend for all the good work he did.

#### HONORING JERRY MUMFORD PATTERSON

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the extraordinary career of Jerry Patterson, a lawyer, educator, and former U.S. Congressman who dedicated his life to public service.

As a UCLA alumnus just like myself, Mr. Patterson served Santa Ana as a city councilmember and as Santa Ana mayor.

He fought to double the size of city-owned parks and created the first nationally recognized golden circle bike-way. After serving in Congress, Mr. Patterson came home and represented our community as an educator until 1999.

Jerry Patterson always put the needs of his communities first. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring his service to our great Nation.

□ 1030

#### HONORING ORANGE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL'S MARINE CORPS JROTC

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Orange High School's Marine Corps Junior ROTC program.

The JROTC program at Orange High School began in 1995 under the leadership of Master Gunnery Sergeant James Fearn, but not without a fight. After having his request denied over and over again, Master Gunnery Sergeant Fearn flew to Washington, D.C., himself to demand a meeting with the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and he got it done.

Today, Orange High School has one of the largest Marine Corps ROTC units in the Western United States, and it teaches over 160 cadets the values of citizenship, service, discipline, and responsibility. I must say these cadets are the leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate them, and I wish the Marine Corps a happy birthday. They are 248 years old this year.

#### CALIFORNIA'S HIGH-SPEED RAIL IS BIGGEST BOONDOGGLE IN U.S.

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

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, today I will be voting for the transportation appropriations bill, and one of the reasons why is that it provides exactly the right amount of funding for California's high-speed rail, which is zero dollars.

Zero dollars are appropriated for high-speed rail in this bill, and it is well past time that we stop throwing good money after bad.

High-speed rail was an idea in the early 2000s in California that might have initially had some promise, but because of sheer political dysfunction, it has become perhaps the biggest boondoggle in United States history.

The price tag is now pegged at \$128 billion, and a decade and a half after it was approved, there is still absolutely nothing to show for it. When you look at the press releases that come out from the high-speed rail authority, it is almost beyond belief what now counts as success.

This press release is from just 5 days ago: "California High-Speed Rail Authority Moves Closer to Designing Tracks and Systems."

This is a decade and a half after the project was conceived. According to The New York Times, at the current

pace, the high-speed rail project will not be completed in this century.

Last year, an investigation by The Times produced a story headlined: “How California’s Bullet Train Went Off the Rails.” The Times explained that the tortured effort to build the country’s first high-speed rail system is a case study in how ambitious public works projects can become perilously encumbered by unrealistic cost estimates, flawed engineering, and a determination to persist on projects that have become too big to fail.

The Times reported how one of the early operators that actually knows how to build high-speed rail systems, SNCF, became so frustrated after their ideas and plans were repeatedly discarded that they pulled out in 2011 and decided to go to North Africa, where it was less politically dysfunctional. Indeed, they then helped Morocco bring a high-speed rail system online in 2018.

All the while, the condition of California’s roads continues to deteriorate and are among the very worst in the country. They are unsafe. They cause needless wear and tear on vehicles. They cause Californians to be stuck in traffic for hours on end.

This is an area where my particular district has unique needs. The Third Congressional District is one of the few parts of California that is still growing. Cities like Roseville, Folsom, and Lincoln are growing as fast as anywhere. People want to come to our communities because of the high quality of life. We have eluded the downward spiral that has afflicted many other parts of California because we support small businesses, law enforcement, and public safety. We have local governments that are accountable to taxpayers.

Precisely because of this success, many people want to move into our communities, and it is creating major challenges when it comes to traffic. Because of that, I have made it a top priority to look for every possible opportunity to stop spending Federal dollars on wasteful projects like the high-speed rail boondoggle and instead direct those funds to needed local road projects that will alleviate traffic for my constituents.

I was very glad to participate earlier this year in the groundbreaking for the I-80 fifth lane project, which is going to improve travel times westbound on I-80 between Douglas Boulevard and Riverside Avenue.

In the Transportation appropriations bill, which will be voted on by the House today, I have secured funding for three important projects in our district.

The first is the U.S. 50/Empire Ranch Road Interchange Project, which would reduce traffic congestion and improve safety on adjacent interchanges, ultimately enhancing local and regional circulation and transportation infrastructure in Folsom and surrounding areas.

The second is the Blue Oaks Boulevard Roadway and Bridge Widening

Project, which is going to alleviate a critical transportation bottleneck.

The third is the Folsom Lake Crossing safety improvement phase two project, which would enhance road safety on Folsom Lake Crossing by adding a median barrier rail to minimize head-on collisions, injuries, and fatalities.

Mr. Speaker, this is the way that Federal funding should be directed toward infrastructure and projects that will improve the quality of life for our constituents.

I am glad in the bill that we will vote on today that is the priority and that we will be sending zero dollars to the failed California high-speed rail.

#### STOP THE FRENZY OF MOTIONS OF CENSURE

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, it was in this Chamber on January 6, 2021, that I came to realize relatively late in life how fragile our democracy is. I realize that the words of the Constitution, to which we all pledge an oath, are important, and so are the concepts underlying those words, the concepts of a peaceful transition of power, the concept of the separation of church and state, and the concept of freedom of expression.

These are concepts that are hundreds of years older than the Constitution, but they are critical to our democracy, which I think we would all agree is currently a bit fragile.

For this reason, I am profoundly disturbed that this House has gotten into a frenzy of censure resolutions to censure the speech of Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is the second clause of the First Amendment to our Constitution that says that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. Our Founders protected us, in particular, with another clause in the Constitution, the Speech and Debate Clause. Article I, Section 6, says that we will be protected: “For any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned.”

Our Founders decided that we would not be sanctioned for the things that we say, yet there are at least four resolutions before this House—one from Ms. JACOBS, one from Ms. GREENE, one from Ms. BALINT, one from Mr. MCCORMICK—seeking an official censure of Members of Congress for the things that they have said.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I mean by the erosion of the foundational principles on which our democracy exists.

I don’t much like any of the speech that the Members who are accused of foul speech have engaged in, but the test of our commitment to freedom of expression is not how hard we fight in a moment for the rights of those that we agree with. The test is whether we are willing to stand up for freedom of

expression for somebody with whom we don’t agree.

To my Republican friends, I would say they have quite rightly, in many instances, objected to the cancel culture, which is too rampant in our universities and elsewhere. Why now? Why in this institution?

To my Democratic friends, I would remind them that every progressive, going back to Galileo right up through Cesar Chavez to Martin Luther King, has been tolled and tortured and sanctioned for their expression.

It is time for this to stop in this Chamber. It is time for us to stop trying to punish each other for the things that we say, no matter how abhorrent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are more than just Representatives. If we were just Representatives, we would go back to our constituents and bring their ideas here. We are stewards of this institution, which is why we take an oath to the Constitution.

If you take seriously your role as a steward of this institution, vote to table every one of these obnoxious motions to censure. If they do come up and aren’t tabled, vote against them. The freedom of expression upon which this institution is built demands nothing less.

#### CELEBRATING VETERANS DAY

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

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in 1919, President Woodrow Wilson declared November 11 as Armistice Day, a day in which to honor those who gave their all in World War I.

In 1954, Congress amended Armistice Day to be inclusive of all veterans who have fought for American freedom, effectively changing its name to Veterans Day. It is on this day that we salute our remarkable, brave patriots who keep America safe.

We the people enjoy the blessings of hard-earned peace, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness because of our warriors who answered the call to defend our Nation.

Our men and women in uniform are a constant reminder of the true source of our Nation’s greatness, and many veterans have freely given the last full measure of their devotion for our Nation. Because of their defense, our Nation remains strong, and our children can pursue their dreams.

To our veterans, your loved ones have endured seasons without a parent, a child, a sibling. On Veterans Day, we also recognize your families and thank them for their sacrifice.

It is my greatest honor to represent so many heroes who have served our Nation or who are serving our Nation from the Fourth Congressional District of Florida. Just as they have fought for our country, I will always fight for them.

Mr. Speaker, here is the truth about Veterans Day. It is not just one day. It

is every day because every day America and her people cherish the sacrifice and the service of our Nation's veterans.

OCTOBER 7 IS DEADLIEST DAY IN JEWISH HISTORY SINCE THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, hearts, minds, and lives were forever changed. We believed hatred and murder of Jews to be a thing of the past, but we were heartbreakingly wrong.

October 7 will go down as the deadliest day in Jewish history since the Holocaust.

Today, our strongest ally in the Middle East, our friend, Israel, is at war after enduring a multipronged terror attack by Hamas.

Let me be clear: Hamas is not a militant group. They are terrorists.

The atrocities that took place on October 7 by Hamas against innocent Israelis were not the result of provocation. It was a massacre.

It was not in response to occupation of the Gaza Strip. It was a massacre.

It was not a flare-up. It was a massacre.

If you take elderly women, mothers, the disabled, and children hostage, or if you target families and slaughter and torture civilians indiscriminately, you do not get to claim the moral high ground.

There can be no confusion about the war between Israel and Hamas. It is good versus evil. It is civilization versus barbarism. It is self-defense against aggression.

We must be a voice for the truth, and here is the truth: At least 1,400 Israelis were murdered. More than 4,400 were severely injured. More than 200 hostages were taken to be used as human shields. Twenty-seven Americans are dead, and 10 remain unaccounted for.

Make no mistake, Israel is shaken but is not defeated. The United States must be bold and courageous in standing up for the nation of Israel and the right for her to defend itself.

When fighting evil, there can be no neutrality. We must send a clear message to Hamas and Hezbollah and those that fund them that the United States stands with Israel today, tomorrow, and always.

WORKING TO MAKE IT EASIER TO VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. NICKEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Speaker, we need to make it easier, not harder, for eligible voters to make their voices heard in our elections. We need to make sure that voting is accessible to everyone, whether they want to go to the polls, vote early, or vote by mail.

In Congress, there is so much we can do to make it easier for people to vote and participate in our democracy. It starts with passing the John Lewis Voting Rights Act and the Freedom to

Vote Act. These commonsense bills would end partisan gerrymandering, expand voting by mail, protect early voting, help get big money out of our elections, combat dark money, support election integrity, and make additional reforms to improve ballot access.

□ 1045

It is time to put politics aside and get these commonsense bills across the finish line. I will continue to do everything I can to protect the right to vote and work to make it easier for people to vote and to participate in our democracy.

CONGRATULATING MAYOR KEN MARSHBURN ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and celebrate the exemplary service of Mayor Ken Marshburn, a distinguished leader and devoted public servant to the town of Garner.

During his time in office, Mayor Marshburn has worked tirelessly alongside council members, town staff, and community leaders to enhance the quality of life in Garner. He has an unwavering belief in Garner's potential and has always worked to make Garner a place where people can not only live but also thrive.

Mayor Marshburn's leadership is coming to an end today with our elections in Garner. He has steered Garner toward a positive and prosperous future. His commitment to fiscal responsibility has laid a solid foundation for the town's growth, attracting new businesses that enrich our economic diversity. His legacy is one of leadership, service, and unwavering dedication to our community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Mayor Ken Marshburn for his unwavering commitment and invaluable contributions to the town of Garner and extending our best wishes to him and his family as they embark on this well-deserved retirement.

Our community is richer and brighter due to his leadership and service. I again thank Mayor Marshburn for his service.

FIGHTING HATRED IN ALL FORMS

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Speaker, in North Carolina last year, anti-Semitic incidents increased by 30 percent. The ongoing conflict in Israel has led to even more anti-Semitic attacks both in the U.S. and around the world.

Just this week, the ADL's Center on Extremism reported a nearly 400 percent increase in anti-Semitic incidents compared to the same period last year. The situation has been even worse since Hamas launched a brutal and calculated attack against Jewish people and the State of Israel on October 7.

In New York, Jewish students at Cooper Union College were forced to shelter inside the school library on Wednesday for their own safety during a campus protest. In Indianapolis, a woman deliberately crashed her car into the building of what she believed was a pro-Jewish organization.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to remain vigilant against anti-Semitic

discrimination, and prejudice. Let's work to fight hatred in all forms and ensure that the scourge of anti-Semitism does not rear its ugly head both at home and abroad.

AVOIDING A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss our core job here in Congress, funding the Federal Government. We have 10 days until a government shutdown. Mr. Speaker, I will say that again, 10 days, just over a week until the government runs out of money.

A government shutdown would hurt the economy, risk our national security, and would be a disaster for North Carolina. Hundreds of thousands of people would be put on temporary leave without pay or be forced to work without pay. Essential staff—like our TSA agents, air traffic controllers, and many others—would be required to work without pay through the duration of any shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one path forward, and that is bipartisanship. Republicans have a very narrow majority in the House. Democrats have a very narrow majority in the Senate. We have the White House, but we have to work together.

Right now there is no plan to fund our government, and we have to do it next week. This needs to be a priority for this body, for this institution, and we have to do our job. The American people expect us to fund the government, and right now there is no plan to do that.

A shutdown will cost taxpayers money. It will hit our economy hard. My constituents are hit hard right now with the rising cost of inflation, the high cost of mortgages, and the continuing costs that hit hard, whether it is childcare or healthcare. A shutdown would be an incredible unforced error at this time.

Mr. Speaker, we need to fund the government.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, Congress is considering a transportation appropriations bill right now as we speak. It is critical that we don't give another dime to California's failed high-speed rail project that has sought money year after year after year from the Federal level.

Indeed, this document does not provide any new money for the high-speed rail project, but they are certainly seeking it. There are reportedly proposals for \$3 billion requested by Governor Newsom and even reportedly asks of a possible \$28 billion, which is what they really seek.

Let's go back just a little bit to learn the history of this project. In 2008, a proposition was passed on California's ballot with the idea to build a high-

speed rail system from San Francisco to L.A. The voters were told the cost would be \$33 billion. Okay. There would have to be a high-speed rail that would go from the two cities at approximately 220 miles an hour and get the job done in approximately 3 hours or less. It has fallen far short of those goals.

They only have to have one high-speed train a day go in order to be eligible to be called a high-speed train. Otherwise, it is going to be a commuter line stopping in every little burg along the way. As it is turning out, from San Francisco to San Jose, it looks they are going to use local electric rail. Passengers would need to jump on a train in San Jose and then take it down to an undetermined point in southern California and perhaps jump on another train there.

We were talking about this last night in the debate, and I mentioned that you could take a Southwest Airlines plane and already be on the beach and have half a sunburn before you could get off the high-speed rail at that point.

What is the cost these days? That is the interesting part. In 2008, \$33 billion is what they were sold. A year later, they adjusted the price up to \$42 billion. Not long after that, when I was still in the State legislature, they actually admitted the price then would be \$97 billion. Today's estimates show it to be \$128 billion.

How much construction is finished on it? The voters were told in 2008 that it would be ready to go by 2020. Well, it is 2023, and not a single mile of track has been laid. They have some bridges and aqueducts already built around Fresno and such, but it is nowhere near being completed.

They are trying to do it in segments, so they are doing the Central Valley segment because, as they said at the time—this is pretty funny—they can build it in the Central Valley, there are fewer people there, so there is less resistance to having it built. They are going to do a segment from Merced to Bakersfield, where it ends up in an orchard somewhere as the terminus. At this point, we are finding they need \$28 billion just to complete that segment, not the entire thing.

It has been a boondoggle from the beginning, with lies basically from the rail authority about what is going to happen with the timeline, the environmental work, and the number of jobs.

Here is another good one: They were promising there would be a million jobs for California. Well, 3 years into the project, they finally admitted it would be a million job years. Currently, they claim 5,000 people are working on the rail, and so at that rate for a million job years at 5,000 people, that would take 200 years to complete the system.

Well, the people who voted for it would probably like to see it done in their lifetime, which may not even happen. I think at this point, why don't

we just cut our losses and move toward something that is useful not just for Californians but for all Americans.

Indeed, we want to do infrastructure around here. Why don't we do true infrastructure? We talk about highways. We talk about a lot of things. I am focused a lot on California's water situation. We have several projects to add to its water supply so it can continue to grow crops and people can thrive in our State, not just environmental water that gets shifted more and more towards fish water and running it out the delta, which doesn't actually help that situation or do anything environmentally positive anyway.

Instead of continuing to come to Washington, D.C., for more money to do something that is only covering this little portion of California, rather than San Francisco all the way to L.A. as originally planned, I propose instead that we shift the money into other projects that can help all Americans.

They don't even have the route planned out for the high-speed rail project. They don't know how they are going to get the last leap from Bakersfield into southern California. Are they going to build a tunnel through there with all that seismic activity? Are they going to go around it? Are they going to go over it? They don't have the whole plan this many years into the project, and they still want more money from Washington, D.C., from all Federal taxpayers.

If they shift the money into other infrastructure that can help all Americans, these crops that are grown in California, look at these numbers, basically 100 percent of walnuts and tomatoes grown commercially are grown in California. Many of these other crops, 90-plus percent are grown in California. Having a stable food supply is what benefits Americans, so dollars invested into our water system in California would go much further than wasting money on high-cost rail.

#### COMMEMORATING INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Indigenous Peoples' Heritage Month and the enduring contributions made by the Acjachemen and Tongva people to our community. In Orange County, we are dedicated to supporting our indigenous neighbors, as they reclaim their history.

For generations, indigenous groups have fought against the pressure to assimilate. They have retained a strong connection with their cultures even when the Federal Government has failed to support them. Indigenous Peoples' Heritage Month is a celebration of their resilience.

We owe these communities recognition. In the past, I have held

roundtables with Tribal leaders and chaired hearings to better understand how our current systems leave Native people behind.

I am proud to represent indigenous populations, to lift up their stories, and to celebrate how their perspectives make our communities stronger. I will continue to be a partner with indigenous leaders and will fight to get their communities the help that they need.

#### STANDING UP FOR VETERANS

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, elected officials have a duty to stand up for veterans. I rise today not only to honor their sacrifices with my words but to reiterate a call for meaningful action.

Nearly 100,000 veterans call Orange County, California, home. They embody the resilience of our Nation. Yet, when they come home, they face institutions that systematically fail them. For those who have fought for our country, we must take care of them and their families. We must deliver the benefits that they are owed. We must address their invisible wounds by making it easier for them to get mental health care.

In Congress, I have proudly worked on improving military families' housing, strengthening the Veterans Crisis Line, and getting Orange County veterans answers and care from the VA.

On Veterans Day, we thank our troops for their service, and we recommit ourselves to getting them the help that they need.

#### STUDENT LOAN FORGIVENESS

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, student debt holds back our entire economy and hurts all of us. Americans today, young and old, cannot start businesses or save for retirement because they are burdened by student loans.

I am glad the Biden-Harris administration is doing what it can to forgive student debt despite roadblocks from a corrupt Supreme Court. The administration's actions will extend relief to 125,000 Americans who can participate better in our economy, totaling \$9 billion that will go back into our communities.

In the long term, we must have a comprehensive plan to prevent another student debt crisis from happening as we fix the current one. I founded the College Affordability Caucus to address these problems.

Debt-free higher education is one of the best investments that we can make to improve the lives of young people and strengthen our Nation's workforce for decades to come.

#### STANDING UP FOR TRANS STUDENTS

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight how anti-transgender campus policies hurt students' well-being.

In September, the Orange Unified School District became the sixth school district in California to adopt a forced outing policy. As young people are growing up, these harmful mandates expose students for something as simple as going by a different name

without considering whether they are safe at home.

More than half of transgender youth contemplate suicide due to a lack of support from their family or community. Schools should be places where students can focus on learning, free from fear.

As a single mom of three, I rely on public schools to help my kids mature into thoughtful and confident citizens, and I oppose misguided policies that endanger LGBTQ+ Americans.

I urge all California schools to stand up for trans students and protect the safety of queer youth.

□ 1100

#### RENAMING FORT GORDON TO FORT EISENHOWER

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the formal renaming of Fort Gordon to Fort Eisenhower, a well-known name in history throughout the world.

Located in Augusta, Georgia, this military base has experienced a major transformation over the last 10 years and is widely considered a top-tier installation that will continue to grow, all while training and housing thousands of the best and brightest who serve our country.

As the home of the Eisenhower Medical Center, which provides top-notch healthcare services for our veterans and men and women in uniform, as well as the U.S. Army Cyber Command and the U.S. Army Cyber Center of Excellence, this renaming is a true representation of President Eisenhower's commitment to science and innovation and his love for the surrounding community that he so frequently visited for fellowship and sport.

A beloved visitor of Augusta, President Eisenhower's deep ties and admiration for the area were well known. My team and I worked side by side with local community members to ensure that if the base was to be renamed, its new name would reflect both the history of our community and the significance of the mission.

President Eisenhower made 45 trips to Augusta—5 before he became President, 29 while in office, and 11 after his first term—taking full advantage of all that our community has to offer, including the world-renowned Augusta National Golf Club, one of his favorite destinations.

President Eisenhower always found time for his faith, as well. At the Reid Memorial Presbyterian Church in Augusta, there is a pew known as the Eisenhower pew. It has a plaque on it where the former President would worship when he was in town.

With a name like Fort Eisenhower and the international renown that comes with it, as well as the critical missions housed there, this military base will endure from now on.

As President Eisenhower's granddaughter Susan Eisenhower stated at the renaming ceremony: "If Dwight Eisenhower were here today, he would be full of heartfelt appreciation for the focus and dedication this community has placed on serving our country and keeping it safe."

I couldn't agree more.

#### RELEASE OF CUBAN PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, two years ago, thousands of Cubans peacefully demonstrated for their basic rights, and their corrupt rulers responded with a brutal, indiscriminate crackdown.

Maykel Castillo Perez and Luis Manuel Otero Alcantara both helped forge the historic and resurgent pro-democracy movement on July 11. They have been imprisoned ever since. Maykel, a Latin Grammy-winning rapper, coauthored the song "Patria Y Vida," an anthem for the mass demonstrations. Luis Manuel, an Afro-Cuban visual artist, has fought passionately for free expression and against censorship.

Maykel disappeared from public view after being detained without a warrant on May 18, 2021, and a kangaroo court sentenced him to 9 years in prison. The U.N. reports Maykel remains in prison "solely for his prodemocracy activism," enduring inmate threats, solitary confinement, and denied family visits and medical attention. Yet he still rebels however he can. On the anniversary of the July 11 protests, he sewed his mouth shut and tattooed "Patria Y Vida" on his arm. Maykel told friends: "I have enough strength to keep bleeding . . . I prefer with great pride to descend in a coffin than to bow."

Luis Manuel's despicable treatment is compounded by the jarring legacy of anti-Black racism in Cuba. On July 11, he too was arrested after posting a video on his plans to join Cuba's mass democracy demonstration.

Like Maykel, he was tried behind closed doors and thrown in a maximum security prison. Due to abuse, bad medical care, and denial of food and water, Luis Manuel is suffering from extreme weight loss and severe medical issues.

I am grateful the Biden administration granted humanitarian parole to both Luis Manuel and Maykel, but for the Cuban regime, exiling these patriots isn't enough. Their very existence is a threat.

While these cases are egregious, thousands of peaceful prodemocracy protesters have been jailed, tortured, or killed. If we truly intend to live up to our Nation's values, we must work tirelessly to liberate those who continually sacrifice their freedom for others.

As co-chair of the Cuba Democracy Caucus, I proudly join forces with Free-

dom House and Amnesty International to demand justice for Maykel and Luis Manuel through the Defending Freedoms Project.

I intend to use my platform to ensure their unconditional release is a top priority in any discussion of Cuba policy.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me.

(Spanish translation of the statement made in English is as follows:)

Hoy me levanto para exigir la liberación inmediata de dos presos de conciencia cubanos. Maykel Castillo Pérez y Luis Manuel Otero Alcántara ayudaron a empezar el movimiento pro-democracia el once de julio.

Ellos están encarcelados desde ese día. Maykel, rapero y ganador del Grammy Latino, es coautor de la canción "Patria y Vida" que fue himno de las protestas.

Luis Manuel es un artista visual afrocubano que ha luchado duro por la libre expresión y contra la censura.

Maykel desapareció de la vista del público tras ser detenido sin orden judicial, y un tribunal irregular lo condenó nueve años de prisión.

Según el informe de las Naciones Unidas, Maykel sigue encarcelado "únicamente por su activismo a favor de la democracia".

Sin embargo, todavía se manifiesta como puede. En el aniversario de las protestas, se cosió la boca y se tatuó "Patria Y Vida" en el brazo.

El trato despreciable recibido por Luis Manuel se ve agravado por el preocupante legado del racismo contra los Afrocubanos.

Tambien fue arrestado luego de publicar un video sobre sus planes de unirse a manifestaciones masivas por la democracia en Cuba.

Al igual que Maykel, fue condenado y encarcelado atrás de una prisión de máxima seguridad. Luis Manuel sufrió una pérdida extrema de peso y graves problemas médicos.

Agradezco que President Biden esté ofreciendo libertad humanitaria a Luis Manuel y Maykel, pero para la dictadura cubana exiliarlos no es suficiente. Su propia existencia es una amenaza.

Si queremos estar a la altura de los valores de nuestra nación, debemos trabajar todos los días para liberar a los que sacrifican por los demás. Como copresidenta del Caucus para la Democracia en Cuba, voy a luchar al lado de Freedom House y Amnistía Internacional para demandar justicia para Maykel y Luis Manuel.

Voy a hacer todo lo posible para abogar por su liberación incondicional.

Espero que mis colegas de ambos partidos se unan a mí.

I'd like to share more about these brave patriots, in their own words and those of people who know them well. The following is a letter written by Luis Manuel Otero Alcantara to the Miami Herald, entitled: 'Cuba's authorities have stolen my youth just for speaking my mind'. It was published July 10th of this year, two years after his arbitrary arrest.

I am an artist and a political prisoner in Cuba. I was arrested on July 11, 2021, on my way to a protest in which thousands of my compatriots rose up across the island to demand freedom.

I've been imprisoned ever since.

Last year, I was sentenced to five years in prison on charges of contempt and insult to national symbols, because I used the Cuban flag in a performance in August 2019. This is how the Cuban government views my art. I was tried, alongside my dear friend, the Grammy Award-winning rapper Maykel Castillo—known as El Osorbo—who is now serving a nine-year sentence for similar offenses. My imprisonment is a result of the Cuban authorities' systematic strategy to silence the voices of young people. They have been harassing me for years, arresting me 50 times between 2017 and 2021 and also through defamation, violation of privacy, threats and police beatings. But it wasn't until the historic protest of 2021 that the regime decided to lock me up for a longer period of time so I could no longer communicate with my people.

I'm imprisoned in Guanajay, a maximum-security penitentiary southwest of Havana. Many of my fellow prisoners are serving life sentences for murder. The authorities have separated me from other political prisoners. I share a cell with three others. I'm allowed to talk to other inmates in the hallway, but I'm only taken out to the yard when other prisoners are gone. I should be allowed to spend an hour outside every day, but I'm only let out occasionally at the whim of the guards.

I've lost weight because of the scarcity of food and poor quality of meals. I'm often afraid to eat because the food looks rotten. After I was sentenced in June 2022, the rules for visiting me changed. Now my family can only visit me once a month, instead of twice. No one else is allowed. Even my beloved uncle is banned because of his involvement in activism.

More than 1,800 Cubans, mostly young and Black, were arrested in the protests in 2021. Of these, 897 have been tried, and 777 remain in prison. Many are minors. Some have been sentenced to up to 30 years for sedition. But there's no evidence that the protest was pre-meditated. It started in a small town outside Havana, when a young boy posted a video on Facebook of people protesting power outages. Within hours, thousands of Cubans decided to take to the streets.

Since that day, hundreds of young Cubans have been trapped behind bars. Every day is the same. Violence is constant. Only one's body changes. Your hair falls out and your face ages prematurely from pain, frustration and sadness. Your friends leave the country. Lovers' caresses are long gone. The soundscape here is always the same. All you hear is the murmur of death slowly approaching. In these harsh conditions, human beings are stripped of their youth. They wander the four square meters of their cells with no sense of future.

I speak as a young man in today's Cuba. We are full of energy and confidence, determined to lend our talents to the quest for a truly democratic and free Cuba. The regime that has survived for 64 years on the Caribbean's largest island is once again trying to crush a generation, just as it crushed and erased those who preceded us.

Today every young Cuban is a political prisoner. A censored artist. An exile inside and outside Cuba. Even if you're an accomplice of the system, you will inevitably be crushed like the others, because to be young is to be daring and reckless, eager to bring change to the world. It means fighting for love, dreams and utopia. But these qualities are considered crimes in Cuba, and that condemns us all to martyrdom.

Today, as I approach the age of 35 behind bars, I reflect on the loss of youth under a dictatorial system. Forced to survive political violence, we all lose 90% of our physical and intellectual productivity. Only 10% is left for creative and life-affirming pursuits.

On behalf of the young Cubans locked up in the island's horrible prisons, I appeal to people of conscience around the world to support our struggle to liberate ourselves and our country. All we did was demand the right to choose our political future and to speak our minds.

No one should have to give up their youth for such a just cause.

Next, I'd like to share a story written by Julyssa Lopez and published January 6th, 2023 in Rolling Stone magazine detailing Maykel Osorbo's life and current detention. The article is titled "Two Years After 'Patria Y Vida,' Cuban Rapper Maykel Osorbo Remains in Jail."

Maybe it was the excitement of post-lockdown celebrations or the simple triumph of getting through the worst of the pandemic, but the energy felt different at the 22nd annual Latin Grammys back in November of 2021. Thousands of people, dressed in shimmering gowns and slick suits, had gathered at MGM Grand Garden Arena in Las Vegas for the awards ceremony. At the end of the night, when it was time for the anticipated Song of the Year category, the air turned electric as people waited to hear who might take home the trophy—maybe be a massive pop name like Camilo or Rauw Alejandro, who were both nominated and sitting in the audience.

Instead, the award went to "Patria Y Vida," a song that started out in a small studio in Miami and spiraled across the streets of Cuba in 2021. The title, which inverts the popular Fidel Castro-era slogan "patria o muerte," took on such force that it became a common chant during the unprecedented demonstrations that swept the island that summer. Despite its political impact, no one expected "Patria Y Vida" to win in Las Vegas, particularly because of how traditional the Latin Recording Academy can be. Five of the song's performers—Yotuel Romero, Descemer Bueno, Eliexer "El Funky" Márquez Duany, Alexander Delgado Hernández, and Randy Malcom Martínez—appeared onstage, shocked and tearful, to accept the award. But there was one artist notably absent: the rapper Maykel Osorbo.

At that precise moment, Osorbo was sitting in Kilo 5 Y Medio, a maximum-security prison in the rural, tobacco-rich region of Pinal del Rio, Cuba, far from the glamour and glitterati of the awards show. By then, he'd been jailed for six months, after authorities detained him on accusations that included assault, resistance, public disorder, and "propagating the epidemic," all of which outside lawyers supporting him say are false charges. His family heard from him only sparingly, and they worried about his health, which had deteriorated since his arrest.

Since the late 2010s, Osorbo—whose real name is Maykel Castillo Pérez—had gained attention on the island as one of the most public figures of Movimiento San Isidro (MSI), a collective made up of dissident artists and intellectuals in Havana. He was also known for his bold, outspoken music, which caught the ear of Romero. Romero had begun working on "Patria Y Vida" in October of 2020, and he'd been collaborating with other artists who, like him, had moved to the U.S. from Cuba. Still, he felt the track—which was inspired by the political anthems of nueva trova legend Silvio Rodríguez—needed the voices of people still living on the island. He asked Osorbo to be part of the song,

aware that the music risked provoking the Cuban government; the lyrics call for freedom and mention several activists by name. But Osorbo wasn't afraid.

He and his close friends El Funky recorded verses in secret, sending them to Romero through WhatsApp. Over the next few months, they watched in awe as the song caught on in Cuba, becoming a rallying cry as unrest started brewing in the country. Frustrations had been mounting as Cubans faced food and supply shortages something many saw as a direct product of government mismanagement and the effects of the pandemic—though others, including Cuban president Miguel Díaz-Canel, pointed to the effects of the U.S. embargo. Additionally, there was a tightening of restrictions during lockdown that reflected the Cuban government's broader limits on civil liberties. Osorbo continued working with MSI, often using his platform to speak out and demand justice for people who'd been detained for expressing themselves. His rising popularity and outspokenness made him a frequent police target and, according to the humanitarian organization Prisoners Defenders, he was arrested and beaten multiple times before he was thrown in prison in May 2021.

Meanwhile, tensions in Cuba boiled over in July that year, resulting in rare nationwide protests. Many of them were set to the sound of "Patria Y Vida"—a sign that even if Osorbo was locked away, the messages he'd gotten out were still resonating with people.

After the Latin Grammys that November, there was a faint sense of hope: Perhaps such massive international attention would eventually mean Osorbo's release. In February 2022, the United Nations Group on Arbitrary Detention responded to a complaint, spearheaded by Prisoners Defenders, and determined that Osorbo had been "persecuted and arbitrarily detained for exercising his fundamental rights to freedom of opinion, expression, assembly, association and participation." They demanded his release, and Osorbo's friends organized to fight for him. El Funky, who moved to the U.S. in 2021, released music lambasting Cuban authorities for imprisoning artists, and Osorbo's partner, the activist Anamely Ramos, spoke out at demonstrations and rallied supporters on social media.

But in June 2022, a court in Havana made its final decision. Osorbo was sentenced to nine years in prison; artist Luis Manuel Otero Alcántara, a close MSI associate, was sentenced to five. Javier Larondo, the president of Prisoners Defenders, believes some of the recognition Osorbo got for his music did help. In addition to winning Song of the Year, "Patria Y Vida" also secured the award for Best Urban Song, making Osorbo a two-time Latin Grammy winner—and, perhaps, lightening his sentence. "Given the way crimes were fabricated the way they were for Maykel, if he'd been hidden in anonymity, he perhaps could have even had a 12 or 13-year sentence dropped on him," Larondo says.

Still, the sentence was a painful one for him and those who'd been following Osorbo's case. Osorbo will turn 40 this August: he'll be almost 50 by the time he's released. People have continued to denounce his imprisonment: Last month on Christmas Eve, the Argentine-Venezuelan singer Ricardo Montaner called for his liberation. Others, like El Funky, want to make sure Osorbo isn't forgotten. "We're going to keep making music, keep speaking up, until Maykel is free," he says.

Maykel Osorbo grew up in Old Havana as an only child. When he was 10 years old, his mother left in the dead of the night, part of a swell of Cubans who left the island after the 1994 Maleconazo protests that led then-

president Fidel Castro to briefly allow citizens to leave the island voluntarily. Osorbo was largely on his own after that.

"Maykel had a hard childhood," says El Funky, who met Osorbo in the neighborhood as a kid. "He had to become a man at a really young age and went through really difficult things." They stayed friends throughout the years, and they always had a love of music in common. They both wanted to be performers, but El Funky had to put his career ambitions on hold in 2005, after his first child was born, to focus on opening a café with his father.

In 2013, Osorbo came knocking on his door. "He said, 'Compadre, you have talent, we've known each other for years. There are all these music festivals in Cuba with prizes. I have a studio where we can work without a problem,'" El Funky remembers. At first, El Funky told Osorbo that he was done with music, but Osorbo had a way of inspiring. Within a few months, they were releasing songs together and independently, building recognition as artists in the neighborhood. They rapped about life in Cuba, and invariably what they were releasing was political. "I've always said that anyone who writes songs about everyday realities in Cuba is talking about the situation in Cuba," he says. "So, without meaning to, we were making protest music."

Osorbo's work took on a radical urgency in 2018, when Cuba proposed Decree 349, a law that prohibited any artistic expression in both public and private spaces without approval by the government's Ministry of Culture. Authorities were also given the power to shut down artistic activity that they deemed as containing "sexist, vulgar or obscene language." Many artists and poets spoke out against the law, many of them eventually creating the MSI collective. Osorbo took on a central role alongside Otero, who was arrested dozens of times for staging demonstrations and art performances. Osorbo's music became more direct than ever, filled with lacerating critiques of the government. In late 2020, he teamed up with El Funky for "Diazcarao," a heated, blistering rap that directly took aim at president Diaz-Canel. El Funky believes that song is what started to rattle the government, just before "Patria Y Vida" exploded into the world.

Once they'd recorded their parts in "Patria Y Vida," Osorbo and El Funky decided to take a huge risk by shooting a few scenes for a music video Romero was planning. They worked with the video director Anyelo Troya, who pawned off one of his cameras to get better equipment for the shoot, and snuck into an abandoned building in the dead of night. The Cuban government had enforced lockdown curfews, and they'd all face fines and even jail time if they got caught. They had three friends stand watch the entire night, switching off so they could sleep, and featured Otero in the video as well. Once it was finished, the video made an impact quickly, garnering one million views within three days.

"People who know me and my work were like, 'Now you really went crazy.' I knew there was going to be a fallout," El Funky remembers. Ramos says that shortly after the song came out, she heard people starting to use the phrase 'patria y vida' casually on the street, and she noticed neighbors playing the song in public. She says that she was stunned by how much other Cubans were connecting to "Patria Y Vida," but she was concerned about Osorbo. "All of us knew when we saw the reaction it got that there were going to be consequences. We know the authorities weren't going to forgive something like that."

Cuba, at the time, had been ramping up arrests on artists in particular. A 2021 report

from the international NGO Freemuse, which has been documenting and researching incidents of censorship and suppressing freedom of expression, showed that Cuba's rappers are some of the most persecuted rap artists in the world. Prisoners Defenders outlined more than 120 "repressive police acts" committed against Osorbo between 2019 and 2021, including beatings and arbitrary detentions. In one incident, he was picked up by police when he was at a park with his two-year-old daughter, who was left alone after authorities took him away.

Clashes that intensified that April ultimately led to his arrest. According to Prisoners Defenders, Osorbo had been walking to MSI headquarters when he saw police harassing a woman on the street. He attempted to intervene, and police moved to arrest him instead, despite not having a reason. By then, Osorbo had become a beloved figure in town, and neighbors quickly jumped in and helped him escape. They surrounded police officers and screaming at them to let Osorbo go, showing the mass support he had from Cubans. (An image of Osorbo holding one handcuffed arm up in the air after evading arrest went viral.) Almost a month later, on May 18, authorities picked him up again, handcuffing him shirtless and without shoes on while he was at home. Like many of the previous arrests, this one was made without an arrest warrant or clear charges against him. He's been held ever since.

El Funky was detained at one point as well, but ultimately let go. "I'm not the type of person they were going to arrest," he says. "I've done stuff, don't get me wrong, and I'm a person who has a lot of support, but I don't have a personality like Maykel and Luis Manuel. These guys are leaders—natural leaders. When they thought of things, what they'd come up with was so ingenious that it was a danger to the state."

In addition to his work with Prisoners Defenders, Larrondo is a singer who's played the most renowned venues in Spain and several other parts of the world. He's performed with the legendary Celia Cruz and sang on an album alongside artists such as Gloria Estefan and Alejandro Sanz. He understands the value of freedom of expression intimately. His interest in Osorbo's case came from his experiences both as a musician and a defender of human rights, and he's been working with the hope of finding organized, systematic ways for the artistic community to show solidarity with artists who are oppressed around the world.

"Patria Y Vida" was the main storyline at the 2021 Latin Grammys, and the song's two wins made headlines around the world. There was some inevitable controversy, with skeptical fans and musicians arguing that "Patria Y Vida" reflected a Western, anti-left political agenda and noting that the government organization USAID has used Cuba's hip-hop scene in the past as a way to infiltrate the Cuban government. (Some Cuban rappers Rolling Stone spoke to have countered that regardless of what the U.S. has done, Cuba's artists and hip-hop scenes have their own voice.) But more broadly, the Latin Recording Academy was applauded for swaying from its more risk-averse tendencies and recognizing a song with a strong social message.

And then, as the months passed, Osorbo's story largely faded from mainstream coverage—and, seemingly, from the Latin industry and Latin Grammy's consciousness. Osorbo, who remains behind bars, wasn't mentioned at the 2022 awards ceremony this past November, and El Funky says no one contacted him about other efforts to raise awareness. However, he has kept writing music about Osorbo and other political pris-

oners in Cuba, refusing to back down. Artists such as Romero have also spoken out; he's currently working on a documentary about "Patria Y Vida."

Larrondo believes that cases such as Osorbo's illustrate a violation of fundamental rights, and that limits on artistic expression—like other human-rights violations—require bigger, broader movements in response. "In the music industry, as well as in the sports industry, there isn't a systemic process to show solidarity with oppressed artists or athletes," he says. "I say this thinking of the Iranian case of the athlete sentenced to death. I haven't seen soccer players, or soccer clubs, express themselves against that sentencing in a big way, doing things like organized moments of silence at stadiums. the same way I haven't seen artists defending the freedom of Maykel Osorbo in a massive way."

He adds: "The fact that some artists have stood up for Maykel is good, but without some coordination or a major response from the collective art world to support a Latin Grammy winner, and a constant, permanent message—without that, you can't have that person set free from prison. Any artist in any regime could suffer things similar to Maykel."

Ramos worries constantly about Osorbo's medical condition in prison. She says he went through a critical period in which skin lesions and boils appeared on his skin, perhaps a result of contracting scabies or an infection in prison. Though he's since stabilized, she wonders if the symptoms could be a sign of cancer, and she believes the Cuban government is actively withholding medical attention—something it has been accused of doing with prisoners in the past. Beyond that, she says Osorbo's mood has dipped, especially after the holidays. "He's really not doing well, and he's been that way for a long time," she says. "Especially these days toward the end of the year, which is a tough time that you typically spend with family."

Despite all this, Osorbo recently managed to share an audio recording, which was posted on his social media accounts. It's a message of gratitude to his family, his friends, and above all, those who have supported him. "Those supporters have been there for me at all times, they have made me grow," Osorbo says. "They have made me leave behind who I was and they've made me who I am."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida will provide the Clerk a translation of her remarks.

#### HONORING COMMANDER JAMES CHRISTIAN DUNCAN

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

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Commander James Christian Duncan of the 31st Combat Training Squadron of the United States Air Force.

Lieutenant Colonel Duncan joined the Air Force in 2003 and trained at Columbus Air Force Base where he finished with distinction, flying both the T-6 and the T-38.

He has a distinguished training career, training other pilots on both the F-15E and the F-35. Before the 31st was activated in April of 2021, Duncan served as commander of Detachment 1 of the 29th Training Systems Squadron.

In his career, Commander Duncan had received many honors and awards, including the Transition Top Gun Award, Military Training Award, Flying Excellence Award, and the Order of Daedalians AETC Commander's Trophy.

On November 1, he retired from the armed services and is looking forward to opportunities with his family, Amy, Elliana, Micah, and Sarah.

I thank Commander Duncan for a career of service to our country and wish him the best in retirement.

#### 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 11 o'clock and 9 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BICE) at noon.

#### PRAYER

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

Almighty God, Your grace is sufficient for all that we will face this day. When we find ourselves faltering for want of a reason to hope, weakened from lack of energy or enthusiasm, dismayed by the complexity of the issues at hand, let us not, as Howard Thurman encouraged, shrink from the present intensity, lest we turn away from the power of Your love.

Yours is the power that is made perfect in our weakness. Yours is the strength that carries us through the difficulties of the day. Yours is the mercy that enables us to endure the repercussions of our own mistakes. Yours is the hope that gives us purpose when nothing in our lives is certain.

May we not shrink from the many challenges this day will reveal, and may we never turn away from the incredible power Your love provides.

In the strength of Your word we stand, and in the power of Your name we pray.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. HARD-

ER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HARDER of California 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 PRO TEMPORE

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

#### FOCUS ON HONORING VETERANS ON VETERANS DAY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, as we approach Veterans Day this coming weekend, we will remember that on the eleventh hour of the 11th day of the 11th month it was originally the end of World War I. It was known as Armistice Day, and in 1919 was the first Armistice Day until the Treaty of Versailles finally was done after several iterations of armistice was done back then.

Finally, in 1945, World War II veteran Raymond Weeks had the idea to expand it to all veterans. Raymond Weeks was later known as the father of what we now know as Veterans Day. In 1954 it was fully renamed Veterans Day.

To properly put the focus on the service and thanking of all our living veterans, this Saturday on November 11, I urge all Americans to pause and participate in honoring our living veterans at local events you may find in your area, Madam Speaker.

Let them know. It is not just a Friday off for Federal employees and the banks or no mail on Saturday, but a grateful Nation, instead, thanks them for preserving our freedom and that we should also be participants in our citizenship for our country.

#### END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the Biden administration for meaningfully updating the Thrifty Food Plan as Congress mandated in the last farm bill.

Before the Biden administration took action, the Thrifty Food Plan had not been updated in 50 years. That is absurd. Needy families were having to make purchasing decisions based on data from one-half century ago.

Nevertheless, thanks to their updates, SNAP recipients now get an extra \$1.40 per day. It is a small increase, but it means more people can make ends meet.

Guess what, Madam Speaker?

It is something that is real that is already helping families buy groceries.

I am so sick and tired of hearing my Republican friends play the inflation blame game, but then, when it comes time to actually do something to actually help families pay for groceries, Republicans are floating the idea of rolling back the Thrifty Food Plan update. Really, that is a rotten thing to do.

As Congress works to complete the 2023 farm bill, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to join me in rejecting this cruel and cynical approach.

Enough for God's sake.

#### THE DEVOTED SERVICE OF COLONEL CHARLES ECKART OF CORYDON, INDIANA

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

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Madam Speaker, if you ask anyone who knows him, you will learn that Colonel Charles Eckart of Corydon, Indiana, among other things, is devoted. He is devoted to his faith, to his family, and to his country.

Colonel Eckart served in the United States Army for 28 years. He served our Nation with unwavering dedication, protecting our freedom and ensuring our liberty. His service extended beyond the call of duty, making a profound impact on countless lives and communities. This is why he is being inducted into the Indiana Military Veterans Hall of Fame.

Colonel Eckart was awarded the Bronze Star for his heroism during the Tet Offensive in Vietnam.

He taught English literature at his alma mater, the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He was the battalion commander in charge of the U.S. Army Reserves in Jeffersonville and retired as a colonel in 1993 in Indianapolis.

Although he retired, his service never stopped. He has served his community of Corydon for decades and has served as the West Point liaison for Indiana's 9th District for the last 23 years.

This is where my staff and I have had the honor and privilege of getting to know him.

Colonel Eckart is loved by my staff, his family, his community, and his country. It is truly a blessing to honor him on the House floor today.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Colonel Eckart on being inducted into the Indiana Military Veterans Hall of Fame. Indiana is proud to call him one of its own.

#### HIGH AUTO INSURANCE RATES

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, auto insurance discrimination continues to keep our residents in the cycle of poverty in Michigan.

The Prohibit Auto Insurance Discrimination Act, or PAID Act, would prohibit auto insurance companies from using education level, marital status, credit scores, ZIP Codes, Census tracts, or homeownership status in insurance rating or underwriting decisions.

Madam Speaker, these factors don't determine your driving ability, yet our neighbors, especially in my district, regularly face higher auto insurance rates.

Currently many people are charged hundreds or even thousands of dollars more based on these factors, even though they aren't related to driving.

Madam Speaker, I don't know what the heck marital status or education level have to do with whether or not you are a good driver.

This summer Michigan residents saw a 42 percent fee increase adding on to higher fees that are still unaffordable for many families.

I am really grateful to be working with Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN on the PAID Act.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to please fight against this discriminatory practice.

#### HONORING MARY ANN RILEY OF INMAN, SOUTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. TIMMONS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mary Ann Riley of Inman, South Carolina, for her decades of service to our community and dedication to the South Carolina Republican Party.

Ms. Riley moved to South Carolina in 1982. That same year she began attending community meetings, getting involved in local campaigns, and was appointed president of the Spartanburg County Republican Women where she has served ever since.

More than politics, Ms. Riley is a major contributor to her local pregnancy center and supports upstate veterans undergoing hospice care. She is also active in her church and other organizations that work to assist our fellow South Carolinians every single day.

A former teacher, her life's work has been to make the world a better place for her students, her neighbors, and future generations.

Ms. Riley is a true public servant who has made a significant and lasting impact on South Carolinians. I thank Mary Ann for over 30 years of service to the people of Spartanburg County and the upstate as a whole.

#### CELEBRATING DIWALI

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Diwali and honor its message of light triumphing over darkness.

This Sunday, families in San Joaquin County and across the world will gather to celebrate the festival of lights with their families and friends.

Diwali holds a special place in the hearts of the South Asian community and serves as a beacon of hope, unity, and joy.

My wife grew up celebrating Diwali with her own family. From lighting diyas to decorating her doorstep with rangoli, it is a chance now to make sure that that tradition lives on with my own daughter and her Indian heritage celebrating the values that Diwali embodies.

I am so grateful to the South Asian community whose hard work, dedication, and vibrant culture are such an important part of San Joaquin County and across the United States.

Madam Speaker, I hope this year's Diwali is filled with joy, love, and plenty of good sweets.

#### RECOGNIZING MR. GERALD McCLELLAN ON VETERANS DAY

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

Ms. LETLOW. Madam Speaker, in honor of Veterans Day, I would like to take the time to recognize one of our very own veterans from the Fifth District of Louisiana.

Mr. Gerald McClellan, a resident of Pineville, Louisiana, is a retired Master Sergeant E-8 of the United States Army. He joined the Army straight out of high school in 1973, went through vigorous training, and spent his deployment in the demilitarized zone between North and South Korea.

He distinguished himself with outstanding achievements, going on to receive the Meritorious Service Medal upon retirement for impeccable service to the military.

On Veterans Day, we reflect on the service and sacrifice of our Nation's veterans like Gerald. They are responsible for protecting and ensuring that our freedoms continue to last from generation to generation.

We must never forget that we are the land of the free because of the brave.

Today we give our most sincere gratitude to our veterans. Their duty and fidelity to the cause of freedom is something for which they will forever be honored. Today and every day we thank them for their service.

#### REPUBLICANS ARE CUTTING FUNDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

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

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to House Republicans' transportation and housing appropriations bill.

This week Republicans are fast-tracking a bill that would make it

more difficult for people in North Carolina to commute to work and find an affordable place to live.

Specifically, this legislation slashes funding for the HOME program, the sole Federal housing program dedicated to affordable housing construction.

Under their plan, funding will be cut by two-thirds, and 17,000 fewer affordable homes will be built or rehabilitated in the coming fiscal year.

I consistently hear from constituents about the high cost of housing and how it is an unbearable burden. Across North Carolina, 25 percent of all renter households are categorized as extremely low-income. These families need our help.

Madam Speaker, we must do more to make housing affordable, and we must reject this deeply flawed bill.

#### BIDEN DEFICIT THREATENS FAMILIES

(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. Madam Speaker, last month the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget reported on the final Monthly Treasury Statement for 2023 by the Department of the Treasury.

The U.S. deficit totaled \$2 trillion. This figure is double the deficit of 2022 and higher than the Congressional Budget Office projected in June.

Officially, the deficit grew \$320 billion from 2022. As a share of the economy, the deficit was 7.5 percent of the gross domestic product. This is larger than at any time in American history outside of war, recession, or national emergency.

Republicans, led by Speaker MIKE JOHNSON, will continue to fight to pass legislation to reduce the deficit helping American families.

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

The New York Post this week warns a 9/11 attack in America is imminent.

□ 1215

#### HONORING AMERICANS WHO SACRIFICED SO MUCH

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the 16 million brave men and women alive today who valiantly served this Nation in the United States military.

Every year, on November 11, we unite as a nation to celebrate and honor all veterans who selflessly put their lives on the line, fighting for the freedoms that make this the greatest country on Earth.

Veterans have made considerable sacrifices serving this Nation. We must honor them and ensure they receive the benefits promised for their noble service. That is why I am introducing the Veterans Education is Timeless Act of 2023, removing arbitrary expiration dates for education benefits for veterans and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and uphold the commitments we have made to the men and women who serve and fought on our behalf.

As we approach Veterans Day, I express my profound gratitude to all veterans and especially recognize the 45,000 who live in Virginia's Fifth District. It is an honor to recognize and represent these Americans who sacrificed so much to defend the freedoms we enjoy.

#### REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE CHAMPION CINDY MONTANEZ

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of an environmental justice champion, fighter for workers' rights, and former southern California assemblymember, Cynthia Montanez.

Cindy's activism started at UCLA, where she participated in a 14-day hunger strike to help establish the Chicano Studies Department.

At 25, she became the youngest councilmember of her hometown of San Fernando.

At 27, she became mayor.

At 28, she was the youngest woman elected to the State legislature.

Cindy used her talents to create immediate change for our communities. As an assistant general manager of the L.A. Department of Water and Power, she helped transition the Nation's largest publicly owned utility to cleaner energy. As CEO of TreePeople, she transformed the organization into the fastest-growing environmental nonprofit in southern California.

Madam Speaker, I thank Cindy for her tireless advocacy for Latino communities in California. She is gone way too soon. Rest in power.

#### HONORING VIETNAM VET WALTER BUECHI

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor a Vietnam veteran and Clarence, New York, resident, Walter Buechi.

For most of his life, Walt has been dedicated to serving our country and our community. In 1965, he answered the call to serve our Nation and spent 18 months as a radio operator in Viet-

nam. However, his service didn't stop when he made it back home.

Instead, he joined the Clarence Fire Department, where he continued to exemplify the qualities that make him a hero in the truest sense. As a firefighter, Walt put his life on the line once again. He has gone above and beyond the call to serve, and we owe him a debt of gratitude that can never fully be repaid.

Walt is facing his next battle as he has been diagnosed with stage IV cancer. When we support veterans healthcare in this body, he is the kind of hero that we are helping.

Madam Speaker, I ask our Nation to pray for Walt. We are grateful for his remarkable contributions to our great Nation, to western New York, and to the town of Clarence.

#### DYCKMAN BASKETBALL IS BACK

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dyckman basketball, the red carpet of streetball.

In my district, basketball is everything to Dyckman. It is the opportunity to connect with friends and neighbors in fellowship and celebration of the vibrancy of our community.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a halt in the 30-year tradition of the Dyckman summer basketball tournament, but I am here to tell you that Dyckman is back.

Featured in the sports documentary "Dyckman: The Comeback," the incredible team of Dyckman sports worldwide, CEO Ken Stevens and Sharon Bond, or Ms. B as she is known throughout the community, have poured a tremendous amount of love into the sport.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate them on their Emmy award-winning documentary, and I congratulate the dedicated Dyckman team.

Dyckman basketball is back.

#### CONGRATULATING KEYSTONE CENTRAL CAREER AND TECHNOLOGY CENTER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Keystone Central Career and Technology Center in Clinton County, Pennsylvania.

Keystone Central Career and Technology Center was named a semifinalist and received \$10,000 as part of the Career Z Challenge.

The Career Z Challenge, run through the Department of Education's Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, aims to expand work-based learning opportunities for Gen Z students.

Schools, nonprofit organizations, and local educational agencies in urban and

rural communities across 35 States submitted entries describing their plans to create collaborative and sustainable work-based learning ecosystems to provide students with interconnected and expansive career development opportunities from grades 9 through 12.

Semifinalists will be eligible to move on to phase three, and during the 2023-2024 school year, semifinalists will receive technical assistance to support the refinement and implementation of their proposed WBL ecosystem plans.

They are also participating in a community of practice and have access to learning workshops, peer collaboration opportunities, and other resources.

Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am pleased to see the next generation of learning of the many job opportunities CTE provides.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Keystone Central Career and Technology Center and wish them good luck in phase three.

#### COMMUNITY FUNDING PROJECTS REJECTED FROM T-HUD BILL

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

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, as we consider the T-HUD appropriations bill, I stand here to remind this legislative body of the 3 of nearly 3,000 community funding projects that were rejected from this bill in July, including the LGBTQ Center of Reading in my home community.

The very sad reality can be boiled down to this: These organizations were rejected by the GOP-led House simply because they had LGBTQ in their names.

Let's be clear, these services provide lifesaving services like food and shelter for those who have been rejected from their homes because of whom they love. They equip our vulnerable populations with the tools they need for future success—financial literacy, professional resumes, and life skills, among many other things.

Unfortunately, the Republicans who pulled this funding are likely hopeful that the American people will not see this bigoted and targeted approach for what it is, but what we do here today does send a very clear message to our LGBTQ community. It is a message that says that too many of my colleagues in Congress don't want to support these vital community investments simply because of who they serve. We owe it to the American people to do better and to serve everyone.

Madam Speaker, for my daughter Molly, I ask those who are affected by this to not accept this bigotry and discrimination any longer.

## CONGRATULATING FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF COOKEVILLE, TENNESSEE

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

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate First Baptist Church of Cookeville on 150 years of spreading the Gospel throughout middle Tennessee.

I was raised at First Baptist Church and came to know my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, was baptized, and was a member for many years of First Baptist. My wife, Chelsea, and I were married in this church. Needless to say, I have received many blessings from this congregation.

The church was organized in 1873 with a congregation of 34 members. They agreed on a church covenant, which reads, in part: The purpose of this body is to advance the church in knowledge, holiness, and comfort, promoting prosperity and spirituality.

They continue to fulfill that commitment 150 years later.

The folks at Cookeville First Baptist embody what it means to have a servant's heart, whether it be through their many Bible study groups or missions, like Operation Christmas Child or their Family Life Center.

Today, the church enjoys a membership of more than 1,300 members. That is the result of 150 years of persistence and faith.

Madam Speaker, I pray they will continue to be a blessing to our community for the next 150 years.

## REMEMBERING THE 12 LIVES LOST AT BORDERLINE BAR AND GRILL 5 YEARS AGO

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I come before this body to remember the 12 innocent lives lost 5 years ago today at Borderline Bar and Grill in Thousand Oaks, California.

Our community was forever changed by this tragedy inflicted by the plague of gun violence that continues to permeate every corner of our country.

While House Republicans wasted precious time fighting with each other over electing a new Speaker for 21 days and 21 hours, there were 33 more mass shootings, 1,030 people died from gun violence, and another 2,072 people were injured.

Within hours of Speaker JOHNSON being elected, there was a mass shooting in Maine that resulted in the tragic loss of 18 lives and left 13 others injured.

Madam Speaker, the American people are no longer satisfied with empty offers of thoughts and prayers in times of such tragedies. They want action, not meaningless words.

In memory of the Borderline 12, I call on Speaker JOHNSON and my Republican colleagues to bring commonsense, lifesaving gun safety legislation, including a ban on assault weapons, to the floor now.

## CELEBRATING HMONG NEW YEAR

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, we are beginning November here. What does November mean? It varies from city to city, but it means the Hmong New Year.

Madam Speaker, I call to my colleagues' attention that some time during November or December, if you have a Hmong population close by, they will be celebrating their new year. I encourage everyone to show up and learn more about Hmong culture, their beautiful dress, great clothes, and great music.

Our country always has a debt to pay to the Hmong, who fought during the Vietnam war against totalitarian atheism, the most evil form of government we have ever known. Afterward, they came to our country.

Wisconsin has the third most Hmong in the country, and I have gotten to know many. I have yet to run into a Hmong family—I am sure they must exist—that was not doing very well. Everyone was getting married, having children, living the American Dream.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate my Hmong friends. I look forward to celebrating separate the new year in Oshkosh and Sheboygan. I hope that anyone listening out there finds their local Hmong New Year celebration.

## CONGRATULATING TOWN OF BETHEL, NORTH CAROLINA, UPON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the town of Bethel in Pitt County, North Carolina, on its remarkable 150th anniversary.

This past weekend, Mayor Carl and Mrs. Wilson, board members and staff, former Mayor and State Representative Gloristine Brown, Pitt County Board of Commissioners Chair Mary Perkins-Williams, Sheriff Paula Dance, town residents, and others far and near joined to commemorate the significant milestone.

Bethel is not just a town. It is a place of cherished experiences, stories, and enriched traditions that have enhanced countless lives. Indeed, Bethel offers old-time charm and exceptional family-friendly amenities.

Madam Speaker, I wish the town residents many more years filled with joy, unity, and prosperity.

□ 1230

## NAHASDA REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mrs. PELTOLA. Madam Speaker, I have heard stories from people across Alaska, some of the most rural and distant parts of our country, of about 20 people sharing a house with only three bedrooms and one bathroom. They sleep in shifts because they don't have enough space.

Without enough places to live, people are being forced out of their communities, the communities they love and the Native cultures they were raised in.

The Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act, or NAHASDA, is called the backbone of Indian housing for the essential support block grants and financing it guarantees in order to develop critical affordable housing and community facilities. However, 15 years of inflation since the last reauthorization has decimated housing production.

I am asking Congress to reauthorize and properly fund NAHASDA. We cannot force Alaska Natives to make a choice between the communities of their place-based cultures or a roof over their head.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4664, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 847 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 847

*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. 4664) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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 read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to H.R. 4664, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in

section 3 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered 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 except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. During consideration of H.R. 4664 for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of H.R. 4664 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam 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 gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 847, providing for the House's continued consideration of appropriations bills for fiscal year 2024.

The rule provides for H.R. 4664, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2024, to be considered under a structured rule with 104 amendments made in order.

It provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and support the underlying pieces of legislation.

H.R. 4664, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2024, was subject to a robust committee process, one that saw both Republicans and Democrats offer amendments during the markup.

This is a work product the whole House can be proud of. Chairman WOMACK and his team, working together with Ranking Member HOYER and his team, have produced a comprehensive and timely bill. While I am sure the two sides have differences of opinion on the final product, I am also sure I am joined by all my colleagues in thanking them for their hard work.

There are many aspects of this appropriations bill that I want to highlight. First and foremost is the commitment to rooting out wasteful spending.

The bill limits funds for 31 unauthorized accounts for a savings to the American taxpayer of approximately \$64 million. It ensures that the Small Business Administration focuses on its core mission—helping small businesses—and not undertaking unnecessary climate activism outside of its primary responsibilities.

The bill also claws back wasteful spending from previous fiscal years, including money used to hire an army of IRS workers. The American people have been very clear. They don't want tens of thousands of additional IRS agents.

I also commend this bill as a product of strong cooperation between the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing Financial Services Committee, on which I am proud to sit. The bill furthers a lot of the efforts we have been working on in that committee.

It would prevent the SEC under Chair Gensler from finalizing rules that vastly overstep the Commission's jurisdiction, including ones that push ESG and Green New Deal agenda items over the interests of everyday investors.

The bill prevents the Federal Housing Finance Agency from forcing responsible borrowers to subsidize individuals with bad credit.

This bill also eliminates funding for the Federal Insurance Office and stops the Federal Government from taking over the insurance industry, an industry that is already successfully regulated at the State level.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the waste and abuse that this bill prudently targets, starting with penalizing the administration for not submitting its budget request on time. If the Presi-

dent can't complete this task, then there must be consequences. This is a basic principle in business and in our households, one our government would be prudent to similarly adopt.

Additionally, this legislation prohibits funds for Federal agencies until telework policies are reinstated to prepandemic standards. The pandemic is over, and it is long past time that the Federal Government returned to work. Our constituents deserve fully staffed and responsive agencies, and I commend Chairman WOMACK for his commitment to this principle.

Finally, we are here today and over the course of this week to consider more appropriations bills like the one provided for in this rule because we must rein in Federal spending.

To be more exact, this bill comes in at approximately 20 percent below the President's request, without sacrificing essential government functions. If enacted, it represents a modest 7 percent cut below last year's fiscal level.

The most important number we should all keep in mind is \$33 trillion, that is \$33 trillion in debt. We can no longer afford to kick the can down the metaphorical road. Madam Speaker, there is no road left.

We need to pass this rule and the FSGG appropriations bill so we can continue to deliver on the fiscal sanity that puts us back on the right path.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana, Mrs. HOUCHIN, for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, after wasting weeks as Republicans tried to get their house in order, we have just 10 days left to fund the government or we shut down.

My colleagues across the aisle might say that the House has already passed 7 of 12 funding bills, but they know those bills are so extreme that they won't get the necessary Democratic or Republican votes in the Senate and don't have any chance of becoming law.

We are reviewing another extreme bill today, H.R. 4664, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2024.

Let's start with the numbers. The bill is 58 percent below last year's level. If any of you had a business or just balanced your housing budget, what would happen if you cut almost 60 percent from what you had to spend from one year to the next? Your business or your household would fail.

If a budget reflects your values, this extreme Republican bill values the wealthy, the well-connected, the fraudsters, and the scammers.

A family putting their baby to bed tonight knows cribs are safe. The babies aren't being strangled because of the work of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, which recently turned 50.

What are Republicans doing in this bill to this well-honored and respected

Commission? They are cutting their funding by 10 percent, so big corporations can put profit over safety. Right now a small business entrepreneur in a rural community or an affordable housing developer in an urban neighborhood that the big banks ignore can secure financing from a community development financial institution.

What is H.R. 4664 doing about those great affordable housing opportunities? They are cutting the CDFI funding by \$45 million. They are cutting the Small Business Administration's entrepreneurship program by \$72 million. They are destroying opportunities that could be created in small places that big banks just don't care about.

We want to grow the middle class and lower costs for Americans, but this bill would do the opposite by slashing the budgets of the agencies that protect consumers.

American consumers can sometimes feel helpless against the robocalls, the credit card and bank fees, and the financial scammers. Well, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau helped those consumers get \$19 billion back when they went after those scammers, when they went after those excessive fees. However, this bill would weaken this agency, an agency that was born out of the 2008 financial crisis and the Great Recession, a crisis that I will remind everybody occurred on Republicans' watch and brought great suffering to families and businesses.

This bill also undermines oversight of Wall Street when it cuts the SEC by \$149 million. Remember the SEC? It also came into existence, but this time during the Great Depression. In each financial crisis we have mentioned, Democratic Congresses and Presidents stood with small businesses and working families against greed. Yes, the greed of Wall Street and the greed of payday lenders.

This bill tells us that extreme Republicans are okay with dangerous or defective products making their way into homes. Indeed, last night, one Republican Member said we should just get rid of the Consumer Product Safety Commission or just let them make recommendations, maybe Congress will act. It is ridiculous to get rid of this important consumer product safety agency.

Finally, this bill rescinds \$10.2 billion from funding we gave to the IRS last year. Then it cuts more funds for the IRS to modernize or protect itself from cybersecurity threats. Why would you want to make the IRS vulnerable to cybersecurity threats?

To add insult, the bill would keep the IRS from developing a program so Americans can file their taxes for free. Really? You want to make sure for-profit companies can charge taxpayers to file their taxes? How cynical is that?

□ 1245

At a time when Americans are worried about fentanyl killing their loved ones, this bill cuts funding for the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

At a time when Americans are worried about terrorism, this bill cuts funding for the National Security Council and Homeland Security Advisory Council.

While this bill cuts funding for CDFI, Democrats are fighting to grow the middle class by making housing more affordable.

While Republicans cut funding to the SBA, we are putting people over politics by supporting small businesses.

Democrats, as we have been saying for the last 3 years, put people over politics.

Unfortunately, this weekend the Republican Speaker of the House stated he would not put people over politics. Well, today's appropriations bill actually proves that.

I will end where I started. There are just 11 days to fund the government. We need spending bills that are bipartisan, that address the real needs of American taxpayers instead of just protecting the wealthy and well off.

House Democrats want to work in a bipartisan manner to get things done for the American people, but we will not stand for the extreme culture wars, the attacks on reproductive healthcare, and the draconian cuts House Republicans keep putting up for a vote in these appropriations bills.

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

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the sky is not falling. I would remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the spending levels in this bill are the same as they were just 10 months ago. The sky was not falling then, and the sky is not falling now.

We are talking about cuts to some agencies, agencies that are intent on overregulating our small and midsize banks out of business.

If our colleagues on the left would have their way, we would have three major national banks and no access to community lending.

I certainly think my constituents would rather have access to their community banks than worry about how much funding level we are giving those agencies.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank my great friend and colleague from the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from Indiana, for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, since January 2021, the Biden administration has been laser focused on making the fantasy of the Green New Deal a reality for Americans.

Earlier this year, the Securities and Exchange Commission proposed the so-called Climate Disclosure Project, which would require an entirely new level of burdensome, costly emissions reporting.

Now, who will this rule impact the most? Not big business, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like people to believe. Instead, all of these new compliance costs, as with almost every new rule and regulation imposed by this Biden administration, will be felt mostly and most painfully by small business owners, farmers, and independent manufacturers.

Let me be clear: This misguided rule will hurt hardworking Americans and hinder economic growth at a time where we should be focused on creating jobs and lowering inflation.

Madam Speaker, the bottom line is this: Main Street can't afford the Biden economy. The American people can't afford it.

It hasn't stopped this administration from plowing ahead with even more bans and phaseouts and regulations on everything from internal combustion engines to gas stoves.

My district sees some of the coldest and harshest winters in the country in a State that, thanks to Governor Kathy Hochul, is already one step ahead of the Biden administration in eliminating natural gas as an affordable and reliable source of clean energy.

We can't afford to allow this administration to take what climate extremists in States like New York and California are doing and turn it into a nationwide effort.

At a time when this world is on fire and the rising cost of living is unsustainable, the last thing President Biden should be worried about is banning gas stoves, nickel-and-diming small businesses for emissions, and mobilizing a new IRS and a whole lot more agents to target hardworking families and small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 4664 and protect American families, farmers, and small businesses from this administration's reckless agenda.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Americans know that the climate catastrophe is wreaking havoc on our economy.

I come from a State where we lost billions due to wildfires that were caused by many factors, but this repeats itself over and over again.

Across America, there is no place that is safe from the climate catastrophe: the flooding, the hurricanes, the fires, the drought, and those cost money.

They cost our farmers money. They cost our ranchers money, our cities, our towns, our governments, and so yes, we must address that.

In fact, this administration was elected precisely because he said he would address that. We need to emphasize that. To pretend that there isn't an economic cost is to put your head in the sand.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), my wonderful colleague representing the District

of Columbia, which is a Democratically elected city, and we should respect it as such.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose this rule and the fiscal year 2024 Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill.

The bill blocks, repeals, or amends ten laws and policies adopted by the District of Columbia's locally elected officials.

The rule also makes in order three amendments that would block D.C. from spending its local funds, which consist of local taxes and fees, to carry out local D.C. laws and policies.

While Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, it does not have a constitutional duty to do so. Instead, legislating on local D.C. matters is a choice.

The Supreme Court has held that Congress may delegate "fully legislative power" to D.C. on local D.C. matters.

D.C.'s local legislature, the D.C. Council, has 13 members. All members are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like the laws the Council adopts, they can vote those members out of office. That is called democracy.

Congress has 435 voting Members. The Members are elected by residents of the States. None are elected by or accountable to D.C. residents.

If D.C. residents do not like the laws Congress adopts, they cannot vote the Members out of office. This is the antithesis of democracy.

The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation. Yet, D.C. residents cannot consent to any action taken by Congress, whether on national or local matters, and pay full Federal taxes. Indeed, D.C. pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State and more total Federal taxes than 19 States.

D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves. If House Republicans cared about Democratic principles affecting D.C. residents, they would bring my D.C. statehood bill, which would give D.C. residents voting representation in Congress and full local self-government to the floor.

Congress has the constitutional authority to admit the State of Washington, D.C. It simply lacks the will.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I just want to touch on a few things mentioned by my colleague on the other side of the aisle.

We talk about no economic cost to what they are doing in this bill in terms of climate, but we saw during the collapse of Silicon Valley Bank and Signature Bank that our regulators Federally were spending more time focused on climate risk to our financial sector than to systemic risk.

This is an asleep-at-the-wheel approach of the Biden administration that we are trying to avoid in this piece of legislation.

My colleagues also discussed the District of Columbia. Well, the District of Columbia is receiving Federal funds in this piece of legislation which does give us an opportunity to weigh in on what we think the policies and the policy riders that should follow within that should be attached to this piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), an esteemed Member who I look forward to hearing his viewpoints on the importance of addressing the urgent needs that Americans have told us about such as how do we lower costs, how do we make sure that we bring into line Americans' dreams with Americans' realities.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the lack of resources for safe and affordable housing in the Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development funding bill.

Sadly, it does nothing to address the significant housing and community development needs of our constituents.

Across the country, Madam Speaker, more Americans than ever are cost burdened with the price of rent. Parents are worried about whether they can keep a roof over their families' head. Frankly, Madam Speaker, the rent is too damn high.

This bill rescinds \$560 million from accounts that would address the current harmful conditions of the housing that residents currently face.

The New York City Housing Authority has revealed that over the next 5 years, to address the current and future capital needs, the agency will need \$60 billion. These needs will only continue to compound.

Instead of helping make these investments, the bill funds the public housing fund at a \$150 million below last year's fiscal budget.

Americans deserve to live in safe, reliable, and dignified housing, Madam Speaker. The bill does nothing, absolutely nothing, to accomplish this, and I urge my colleagues to vote against its final passage.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Madam Speaker, again, this bill funds at a level that we were just at 10 months ago. The sky

was not falling then. The sky is not falling now, despite protestations of my friends from the other side of the aisle.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Resolution 847 and to reiterate our commitment to equal justice under the law.

As Members of this distinguished body, we all take an oath to support and defend the Constitution. Unfortunately, the Financial Services and General Government bill we will consider this week will undermine the constitutional rights of Americans.

In this legislation, Federal public defenders face a steep cut—an underfunding of nearly \$100 million. This is unacceptable and will disrupt equal access to justice.

Nearly 90 percent of defendants in Federal criminal cases cannot afford an attorney, which is their constitutional right to have. If there are not enough Federal defenders, cases could be delayed, and the cost will be more in the long run.

□ 1300

Defendants will be referred to private panel attorneys, who typically have less experience and cost more. That makes no sense.

This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. This is an issue of constitutional rights, and it is smart fiscal policy.

For several years, I have led bipartisan efforts to adequately fund Federal public defenders, and this year, I have led several bipartisan calls to fully fund our Federal defenders.

We must defeat this rule and return the bill to committee so we can follow through on our constitutional responsibility to adequately fund Federal public defenders. It is their right to have counsel. If it is not afforded, they will be referred to panel attorneys, who cost more. That makes no sense, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from the Defender Services Advisory Group, emphasizing that failing to adequately fund Federal public defense will inflict a cascade of dangerous and damaging consequences on their program, on clients, and on our criminal justice system.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PUBLIC & COMMUNITY DEFENDERS, DEFENDER SERVICES ADVISORY GROUP,

*Topeka, KS, November 1, 2023.*

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,  
Chair, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Hon. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN,  
Chair, Senate Committee on Appropriations,  
Subcommittee on Financial Services and  
General Government.

Hon. KAY GRANGER,  
Chair, House Committee on Appropriations.

Hon. STEVE WOMACK,  
Chair, House Committee on Appropriations,  
Subcommittee on Financial Services and  
General Government.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
Vice Chair, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Hon. BILL HAGERTY,  
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government.

Hon. ROSA DELAUR, Ranking Member, House Committee on Appropriations.

Hon. STENY HOYER,  
Ranking Member, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government.

DEAR CHAIR MURRAY, VICE CHAIR COLLINS, SENATOR VAN HOLLEN, SENATOR HAGERTY, CHAIR GRANGER, RANKING MEMBER DELAUR, REPRESENTATIVE WOMACK, AND REPRESENTATIVE HOYER: We write on behalf of the Federal Public and Community Defenders with an update on the federal defender appropriation crisis. We appreciate the opportunity to provide more information on this evolving topic.

Earlier this month, upon the close of FY 2023, the Judiciary directed us to prepare a fall re-estimate of our budgetary needs for FY 2024. The fall re-estimate reflects two realities: 1) the Judiciary's recognition that we need more on-board staff to adequately represent our clients; and 2) the fact that—due in substantial part to the emergency cost-saving measures we initiated earlier this summer—the defender program has a greater carryforward into FY 2024 than we first projected.

The defender-initiated cost-saving measures have narrowed the gap between the current congressional marks and the minimum appropriation required to meet our obligations. Before, we needed \$136.3 million above the Senate mark and about \$108 million above the House mark simply to maintain current services. Today—through defender discipline and diligence over the last fiscal quarter—we need at least \$109 million above the Senate mark or \$80.6 million above the House mark. We hope these lower, re-estimated numbers will make it easier for Congress to increase our appropriation by the amount we need to fulfill our constitutional mandate.

The austerity measures our program implemented over the past fiscal quarter have reduced the total appropriation we need to fulfill our mission in FY 2024. But we must emphasize that our efforts to conserve resources have not been without consequence to our program and our clients. Defender offices around the country have been short-staffed, which strains capacity and morale. We have seen an uptick in defender attrition, an inability to draw and retain experienced defenders, and a reduced availability of defender offices to take on critical assignments both within their districts and in connection with high-profile prosecutorial initiatives (such as McGirt cases). We are already bearing the burden of the appropriation shortfall.

We must also emphasize that our fiscal situation will dramatically change if we are subject to a prolonged continuing resolution

in FY 2024 that caps us at our FY 2023 appropriation minus one percent. In that scenario, our FY 2024 appropriation amount would be \$1.368 billion. At that level, we would need an additional \$136.9 million to meet our FY 2024 financial requirements as outlined in our fall re-estimate.

As we have explained elsewhere, failing to adequately fund federal public defense will inflict a cascade of damaging consequences on our program, on our clients, and on the judicial system. These consequences will cost more in the long run than they will save now. We remain in a dire situation where—barring an increase of at least \$109 million to the current Senate mark for our program (and \$80.6 million to the current House mark)—we will face catastrophic layoffs, unpaid furloughs, or panel deferments that will seriously damage the federal criminal system and our clients.

We are grateful that Congress still has an opportunity to appropriate or supplement the sum necessary to avert these grave consequences. And we deeply appreciate your ongoing support for the federal defender program. Please be in touch if you need any further information from us or if you have questions about our situation.

Sincerely,

MELODY BRANNON,  
Federal Public Defender for the District of Kansas, Co-Chair, Defender Services Advisory Group.

CRAIG ALBEE,  
Executive Director, Federal Defender Services of Wisconsin, CDO-Chair, Defender Services Advisory Group.

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

Mr. Speaker, with the Nation \$33 trillion in debt, a number higher than the U.S. GDP, Congress has the responsibility to reduce Federal spending when possible.

According to the CBO, the United States ran a \$1.7 trillion deficit in 2023, driven by \$6.1 trillion in spending and \$4.4 trillion in revenues following a \$1.4 trillion deficit in fiscal year 2022.

This type of spending is completely unacceptable, and every Member of Congress knows it.

With regard to funding for public defenders, \$1.14 billion is afforded in this bill for public defender services. This provides \$8.7 billion for the judiciary, of which \$110.4 million is above the fiscal year 2023 enacted level.

There is no amount of spending cuts that our friends on the left will support. We have to get our fiscal house in order. This is a responsible step forward while still providing for the needs of the American people.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we hear time and again that these draconian spending cuts are necessary because of the deficit, but let's take a step back and think about how we got here in the first place and what we really can do about it.

We need to remember that 36 percent of the debt is due to Republican tax

cuts, the Iraq war, the Republican war. This does not include the \$12.5 billion that Republicans are adding to the deficit from their cuts to the IRS last week.

Clearly, Republicans like to talk about this, but they don't fix the problem. Indeed, they are the problem. Their tax cuts are the problem.

While the House GOP continues to blame critical social, economic development, and law enforcement programs for the Nation's debt, they hide the fact that if it weren't for those tax cuts enacted under President Bush and President Trump, our debt wouldn't be an issue. Indeed, the report shows that revenues would have kept up with spending if we wouldn't have had these tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, let's remind people where those tax cuts went. Who benefited? The wealthy and the corporations that to this day still do not pay their fair share in taxes.

If you want to address the issue of the deficit, let's address the issue of the tax cuts, which you can see on this chart are primarily due to the Trump and the Bush tax cuts, which isn't included on here, or the Reagan tax cuts, which is when we started this downward spiral.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would note for my friends on the other side of the aisle that 40 percent of the debt was incurred under NANCY PELOSI. Both parties are responsible, but it is only House Republicans that seem to be focused on cutting Federal spending. It just simply cannot continue.

It is why House Republicans have put forward and support a bipartisan debt commission. We are talking about discretionary spending in these bills, not mandatory spending. The lion's share of our debt is due to our mandatory spending. We must address that.

Again, I commend Chairman WOMACK on this piece of legislation for trying to cut unnecessary programs, stop funding for unauthorized programs, cut spending, and get us back on a better path of fiscal sanity.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which clearly states that it is the people's House's duty to keep our promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and to fight against any cuts to these vital programs.

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. MURPHY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA), to discuss our proposal.

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, we all know that Social Security and Medicare are core promises that we make as a country to every American. More than 66 million seniors, people with disabilities, and children rely on Social Security, but make no mistake, my colleagues in the majority are committed to cutting these programs down to the bone.

In 2020, even our new Speaker wrote a budget proposal that called for raising Medicare and Social Security eligibility ages. It called for \$2 trillion in cuts to Medicare and \$750 billion in cuts to Social Security. It would be devastating to millions of people, including 8 million veterans who rely on Social Security and Medicare every single day and middle-class people across the country who would see their benefits cut. Cost of living increases that seniors rely on would also be slashed.

The new Speaker is calling for a commission, which would be empowered to slash Social Security and fast-track his extreme proposals through Congress.

Speaker JOHNSON is so out of touch that he also claimed Roe v. Wade and reproductive rights now require us to make more cuts to Medicare and Social Security. This is not the agenda the American people accept or support.

Congress should come together to pass H. Res. 178 and commit to protecting Social Security and Medicare for all Americans. No cuts and no stripping benefits away from the people who work for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up this important legislation.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing to say that Republicans want to cut Social Security and Medicare, to quote my colleague, “cutting these programs down to the bone,” doesn’t make it so.

Republicans are committed to reducing spending. We are committed to trying to find a way to get our fiscal house in order and to get us out of the calamity that we are currently in with our financial situation.

The debt commission won’t make cuts. It might make recommendations on how we can restore the Nation’s fiscal health, which is a matter of national security. It doesn’t matter if we don’t make cuts or if we make cuts if Social Security becomes insolvent. We cannot let that happen, not on our watch.

Republicans are taking the initiative and taking the lead on trying to solve the problem.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, I will touch on the idea that the Trump tax cuts are suddenly the Pelosi tax cuts. That is ridiculous. We know the Trump tax cuts. They claimed them. They want to extend them. In fact, they have already been working on a bill in the Ways and Means Committee that would increase tax cuts for the wealthy, but let’s put that aside.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about something else that is in this bill that is very problematic. We know that we are in a period when elections are so key, and preserving the integrity of our elections and making sure that those who work on the democratic process, the day-to-day process of making sure that our elections work, have all the help that they can get.

Right now, State and local election administrators are working hard to make sure that is possible, but they are afraid.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the 2023 Brennan Center poll analysis about the high turnover of election officials amid safety threats and political interference.

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

There was no objection.

[From the Brennan Center for Justice, Apr. 25, 2023]

#### POLL OF ELECTION OFFICIALS SHOWS HIGH TURNOVER AMID SAFETY THREATS AND POLITICAL INTERFERENCE

Forty-five percent of local election officials said they fear for the safety of their colleagues.

A new Brennan Center survey of local election officials from around the country shows that many election officials have left the field, and more plan to go. In 2020, confronted with the Covid-19 pandemic, election officials ran what the key government agencies at the time called the “most secure election in American history” with the highest voter turnout in over 100 years. But since then, the election officials have found themselves targeted by a campaign to lie about election results and undermine faith in American democracy.

Scapegoated for election outcomes that some politicians and voters did not like, many election officials have faced death threats, online harassment, and abuse. Political leaders interfered in their work by censoring or replacing some officials who told the truth about election security, and in some states they enacted new laws exposing officials to criminal penalties for minor infractions or for taking proactive steps to help their voters.

The result is hollowing out the ranks of experienced election administration professionals, with potentially more to come in the next year. The survey found that 12 percent of local election officials began their service after the 2020 election cycle. Another 11 percent of current officials say they are very or somewhat likely to leave before November 2024. If these officials follow through and exit their positions, we will have lost approximately 1.5 election officials per day between the November 2020 and 2024 elections.

The loss of institutional knowledge that accompanies such high turnover can mean

that election officials are less aware of resources available to assist them in securing and running their elections. Large numbers of resignations can also result in more administrative mistakes, which can in turn fuel conspiracy theories and threats, continuing the cycle that has led to resignations in the first place.

The findings of our survey provide some explanation as to why election officials continue to leave office at high rates, as well as some clues as to what can be done to staunch the bleeding and offer support where it is needed most, particularly to the field’s newest members.

#### DANGERS ON THE JOB

Threats, abuse, and harassment continue to be a significant concern in the field. Cathy Darling Allen, the clerk and registrar of voters of Shasta County, California, has described fearing for the safety of her staff after discovering a surveillance camera planted at the back entrance of her office used by poll workers during the 2022 primary. At least one other official discovered a wireless video camera aimed at his front door. In Gillespie County, Texas, election staff endured several kinds of harassment, including volunteer poll watchers calling the police and filming staff in a dark parking lot, attempting to forcibly enter a secure ballot vault, and stalking and threatening some staffers. In August 2022, the entire staff resigned, with at least one person citing threats in her resignation letter.

This issue is not limited to a small number of places: our survey shows that nearly one in three election officials have been harassed, abused, or threatened because of their job. Alarmingly, more than one in five are concerned about being physically assaulted on the job in future elections. Election officials worry about their colleagues, with 45 percent of respondents expressing concern for the safety of other election officials and workers in future elections. Not surprisingly then, more than half of respondents expressed concern that the attacks will make it more difficult to retain or recruit election workers in future elections.

#### LACK OF FUNDING HURTS ELECTION SECURITY

At the same time, 74% of local election officials say they need their annual budget to grow to address security and election administration needs over the next five years. Election systems are critical infrastructure vital to our democracy and national security, and Congress’s unwillingness to provide adequate funding is a significant failure. While the Department of Homeland Security’s announcement requiring more federal grant money be dedicated to election security was a step in the right direction, our survey shows there is more work to do.

Election officials say increased funding would allow them to invest in more poll workers and improved voting equipment, as well as strengthen cybersecurity and the physical security of election offices. Many election officials have sought to secure their offices following threats. An election official in Jackson County, Oregon asked the state for about \$80,000 to install bullet-resistant glass and transaction windows at certain office counters after the parking lot was painted with threatening language. The Brennan Center has estimated that implementing basic physical security measures to protect election workers would cost about \$300 million over the next five years.

Our survey shows that election officials are unable to adopt basic physical and cybersecurity measures because they do not have the funds to do so. Of the 49 election officials we interviewed who availed themselves of free cyber hygiene scans provided by DHS’s Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security

Agency and the 54 who received their free physical security assessments, the vast majority implemented at least some of the recommended improvements. But in each category, only 10 adopted all recommendations. Of those who did not adopt more recommendations, lack of funds was the top reason why not.

#### POLITICAL INTERFERENCE

Election officials continue to express concern about political interference in alarmingly high numbers. In the aftermath of the 2020 election, many election officials faced pressure from political leaders to certify certain election outcomes. President Trump notoriously called Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger to ask him to “find 11,780 votes.” In 2021, Arizona legislators transferred powers from the state’s Democratic secretary of state over to the attorney general, apparently to prevent the settlement of lawsuits aiming to improve voter access. In Wisconsin and Arizona, sham partisan reviews of the 2020 election were used to misrepresent the work of election officials and cast doubt on legitimate results.

Many local election officials see this threat of political interference as ongoing, with 56 percent reporting that they are either somewhat or very worried about political leaders engaging in efforts to interfere with how their fellow election officials do their jobs. And more than one in nine say they are concerned about facing pressure to certify election results in favor of a specific candidate or party in future elections.

#### FEDERAL SUPPORT

Most election officials feel that the federal government could be doing more to help, with only 27 percent saying that the federal government is doing a “good job” supporting them in their roles. Election officials have reason to complain. In addition to the \$300 million mentioned above for protecting election workers from new threats and violence, the Brennan Center has also estimated the cost of protecting against insider threats as a result of growing belief in conspiracy theories around elections could similarly exceed \$300 million. Further, we estimated in 2022 that the cost to replace polling place voting machines that are aging out is nearly \$600 million over the following 5 years. Despite these massive numbers, Congress provided just \$75 million in new money for elections last year.

While this failure is frustrating, it’s also worth noting many election officials aren’t aware of the full range of federal services available to them, such as federal grant programs and communications toolkits. This lack of awareness is also an opportunity for the federal government. As soon as possible, federal agencies that provide resources to election officials should develop a comprehensive and coordinated communications plan to establish regular contact with election officials through the 2024 election, promote federal funding opportunities and resources, and provide election officials with a venue to highlight questions and concerns.

By and large, the 2022 election was a success for election administration. There was limited violence, courts pushed back on efforts to refuse to certify elections, and election deniers lost key governor and secretary of state contests.

With the 2024 presidential election approaching, now is the time to ask what we can do to further strengthen election administration. It’s clear that many election officials still feel they face a hostile environment, with more than 1 in 10 saying they very or somewhat likely to exit their office in the relatively short time before November 2024. We should work to strengthen cyber and physical protections for election offices, in-

crease funding, and elevate available resources for election officials.

**Note on Methodology:** Our calculation for the rate of turnover among election officials was made as follows: there are approximately 10,000 local election officials in the United States. In our survey, 12 percent of election officials stated they had replaced their predecessors after November 2020, amounting to 1,200 officials. About 900 days passed between the November 2020 election and when the poll was conducted: 1,200 officials divided by 900 days equals roughly 1.34. 11 percent of officials are unlikely to continue serving through November 2024, amounting to 1,100 officials. 1,100 officials divided by 560 days until the November 2024 election equals roughly 1.96.

**Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.** Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4664 would make it harder for those hardworking election officials to do their jobs.

This bill cuts funding for the Election Assistance Commission by \$8 million. That funding helps State and local officials administer fair, free, and secure elections. H.R. 4664 would also eliminate funding for election security grants.

In New Mexico, the secretary of State has used that money for security trainings and to enhance voter registration.

Don’t we all want more people to vote? I know Democrats do.

Indiana, as an example, has used funds for election security and to upgrade voting equipment. This bill says to those election administrators: Good luck. We are not helping you anymore with these kinds of Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, that is not all. This bill includes multiple riders that would allow private companies, nonprofits, and government contractors to keep their political spending secret. This type of secrecy leads the American public to lose faith in our representative government. Our constituents deserve transparency and to know that we work for them and not some special interest group.

Let’s put this bill aside and instead take up one that our democracy deserves. We must always be working to that more perfect Union that our Constitution calls out, but it requires work and funding our elections at adequate levels.

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

**Mrs. HOUCHEIN.** Mr. Speaker, I note again that this bill is funded at levels that we were just under 10 months ago. If we were operating just fine 10 months ago under the grants that my colleague mentioned, then we will be operating just fine following the passage of this bill.

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

**Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.** Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, think about this rule. It sets out many amendments, and that is what we have been seeing when we have been coming to the floor. We come down and spend 10 minutes debating amendments that would reduce

somebody’s salary to \$1, but then it loses overwhelmingly. Over and over, we keep coming to the floor and debating these amendments that are non-starters from the beginning, but we are taking up precious floor time to do that.

Mr. Speaker, there was an amendment that isn’t in this rule that passed out of committee on a 30–30 vote. It was highly bipartisan and didn’t make it into the underlying bill. We asked last night if we couldn’t bring an amendment like this that clearly has bipartisan support to the floor so that House Members would be able to vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, that amendment was the bipartisan Aguilar-Ciscomani amendment, which would have allowed DACA recipients to work for the Federal Government.

Remember, Dreamers can lawfully work for State, local, and Tribal governments and in the private sector. Americans overwhelmingly support Dreamers who were brought to this country at a young age and grew up here. Up to 73 percent of voters in battleground States support Dreamers and their ability to work.

This is the kind of amendment that this rule should have made in order. I am disappointed that it didn’t.

Mr. Speaker, as noted, after waiting weeks for the Republicans to stop their infighting, we have just 10 days to fund the government. However, my colleagues across the aisle have brought forward a bill that slashes crucial funding for agencies that protect hard-working Americans. Remember, this bill is 58 percent below what was appropriated last year.

What does it do? It makes it easier for scammers, fraudsters, and cheaters to exploit vulnerable citizens, including our seniors and children, and makes it easier for them to get away with it.

The proposed cuts to agencies like the IRS, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission would expose families to greater risk, all while protecting the interests of the wealthy and the well connected.

As if that wasn’t enough, this bill reduces support for election officials by eliminating funding for election security grants.

In June, Congressional Republicans and Democrats and President Biden made a deal to keep the lights on, and we passed the Fiscal Responsibility Act into law. Mr. Speaker, 149 Republicans voted for that law.

Americans expect us to live up to our word. Americans expect us to live up to our promise. Americans expect us to live up to a law that came out of significant and intense negotiation as to what the funding level for government would be.

Unfortunately, Republicans broke that promise. They didn’t even wait a week before they broke that promise.

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

rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

We face another week of big legislation under consideration for a vote on the House floor to better the lives of everyday Americans. H.R. 4664, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2024, as well as the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, which was provided for under a separate rule, are important steps in delivering on our promises for a Nation that is both responsive and responsible to the American people and one that delivers a government that is accountable.

It is Republicans that are keeping our Commitment to America. With the passage of these two bills, we are closer to finalizing the appropriations process. We can continue to lead while also reigning in out-of-control government spending.

As I said in my opening remarks, we need to pass this rule and the FSGG appropriations bill so we can continue delivering fiscal sanity to put us back on a better path.

I look forward to moving these promises out of the House this week. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” on the previous question and “yes” on the rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 847 OFFERED BY  
MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. 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. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY) at 1 o’clock and 30 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 847; and

Adoption of House Resolution 847, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 4664, FINANCIAL SERVICES  
AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT  
APPROPRIATIONS ACT,  
2024.

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. 847) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4664) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 204, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 601]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	Bishop (NC)	Ciscomani	Duncan	Joyce (PA)	Pence
Alford	Boebert	Cline	Dunn (FL)	Kean (NJ)	Perry
Allen	Bost	Cloud	Edwards	Kelly (MS)	Pfluger
Amodei	Brecheen	Clyde	Ellzey	Kelly (PA)	Posey
Armstrong	Buchanan	Cole	Emmer	Kiggans (VA)	Reschenthaler
Arrington	Buck	Collins	Estes	Kiley	Rodgers (WA)
Babin	Bucshon	Comer	Ezell	Kim (CA)	Rogers (AL)
Bacon	Burchett	Crane	Fallon	Kustoff	Rogers (KY)
Baird	Burgess	Crawford	Feenstra	LaHood	Rose
Balderson	Burlison	Crenshaw	Ferguson	LaLota	Rosendale
Barr	Calvert	Curtis	Finstad	LaMalfa	Rouzer
Bean (FL)	Cammack	Davidson	Fischbach	Lamborn	Roy
Bentz	Carey	De La Cruz	Fitzgerald	Langworthy	Rutherford
Bergman	Carl	DesJarlais	Fitzpatrick	Latta	Salazar
Bice	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Fleischmann	LaTurner	Santos
Biggs	Carter (TX)	Donalds	Flood	Lawler	Scalise
Bilirakis	Chavez-DeRemer	Duarte	Fox	Lee (FL)	Schweikert
			Franklin, Scott	Lesko	Scott, Austin
			Fry	Letlow	Self
			Fulcher	Loudermilk	Sessions
			Gaetz	Lucas	Simpson
			Gallagher	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
			Garbarino	Luna	Smith (NE)
			Garcia, Mike	Luttrell	Smith (NJ)
			Gimenez	Mace	Smucker
			Gonzales, Tony	Malliotakis	Spartz
			Good (VA)	Mann	Stauber
			Gooden (TX)	Massie	Steel
			Gosar	Mast	Stefanik
			Granger	McCarthy	Steube
			Graves (LA)	McCaull	Strong
			Graves (MO)	McClintock	Tenney
			Greene (GA)	McCormick	Thompson (PA)
			Grothman	McHenry	Tiffany
			Guest	Meuser	Timmons
			Guthrie	Miller (IL)	Turner
			Hageman	Miller (OH)	Valadao
			Harris	Miller (WV)	Van Drew
			Harshbarger	Miller-Meeks	Van Duyne
			Hern	Mills	Van Orden
			Higgins (LA)	Molinaro	Wagner
			Hill	Moolenaar	Walberg
			Hinson	Mooney	Waltz
			Houchin	Moore (AL)	Weber (TX)
			Hudson	Moore (UT)	Wenstrup
			Huizenga	Moran	Westerman
			Hunt	Murphy	Williams (NY)
			Issa	Nehls	Williams (TX)
			Jackson (TX)	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
			James	Norman	Wittman
			Johnson (LA)	Nunn (IA)	Womack
			Johnson (OH)	Obernolte	Yakym
			Johnson (SD)	Ogles	Zinke
			Jordan	Owens	
			Joyce (OH)	Palmer	
					NAYS—204
			Adams	Craig	Horsford
			Aguilar	Crockett	Houlahan
			Allred	Crow	Hoyer
			Auchincloss	Cuellar	Hoyle (OR)
			Balint	Davids (KS)	Huffman
			Barragán	Davis (IL)	Ivey
			Beatty	Davis (NC)	Jackson (IL)
			Bera	Dean (PA)	Jackson (NC)
			Beyer	DeGette	Jacobs
			Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Jayapal
			Blunt Rochester	DelBene	Jeffries
			Bonamici	Deluzio	Johnson (GA)
			Bowman	DeSaulnier	Kamlager-Dove
			Boyle (PA)	Dingell	Kaptur
			Brown	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
			Brownley	Escobar	Khanna
			Budzinski	Eshoo	Kildee
			Bush	Espauillat	Kilmer
			Caraveo	Evans	Kim (NJ)
			Carbajal	Fletcher	Krishnamoorthi
			Cárdenas	Foster	Kuster
			Carson	Fousshee	Landsman
			Carter (LA)	Frankel, Lois	Larson (CT)
			Cartwright	Frost	Lee (CA)
			Casar	Gallego	Lee (NV)
			Case	Garamendi	Lee (PA)
			Casten	García (IL)	Leger Fernandez
			Castor (FL)	García (TX)	Levin
			Castro (TX)	García, Robert	Lieu
			Cherif	Golden (ME)	Lofgren
			McCormick	Goldman (NY)	Lynch
			Chu	Gomez	Magaziner
			Clark (MA)	Gonzalez	Manning
			Clarke (NY)	Vicente	Matsui
			Cleaver	Gottheimer	McBath
			Clyburn	Green, Al (TX)	McClellan
			Cohen	Grijalva	McCollum
			Connolly	Harder (CA)	McGarvey
			Correa	Hayes	McGovern
			Costa	Higgins (NY)	Meeks
			Courtney	Himes	Menendez





Carter (LA)	Huizenga	Panetta
Carter (TX)	Ivey	Pappas
Cartwright	Jackson (IL)	Pascrell
Casar	Jackson (NC)	Payne
Case	Jacobs	Peltola
Casten	James	Pence
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Perez
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Peters
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (GA)	Pettersen
Cherifius	Johnson (OH)	Pingree
McCormick	Joyce (OH)	Plaskett
Chu	Joyce (PA)	Pocan
Ciscomani	Kamilarov-Dove	Porter
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Pressley
Clarke (NY)	Kean (NJ)	Quigley
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Ramirez
Clyburn	Kelly (PA)	Raskin
Cohen	Khanna	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Kiggans (VA)	Ross
Connolly	Kildee	Ruiz
Correa	Kiley	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kilmer	Rutherford
Courtney	Kim (CA)	Ryan
Craig	Kim (NJ)	Sablan
Crawford	Krishnamoorthi	Salazar
Crenshaw	Kuster	Salinas
Crockett	Kustoff	Sánchez
Crow	LaHood	Sarbanes
Cuellar	LaLota	Scanlon
Davids (KS)	Landsman	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Langworthy	Schiff
Davis (NC)	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Dean (PA)	LaTurner	Scholten
DeGette	Lawler	Schrer
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
DelBene	Lee (FL)	Scott, Austin
Deluzio	Lee (NV)	Scott, David
DeSaulnier	Lee (PA)	Sewell
Diaz-Balart	Leger Fernandez	Sherman
Dingell	Letlow	Sherrill
Doggett	Levin	Simpson
Duarte	Lieu	Slotkin
Escobar	Lofgren	Smith (NE)
Eshoo	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Espaillat	Luetkemeyer	Smith (WA)
Evans	Lynch	Sorensen
Ezell	Mace	Soto
Feeenstra	Magaziner	Spanberger
Fitzpatrick	Malliotakis	Stansbury
Fleischmann	Mann	Stanton
Fletcher	Manning	Stefanik
Flood	Matsui	Steil
Foster	McBath	Stevens
Foushee	McCarthy	Strickland
Frankel, Lois	McClellan	Sykes
Frost	McCollum	Takano
Gallego	McGarvey	Thanedar
Garamendi	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Garbarino	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
Garcia (IL)	Menendez	Thompson (PA)
Garcia (TX)	Meng	Titus
Garcia, Mike	Mfume	Tlaib
Garcia, Robert	Miller (OH)	Tokuda
Golden (ME)	Miller-Meeks	Tonko
Goldman (NY)	Molinaro	Torres (CA)
Gomez	Moolenaar	Torres (NY)
Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)	Trahan
Gonzalez,	Moore (WI)	Trone
Vicente	Morelle	Turner
González-Colón	Moskowitz	Underwood
Gottheimer	Moulton	Valadao
Granger	Moylean	Van Drew
Graves (MO)	Mrvan	Van Orden
Green, Al (TX)	Mullin	Vargas
Griffith	Murphy	Vasquez
Grijalva	Nadler	Veasey
Guest	Napolitano	Velázquez
Guthrie	Neal	Wagner
Harder (CA)	Neguse	Walberg
Hayes	Nehls	Wasserman
Higgins (NY)	Newhouse	Schultz
Hill	Nickel	Waters
Himes	Norcross	Watson Colema
Hinson	Norton	Westerman
Horsford	Nunn (IA)	Wexton
Houlahan	Obernolte	Wild
Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Hoyle (OR)	Omar	Williams (NY)
Huffman	Pallone	Womack

NOT VOTING—16

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

1416

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 25, printed in part B of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), 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 148, noes 277, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 605]

AYES—148

Aderholt	Gooden (TX)	Moran
Alford	Gosar	Murphy
Allen	Graves (LA)	Nehls
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Norman
Babin	Green (TN)	Nunn (IA)

Balderson	Greene (GA)	Name (PA)
Barr	Grothman	Ogles
Bean (FL)	Guest	Owens
Bentz	Guthrie	Palmer
Biggs	Hageman	Pence
Bilirakis	Harris	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Harshbarger	Pfluger
Boebert	Hern	Posey
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Brecheen	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Buchanan	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Houchin	Rosendale
Burchett	Hudson	Rouzer
Burgess	Huizenga	Roy
Burlison	Hunt	Santos
Cammack	Issa	Scalise
Carl	Jackson (TX)	Schweikert
Cline	Johnson (OH)	Self
Cloud	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Clyde	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NE)
Crane	Kelly (MS)	Smucker
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Spartz
Curtis	LaMalfa	Stauber
Davidson	Lamborn	Steel
DesJarlais	Latta	Stefanik
Donalds	Lesko	Steil
Duarte	Loudermilk	Steube
Duncan	Luetkemeyer	Strong
Emmer	Luna	Tenney
Estes	Luttrell	Tiffany
Ezell	Mann	Timmons
Fallon	Massie	Van Drew
Feenstra	Mast	Van Duyne
Ferguson	McClain	Walberg
Finstad	McClintock	Waltz
Fischbach	McCormick	Weber (TX)
Fitzgerald	McHenry	Wenstrup
Foxx	Meuser	Westerman
Franklin, Scott	Miller (IL)	Williams (TX)
Fry	Miller (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Fulcher	Miller-Meeks	Wittman
Gaetz	Mills	Yakym
Gallagher	Mooney	Zinke
Good (VA)	Moore (AL)	

NOES—277

Bishop (GA)	Granger	Obernolte
Blunt Rochester	Green, Al (TX)	Octasio-Cortez
Bonamici	Griffith	Omar
Bowman	Grijalva	Pallone
Boyle (PA)	Harder (CA)	Panetta
Brown	Hayes	Pappas
Brownley	Higgins (NY)	Pascrall
Bucshon	Himes	Payne
Budzinski	Horsford	Peltola
Bush	Houlaahan	Perez
Calvert	Hoyer	Peters
Caraveo	Hoyle (OR)	Pettersen
Carbajal	Huffman	Pingree
Cárdenas	Ivey	Plaskett
Carey	Jackson (IL)	Pocan
Carson	Jackson (NC)	Porter
Carter (GA)	Jacobs	Pressley
Carter (LA)	James	Quigley
Carter (TX)	Jayapal	Ramirez
Cartwright	Jeffries	Raskin
Casar	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Case	Joyce (OH)	Rose
Casten	Kamlager-Dove	Ross
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kean (NJ)	Ruppersberger
Chavez-DeRemer	Kelly (IL)	Rutherford
Cherflus-	Khanna	Ryan
McCormick	Kiggans (VA)	Sablan
Chu	Kildee	Salazar
Ciscomani	Kiley	Salinas
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kim (CA)	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kim (NJ)	Scanlon
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kuster	Schiff
Cole	Kustoff	Schneider
Connolly	LaHood	Scholten
Correa	LaLota	Schrier
Costa	Landsman	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Langworth	Scott, Austin
Craig	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Crawford	LaTurner	Sewell
Crockett	Lawler	Sherman
Crow	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Cuellar	Lee (FL)	Simpson
Davids (KS)	Lee (NV)	Slotkin
Davis (IL)	Lee (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Davis (NC)	Leger Fernandez	Smith (WA)
De La Cruz	Letlow	Sorensen
Dean (PA)	Levin	Soto
DeGette	Lieu	Spanberger
DeLauro	Lofgren	Stansbury
DelBene	Lucas	Stanton
Deluzio	Lynch	Stevens
DeSaulnier	Mace	Strickland
Diaz-Balart	Magaziner	Sykes
Dingell	Malliotakis	Takano
Doggett	Manning	Thanedar
Dunn (FL)	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	McBath	Thompson (MS)
Ellzey	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Escobar	McCaul	Titus
Eshoo	McClellan	Tlaiib
Espauillat	McCollum	Tokuda
Evans	McGarvey	Tonko
Fitzpatrick	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Fleischmann	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Fletcher	Menendez	Trahan
Flood	Meng	Trone
Foster	Mfume	Turner
Foushee	Miller (OH)	Underwood
Frankel, Lois	Molinaro	Valadao
Frost	Moolenaar	Van Orden
Gallego	Moore (UT)	Vargas
Garamendi	Moore (WI)	Vasquez
Garbarino	Morelle	Veasey
Garcia (IL)	Moskowitz	Velázquez
Garcia (TX)	Moulton	Wagner
Garcia, Mike	Moylan	Wasserman
Garcia, Robert	Mrvan	Schultz
Gimenez	Mullin	Waters
Golden (ME)	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Goldman (NY)	Napolitano	Watson
Gomez	Neal	Wexton
Gonzales, Tony	Neguse	Wild
Gonzalez, Tony	Newhouse	Williams (GA)
Vicente	Nickel	Williams (NY)
Gonzalez-Colón	Norcross	Williams
Gottheimer	Norton	Womack

NOT VOTING—13

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1419

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. Collins. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 605.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 29, printed in part B of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), 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 213, noes 210, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

AYES—213

Aderholt	Ellzey	Kiggans (VA)	Adams	Garcia, Robert	Omar	Adams	Garcia, Robert	Omar
Alford	Emmer	Kiley	Aguilar	Golden (ME)	Pallone	Alford	Golden (ME)	Pallone
Allen	Estes	Kim (CA)	Alfred	Goldman (NY)	Panetta	Allen	Goldman (NY)	Panetta
Amodei	Ezell	Kustoff	Auchincloss	Gonzalez,	Pappas	Amodei	Gonzalez,	Pappas
Armstrong	Fallon	LaHood	Balint	Vicente	Pascarella	Armstrong	Vicente	Pascarella
Arrington	Feenstra	LaLota	Barragán	González-Colón	Payne	Arrington	González-Colón	Payne
Babin	Ferguson	LaMalfa	Beatty	Gottheimer	Peltola	Babin	Gottheimer	Peltola
Bacon	Finstad	Lamborn	Bera	Green, Al (TX)	Perez	Bacon	Green, Al (TX)	Perez
Baird	Fischbach	Langworthy	Beyer	Griffith	Peters	Baird	Griffith	Peters
Balderson	Fitzgerald	Latta	Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Petterson	Balderson	Grijalva	Petterson
Barr	Fleischmann	LaTurner	Blunt Rochester	Harder (CA)	Pingree	Barr	Harder (CA)	Pingree
Bean (FL)	Flood	Lawler	Bonamici	Hayes	Plaskett	Bean (FL)	Hayes	Plaskett
Bentz	Foxx	Lee (FL)	Bowman	Higgins (NY)	Pocan	Bentz	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Bergman	Franklin, Scott	Lesko	Boyle (PA)	Himes	Porter	Bergman	Himes	Porter
Bice	Fry	Letlow	Brown	Horsford	Pressley	Bice	Horsford	Pressley
Biggs	Fulcher	Loudermilk	Brownley	Houlihan	Quigley	Biggs	Houlihan	Quigley
Bilirakis	Gaetz	Lucas	Budzinski	Hoyer	Ramirez	Bilirakis	Hoyer	Ramirez
Bishop (NC)	Gallagher	Luetkemeyer	Bush	Hoyle (OR)	Raskin	Bishop (NC)	Hoyle (OR)	Raskin
Boebert	Garbarino	Luna	Caraveo	Huffman	Ross	Boebert	Huffman	Ross
Bost	Garcia, Mike	Luttrell	Carbajal	Ivey	Ruiz	Bost	Ivey	Ruiz
Brecheen	Gimenez	Mace	Cárdenas	Jackson (IL)	Ruppertsberger	Brecheen	Jackson (IL)	Ruppertsberger
Buchanan	Gonzales, Tony	Malliotakis	Carson	Jackson (NC)	Ryan	Buchanan	Jackson (NC)	Ryan
Buck	Good (VA)	Mann	Carter (LA)	Jacobs	Sablan	Buck	Jacobs	Sablan
Bucshon	Gooden (TX)	Massie	Cartwright	Jayapal	Salinas	Bucshon	Gooden (TX)	Salinas
Burchett	Gosar	Mast	Casar	Jeffries	Sánchez	Burchett	Gosar	Sánchez
Burgess	Granger	McCarthy	Case	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes	Burgess	Granger	Sarbanes
Burlison	Graves (LA)	McCaul	Casten	Kamlager-Dove	Scanlon	Burlison	Graves (LA)	Scanlon
Calvert	Graves (MO)	McClain	Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Schakowsky	Calvert	Graves (MO)	Schakowsky
Cammack	Green (TN)	McClintock	Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Schiff	Cammack	Green (TN)	Schiff
Carey	Greene (GA)	McCormick	Chavez-DeRemer	Khanna	Schneider	Carey	Greene (GA)	Schneider
Carl	Grothman	McHenry	Cherifilis-	Kildee	Scholten	Carl	Grothman	Scholten
Carter (GA)	Guest	Meuser	McCormick	Kilmer	Schrier	Carter (GA)	Guest	Schrier
Carter (TX)	Guthrie	Escobar	Chu	Kuster	Sewell	Carter (GA)	Guthrie	Sewell
Ciscomani	Hageman	Miller (IL)	Clarke (NY)	Lander	Sherman	Ciscomani	Hageman	Sherman
Cline	Harris	Miller (OH)	Clarke (NY)	Cleaver	Sherrill	Cline	Harris	Sherrill
Cloud	Harshbarger	Miller-Meeks	Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Cloud	Harshbarger	Larson
Clyde	Hern	Fitzpatrick	Castro (TX)	Cohen	Lee (CA)	Clyde	Hern	Harshbarger
Cole	Higgins (LA)	Molinaro	Castro (TX)	Connolly	Lee (NV)	Cole	Higgins (LA)	Harshbarger
Collins	Hill	Moolenaar	Castro (TX)	Correa	Smith (WA)	Collins	Hill	Hern
Comer	Hinson	Foushee	Castro (TX)	Costa	Sorenson	Comer	Hinson	Moylan
Crane	Houchin	Mooney	Castro (TX)	Costa	Soto	Crane	Houchin	Moyleanear
Crawford	Hudson	Moore (AL)	Castro (TX)	Costa	Spanberger	Crawford	Hudson	Moyleanear
Crenshaw	Huizenga	Moore (UT)	Castro (TX)	Courtney	Takano	Crenshaw	Huizenga	Moyleanear
Curtis	Hunt	Moran	Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Thanedar	Curtis	Hunt	Moyleanear
Davidson	Issa	Moylan	Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Thompson (CA)	Davidson	Issa	Moyleanear
De La Cruz	James	Murphy	Castro (TX)	Cohen	Thompson (MS)	De La Cruz	James	Moyleanear
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Nehls	Castro (TX)	Connolly	Titus	DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Moyleanear
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Newhouse	Castro (TX)	Correa	Torres (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Moyleanear
Donalds	Joyce (OH)	Norman	Castro (TX)	Costa	Torres (NY)	Donalds	Jordan	Moyleanear
Duarte	Joyce (PA)	Nunn (IA)	Castro (TX)	Courtney	Trahan	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
Duncan	Kean (NJ)	Obernolte	Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Trone	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
Dunn (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Ogles	Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Vargas	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
Edwards	Kelly (PA)	Owens	Castro (TX)	Cohen	Watson Coleman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Watson Coleman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wexton	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wild	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Williams (GA)	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Connolly	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Correa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Costa	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Courtney	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cleaver	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Clyburn	Wasserman	Duarte	Jordan	Moyleanear
			Castro (TX)	Cohen	W			

Roy	Stauber	Wagner
Santos	Stefanik	Walberg
Scalise	Steil	Waltz
Schweikert	Steube	Weber (TX)
Scott, Austin	Strong	Wenstrup
Self	Tenney	Westerman
Sessions	Tiffany	Williams (TX)
Smith (MO)	Timmons	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NE)	Van Drew	Wittman
Smucker	Van Duyne	Yakym
Spartz	Van Orden	Zinke

## NOES—252

Adams	Gomez	Norton
Aguilar	Gonzales, Tony	Nunn (IA)
Allred	Gonzalez, Vicente	Ocasio-Cortez
Auchincloss	González-Colón	Omar
Bacon	Gottheimer	Pallone
Balint	Granger	Pappas
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Pascarel
Beatty	Grijalva	Payne
Bera	Harder (CA)	Peltola
Beyer	Hayes	Perez
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pettersen
Bonamici	Horsford	Pingree
Bowman	Houlahan	Plaskett
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brown	Hoyle (OR)	Porter
Brownley	Huffman	Pressley
Buchanan	Ivey	Quigley
Budzinski	Jackson (IL)	Ramirez
Bush	Jackson (NC)	Raskin
Calvert	Jacobs	Rogers (KY)
Caraveo	James	Ross
Carbajal	Jayapal	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Carey	Johnson (GA)	Rutherford
Carson	Joyce (OH)	Ryan
Carter (LA)	Kamlager-Dove	Sablan
Carter (TX)	Kaptur	Salazar
Cartwright	Kean (NJ)	Salinas
Casar	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Case	Khanna	Scanlon
Casten	Kiggans (VA)	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Schiff
Castro (TX)	Kiley	Schneider
Chavez-DeRemer	Kilmer	Scholten
Cherifilus-McCormick	Kim (CA)	Schrader
Chu	Kim (NJ)	Scott (VA)
Ciscomani	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Sewell
Clarke (NY)	LaLota	Sherman
Cleaver	Landsman	Sherrell
Clyburn	Langworthy	Simpson
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Slotkin
Connolly	LaTurner	Smith (NJ)
Correa	Lawler	Smith (WA)
Costa	Lee (CA)	Sorenson
Courtney	Lee (FL)	Soto
Craig	Lee (NV)	Spanberger
Crockett	Lee (PA)	Stansbury
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Stanton
Cuellar	Letlow	Steel
Davids (KS)	Levin	Stevens
Davis (IL)	Lieu	Strickland
Davis (NC)	Lofgren	Sykes
Dean (PA)	Lynch	Takano
DeGette	Magaziner	Thanedar
DeLauro	Manning	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Deluzio	McBath	Thompson (PA)
DeSaulnier	McCarthy	Titus
Diaz-Balart	McClellan	Tlaib
Dingell	McCollum	Tokuda
Doggett	McGarvey	Tonko
Ellzey	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Escobar	McHenry	Torres (NY)
Eshoo	Meeks	Trahan
Espauillat	Menendez	Trone
Evans	Meng	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Meuser	Mfume
Fletcher	Mfume	Valadão
Foster	Molinaro	Vargas
Foushee	Moore (WI)	Morello
Frankel, Lois	Moreno	Vasquez
Frost	Moskowitz	Veasey
Gallego	Moulton	Velázquez
Garamendi	Mrvan	Wasserman
Garbarino	Mullin	Schultz
Garcia (IL)	Nadler	Waters
Garcia (TX)	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Garcia, Mike	Neal	Wexton
Garcia, Robert	Neguse	Wild
Gimenez	Newhouse	Williams (GA)
Golden (ME)	Nickel	Williams (NY)
Goldman (NY)	Norcross	Womack

NOT VOTING—12

Banks	Keating	Radewagen
Blumenauer	Larsen (WA)	Swalwell
D'Esposito	Pelosi	Webster (FL)
Jackson Lee	Phillips	Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GIMENEZ) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

## □ 1425

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE) having assumed the chair, Mr. GIMENEZ, 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. 4820) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution that was previously noticed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

## H. RES. 845

Whereas Israel has existed on its lands for millennia and the United States played a critical role in returning Israel to those lands in 1948 immediately following the Holocaust in recognition of its right to exist and as an indelible signal of our solidarity with the Jewish people;

Whereas Israel is a critical ally to the American people and to our strategic national security interests in the Middle East;

Whereas the people of Israel—including American citizens—were brutally attacked on October 7, 2023, by Hamas;

Whereas Representative Rashida Tlaib, within 24 hours of the October 7 barbaric attack on Jewish citizens of the State of Israel, representing the deadliest day for Jews since the Holocaust, defended the brutal rapes, murders, be-headings, and kidnapping—including of Americans—by Hamas as justified “resistance” to the “apartheid state”;

Whereas Representative Tlaib's October 8 statement claimed that Hamas' October 7 attack on the Jewish people was partly attributable to United States security aid provided to Israel, which ignores the fact that the Iron Dome, a co-developed air defense system, saved lives that day by intercepting rockets launched from the Gaza Strip against Israeli civilian targets;

Whereas, on October 18, 2023, Representative Tlaib continued to knowingly spread the false narrative that Israel intentionally bombed the Al-Ahli Arab Hospital on October 17 after United States intelligence, Israeli intelligence, and President Biden assessed with high confidence that Israel did not cause the explosion;

Whereas, on November 3, 2023, Representative Tlaib published on social media a video containing the phrase “from the river to the sea”, which is widely recognized as a genocidal call to violence to destroy the state of Israel and its people to replace it with a Palestinian state extending from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea;

Whereas Representative Tlaib doubled down on this call to violence by falsely describing “from the river to the sea” as “an aspirational call for freedom, human rights, and peaceful coexistence” despite it clearly entailing Israel's destruction and denial of its fundamental right to exist; and

Whereas Representative Tlaib has repeatedly displayed conduct entirely unbecoming of a Member of the House of Representatives by calling for the destruction of the state of Israel and dangerously promoting false narratives regarding a brutal, large-scale terrorist attack against civilian targets inside the sovereign territory of a major non-NATO ally while hundreds of Israeli and American hostages remain in terrorist captivity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Representative Rashida Tlaib be censured.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

## □ 1430

## 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.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 213, answered “present” 1, not voting 11, as follows:

## [Roll No. 608]

## YEAS—208

Adams	Castro (TX)	Escobar
Aguilar	Cherifilus-Cormick	Eshoo
Allred	Clark (MA)	Espaiplat
Auchincloss	Chu	Evans
Balint	Clarke (NY)	Fletcher
Barragán	Cleaver	Foushee
Beatty	Clyburn	Frankel, Lois
Bera	Craig	Frost
Beyer	Cohen	Gallego
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Garamendi
Blunt Rochester	Correa	Garcia (IL)
Bonamici	Costa	Garcia (TX)
Bowman	Courtney	Garcia, Mike
Boyle (PA)	Craig	Garcia, Robert
Brown	Crockett	Golden (ME)
Brownley	Crow	Goldman (NY)
Buck	Cuellar	Gomez
Budzinski	Davids (KS)	Gonzalez
Bush	Davis (IL)	Vicente
Caraveo	Davis (NC)	Carbajal
Carbajal	Dean (PA)	Gottheimer
Cárdenas	DeGette	Green, Al (TX)
Carson	DeLauro	Grijalva
Carter (LA)	DelBene	Harder (CA)
Cartwright	Deluzio	Hayes
Casar	DeSaulnier	Higgins (NY)
Case	Dingell	Himes
Casten	Doggett	Horsford
Castor (FL)	Duarte	Houlahan

Hoyer	Mfume
Hoyle (OR)	Moore (WI)
Huffman	Morelle
Ivey	Moskowitz
Jackson (IL)	Moulton
Jackson (NC)	Mrvan
Jacobs	Mullin
Jayapal	Nadler
Jeffries	Napolitano
Johnson (GA)	Neal
Kamlager-Dove	Neguse
Kaptur	Nickel
Kelly (IL)	Norcross
Khanna	Ocasio-Cortez
Kildee	Omar
Kilmer	Pallone
Kim (NJ)	Panetta
Krishnamoorthi	Pappas
Kuster	Pascrall
Landsman	Payne
Larson (CT)	Peltola
Lee (CA)	Perez
Lee (NV)	Peters
Lee (PA)	Pettersen
Leger Fernandez	Pingree
Levin	Pocan
Lieu	Porter
Lofgren	Pressley
Lynch	Quigley
Magaziner	Ramirez
Manning	Raskin
Massie	Ross
Matsui	Ruiz
McCath	Ruppersberger
McClellan	Ryan
McClintock	Salinas
McCullom	Sánchez
McGarvey	Sarbanes
McGovern	Scanlon
Meeks	Schakowsky
Menendez	Schiff
Meng	Scholten

## NAYS—213

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

Schrier	Rogers (AL)
Moore (WI)	Scott (VA)
Morelle	Scott, David
Moskowitz	Sewell
Moulton	Sherman
Mrvan	Sherrill
Mullin	Slotkin
Nadler	Smith (WA)
Napolitano	Sorensen
Neal	Soto
Neguse	Spanberger
Nickel	Stansbury
Norcross	Stanton
Ocasio-Cortez	Stevens
Omar	Strickland
Pallone	Sykes
Panetta	Takano
Pappas	Thanedar
Pascrall	Thompson (CA)
Payne	Thompson (MS)
Peltola	Titus
Perez	Tlaib
Peters	Tokuda
Pettersen	Tonko
Pingree	Torres (CA)
Pocan	Torres (NY)
Porter	Trahan
Pressley	Trone
Quigley	Underwood
Ramirez	Vargas
Raskin	Vasquez
Ross	Veasey
Ruiz	Velázquez
Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Ryan	Schultz
Salinas	Waters
Sánchez	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Wexton
Scanlon	Williams (GA)
Scanlon	Zinke

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Wild

## NOT VOTING—11

Banks	Keating	Swalwell
Blumenauer	Larsen (WA)	Webster (FL)
D’Esposito	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)
Jackson Lee	Phillips	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1437

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.

□ 1445

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). Pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. McCORMICK) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, Representative TLAIB has repeatedly made atrocious statements against our ally Israel and in support of Hamas, a terrorist group responsible for the largest massacre of Jews since the Holocaust.

Representative Tlaib has levied unbelievable falsehoods about our greatest ally, Israel, and the attack on October 7. Recently, she even falsely blamed them for bombing the Al Ahli Arab hospital, but all of our current intelligence shows that Israel was not responsible.

As stated in my resolution on November 3, Representative TLAIB said: “From the river to the sea is an aspirational call for freedom, human rights, and peaceful coexistence, not death, destruction, or hate. My work and advocacy is always centered in justice and dignity for all people no matter faith or ethnicity.”

Mr. Speaker, let me break down the saying, “From the river to the sea.” The river is the Jordan River, and the sea is the Mediterranean Sea. This is a call for the complete destruction of Israel. It is disgusting when it is used in this context that was meant.

Representative TLAIB boycotted Israeli President Herzog’s address to Congress, releasing a joint statement with Representative BUSH that said: “Bestowing President Herzog with the rare honor of a joint address to Congress while the Israeli apartheid government continues to enable and di-

rectly support racism and brutal settler attacks is a slap in the face to victims, survivors, and their loved ones. . . .”

This kind of hatred against our ally Israel is unacceptable. Israel has a right to exist. For thousands of years, the Jewish people resided in that land and, after being displaced for centuries, returned in 1948 after the Holocaust.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the effects of the reprehensible rhetoric of Representative TLAIB across the Nation. At schools and colleges around the country, Jewish students have been forced to be on alert as their anti-Semitic peers have engaged in disgusting demonstrations, chanting anti-Semitic slogans.

At The Cooper Union, a private college in New York, Jewish students were forced to hide from pro-Hamas protesters in a library where they feared for their safety.

At George Washington University, just about a half mile from this building, students broadcast “Glory to our martyrs,” and “Free Palestine from the river to the sea,” on the side of a campus building.

Further, yesterday, in Ventura County, California, Paul Kessler, a Jewish man protesting for Israel, was killed in an altercation with pro-Palestinian protesters.

These anti-Semitic incidents are happening right now in America in 2023. Quite frankly, in my entire lifetime, I have never seen anything like it.

The same Nation that defeated Nazism in World War II must now defeat an internal rot promoting the same senseless violence and hatred of Jewish people.

It is a sad fact, but this type of anti-Semitic hate is being promoted by a small group of Members in this body—chiefly, Representative TLAIB. We must hold her accountable.

This war in Israel is affecting everyone, whether it is innocent Palestinians at risk because of Hamas’ actions; or our fellow Jewish Americans, who now have to worry each day about the possibility of an anti-Semitic attack; or Sergeant Elisheva Rose Ida Lubin, a young Jewish woman who was a member of the Israeli Border Police and grew up in Dunwoody, Georgia, and was killed by a Palestinian assailant.

For the safety and security of our Nation, we must continue to support Israel, a nation fighting for democracy, decency, and Western values.

Representative TLAIB has undermined U.S. interests with her statements and must be censured.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have images of three politicians in my office: Abraham Lincoln, Robert F. Kennedy, and Samuel H. Bellman, who was the first Jewish person ever elected to the Minnesota Legislature, a great champion of civil rights and civil liberties in the Constitution and of the creation of the

State of Israel, the Jewish democratic state in 1948. He was my grandfather.

He was elected at a time of terrible anti-Semitism, not unlike today. Minneapolis was actually called the anti-Semitism capital of America, and my grandpa told me a story I will never forget.

The Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party and Republican Caucuses both had their annual retreats at a country club that did not allow Jews or Blacks to enter. My grandfather complained privately to the speaker about the fact that he wouldn't be able to go to his own retreat. The speaker apologized but said that it was a tradition.

So my grandfather, the only Jewish person in the chamber, spoke on the floor about anti-Semitism. He was booed and jeered at, and members left as he tried to speak.

When the minority leader asked me to manage our time today, I thought about my grandfather and how he must have felt on that day. I rise here not in spite of the fact that I am a Jewish American who supports the Constitution and the Jewish democratic state and hates all the anti-Semitic tyrants and terrorists of the world, from Putin in Russia and Mohammed bin Salman in Saudi Arabia to Hezbollah in Hamas. I am here because of these things and because of everything that I believe in and stand for.

At this moment when democracy is under siege all over the world, America must stand tall for the Constitution of the United States. This resolution is about one thing and one thing only: the punishment of speech.

We have the chance to show the world what the American Constitution means and how we hold fast to our core principles even when we are drawn away from them by our passions and our righteous anger.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and the very heart of it is our First Amendment, which protects every citizen's freedom of speech and says Congress shall make no law abridging it.

The freedom to speak includes the freedom to disagree, the right to think radically differently from the majority about important things, or else it is no freedom at all. It is easy to defend freedom of speech for people when you agree with them. The test for each Member today is whether you can defend freedom of speech for people when you most fundamentally and vehemently disagree with them.

The First Amendment is like an apple, and everybody wants to take just one little bite out of it—leftwing speech, rightwing speech, sexist speech, feminist speech, homophobic speech, pro-LGBTQ speech, anti-war speech, pro-war speech, religious speech, sacrilegious speech. Everybody wants a bite out of the apple.

At the end of the day, after everybody has taken his or her bite, do you know what is left? Nothing. There is nothing left.

If you want to save the apple, you have to learn to tolerate not just the speech you love the most but the speech you hate the most.

Now, like the First Amendment, the Speech or Debate Clause embodies this central value in the proceedings of this body. It states that Members of Congress "shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place."

In the two-and-a-half-century history of this great Chamber, Members have been overwhelmingly censured for their actions, not for their speech—actions like participating in the violent assault against Charles Sumner of Massachusetts; assaulting Representative Grinnell, of Iowa, with a cane; selling military academy appointments; taking bribes; engaging in mail fraud and payroll fraud; improper spending of campaign funds; embezzling congressional money; engaging in sexual misconduct with a House page.

Do you see the difference? It is not what they said. It is what they did.

I can find only three categories of cases where speech is the sum and substance of the charge, and all are exceptions that have been ratified by the Supreme Court:

One, violent threats against other Members of this body, which the Court has found, as recently as April, are not protected by the First Amendment.

Two, fighting words: the use of unparliamentary or aggressively insulting language on the House floor that constitutes a direct affront to another Member. The Supreme Court has said that fighting words are not protected.

Three, speech advocating or promoting treason, secession, or insurrection, all of them outside of the First Amendment because of numerous provisions in our Constitution condemning and opposing insurrection.

That is it: violent threats against other Members, fighting words on the floor, speech inciting insurrection.

The resolution offered against the gentlewoman from Michigan is all about censuring her for her political speech and literally nothing else. No actions, no conduct, is being alleged or punished. The entire motion is about her speech and how much we hate it and how wrong we think it is, and all of that is fine for all of us to express individually on the floor, in the media, on social media.

I have said to Ms. TLAIB myself that the phrase "from the river to sea" is abhorrent to me, even with her published explanation of what she means by it, which is very different from what Hamas says about it and how Hamas uses it, but I would never think of punishing her or disciplining her because we disagree about that.

The resolution proposes to condemn her for quoting this objectionable

phrase in her video, a video which is indisputably protected speech under the First Amendment.

Unlike the gentleman from New York, Mr. SANTOS, whose proposed expulsion by members of the majority was rejected by a commanding bipartisan majority last week because he has not been convicted of either the criminal or the ethics charges outstanding against him, Ms. TLAIB has been criminally charged with nothing. She has been civilly sued for nothing. She has no ethics charges outstanding before the Ethics Committee in any way.

It is easy to see why. She cannot face criminal punishment or civil liability for her speech because, in the United States of America, we don't punish people for their political ideas, no matter how wrongheaded or offensive we think they are. The majority might think they are, or it might not, but in any event, it doesn't make any difference.

She won reelection with 71 percent of the vote in Michigan's 12th District, and if anyone is going to punish her for her political ideas or performance, it must be the people of her own district who sent her here to represent them.

Mr. Speaker, the disciplinary process should never be used to punish the political speech or viewpoints of a Member of this Chamber just because the majority disagrees.

The punishment of political viewpoints will mean that Members will be censured just for being in the minority rather than in the majority, and that will come to stifle our dialogue and haunt all of our work.

For example, the good Speaker of the House, who is my friend from the Judiciary Committee, has taken positions in the past arguing that sex between consenting gay adults should be a crime, that the Supreme Court was wrong to strike down sodomy laws in Lawrence v. Texas and wrong to give gay people the right to marry in Obergefell, a right that he said is "the dark harbinger of chaos and sexual anarchy that could doom even the strongest republic."

The vast majority of Americans reject these positions as extreme in public opinion polls and believe all citizens should have the freedom to pursue their own love lives and to marry.

If the House majority changes hands, should we actually censure the former Speaker of the House for his constitutional apostasy and thought crimes against the rights of millions of Americans? I sure hope not because the gentleman from Louisiana is absolutely entitled to his political and religious views, no matter how far outside the constitutional and American mainstream they are.

Under the First Amendment, extremism is in the eye of the beholder, but how will we resist the temptation to punish him in the future if we set a precedent today that Members can be censured and canceled simply for their

political heresies in the eyes of the majority controlling the House?

If we say the gentlewoman can be punished because her views of history are wrong, as I heard my friend say, can we then punish Members of this body who refuse to vote to take down in our Halls the statues of Members of Congress from the 19th century who joined the Confederacy and committed treason against the Union, people like John Breckinridge, a former Vice President and U.S. Senator who was expelled from the Senate after he defected to the Confederacy? Should we use the disciplinary process to impose historical orthodoxy?

If anything, there is a stronger constitutional case for punishing the 120 Members of the House who voted against taking down statues of Confederate traitors because multiple provisions of the Constitution explicitly forbid and punish participation in insurrection. Do Members who voted that way want to risk being censured in the future by establishing that divergent minority views on history are a legitimate matter of institutional discipline?

What about the Members who defended conspiracy theorist Alex Jones and stated that Sandy Hook and Parkland mass murderers of dozens of schoolchildren were staged by Hollywood to generate support for gun safety? That is not even a matter of opinion but adjudicated positive fact, and still, the Constitution protects your right to be wrong about facts unless you are deliberately defrauding or cheating someone out of something like money or campaign contributions.

□ 1500

What about all of those Members who have followed the former President in advancing the big lie that he actually won the 2020 election? Should we convert the 60 Federal and State court decisions rejecting claims of election fraud and corruption into discipline and punishment of Members who still cling to that view?

What about the 11 Members of this body who lost the 405-11 vote in 2019 recognizing that the mass killing of Armenians by Ottoman Turks during World War I was a genocide? Does their denial of the genocidal character of the deaths of more than 1 million Armenians qualify them for collective punishment today, institutional punishment?

Can we convert differing interpretations of history into the basis for disciplinary action?

Well, perhaps you say political dissent should be uniquely punishable when it comes to foreign policy. Of course, the First Amendment doesn't distinguish between speech having domestic or foreign policy content. All of it is protected. If not, every Member of this body who has voted against aid to Ukraine and praises Vladimir Putin, as the former President did for his "genius" and his "savvy," or says Putin is

not our enemy, as a number of Members have, could be censured for it by this body.

This resolution not only degrades our Constitution but cheapens the meaning of discipline in this body for people who actually commit wrongful actions like bribery, fraud, violent assault, and so on.

When people are punished for their political ideas and expression, they will wear it as a badge of honor. They will fundraise on it. Millions of dollars will flow to people who are punished that way, and they will join the public in mocking the new speech censors of Congress.

A secure constitutional republic, which actively protects the freedom of dissenting speech to allow for serious debate and growth as society, shows its strength, not its weakness.

As Thomas Jefferson, whose beautiful statue is right outside of this room, put it: "If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it."

Now is a moment when we will get to see who in the House of Representatives believes in the freedom of speech, even the speech they hate, versus those who want to impose a new political straitjacket of cancel culture on America and Congress.

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

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

Fine speech. You talk about setting precedents. I think there is a precedent. You guys must have searched really high and far and long to find the people who voted against censuring PAUL GOSAR or MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE. There is a precedent. You are right.

When you talk about freedom of speech and who protects that freedom of speech, you are talking to a marine, and you are about to talk to a Navy SEAL, people who would give their lives to defend the freedom of speech. I understand that probably as well as anybody.

Let me be clear. This is not about a First Amendment issue. RASHIDA TLAIB has the right to spew anti-Semitic vitriol and even call for the destruction of the Jewish state, but the House of Representatives also has the right to make it clear that her hate speech does not reflect the opinion of the Chamber. That is what this resolution is about.

When you talk about "from the river to the sea," we talked about this with the Parliamentarian, and we talked about it with legal counsel. We talked about precedent. We got the Intel Committee to make sure the facts are straight. We did our homework on whether there is a precedent on this.

If this is not worthy of censure, what is? When you can call for the annihilation

of a country and its people, if that is not worthy of censure, what is?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. VAN ORDEN).

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

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my colleague from Georgia's privileged resolution to censure the Congresswoman from Minnesota.

Before I do so, I remind my dear friend from Maryland that the Founding Fathers did not envision Twitter, but the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal decided that genocide, in fact, is a felony.

One month ago today, October 7, 2023, savages from the terrorist organization, Hamas, invaded Israel from the Gaza Strip and intentionally targeted Jewish civilians, men, women, children, and infants, and then slaughtered them.

Jews were being killed at a level not seen since the Holocaust, and worldwide anti-Semitism is at an all-time high. We have seen anti-Semitic and pro-terrorist rallies at major universities across America. This last weekend, here in our Nation's Capital, we saw over 200,000 people rallying in support of the terrorist organization, Hamas, that committed these atrocities in Israel. They defaced our national monuments and the White House.

Most disturbingly, in this House, the House that freed men from the scourge that is slavery and gave women suffrage, we have a Member who not only supports this organization, Hamas, that slaughtered these Jews but has actively called for the eradication of the Jews as a people by promoting the slogan "from the river to the sea" on social media. She represents this as an aspirational phrase, and she is correct. It is aspirational for those who call for the destruction of the Jewish people.

When I retired from the SEAL teams in 2014, I vowed that I would defend the Jewish people if any horrors like those that took place on October 7, 2023, were to occur. Following the murder of the innocents that took place on October 7, I fulfilled that promise by visiting Israel.

I visited with war-wounded soldiers in medical facilities and consulted with military and various governmental officials. I grieved with the families who had lost their loved ones to this savagery. I visited the kibbutzim where infants were butchered by beasts, including one who was removed from its pregnant mother's stomach as she watched in horror before she herself was executed.

I bore witness to these horrors that can barely be described so that no one can ever tell me that these events did not take place. Hamas is responsible for them and is enabled by those who parrot their slogans.

Another massacre site I visited was the Supernova music festival, where

over 200 children were butchered. Their lives were ruthlessly extinguished after many were raped, tortured, dismembered, and then burnt.

As I was walking through the field strewn with the detritus of this war crime, I noticed some cups, simple festive cups. I asked the Israeli minister I was with if I could take some home to the United States so that I would have a tangible object that could represent the lives of those beautiful children from around the world who were killed. I brought back enough of these cups to give to many of my colleagues, including the one I stand here today to censure.

She and many other Members of this House need to understand that these are human beings. They were not slogans or a flag or a chant. They were children who will never be able to dance again, never be able to love again. Most tragically, they will never be able to look into the eyes of their own children they will never be able to bear.

I ask you today, Mr. Speaker, if you had the chance to stop the Holocaust, would you?

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

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call upon my fellow colleagues from both parties to say yes, we would stop the Holocaust. We will not stay silent as the 21st century holocaust unfolds before our very eyes. We will not.

I cast my vote today to censure, to affirm our commitment to justice and in the defense of the Israeli people.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I am the only Palestinian American serving in Congress. My perspective is needed here now more than ever.

I will not be silenced, and I will not let you distort my words. Folks forget I am from the city of Detroit, the most beautiful, Blackest city in the country, where I learned to speak truth to power, even if my voice shakes. Trying to bully or censure me won't work because this movement for a cease-fire is much bigger than one person. It is growing every single day.

There are millions of people across our country who oppose Netanyahu's extremism and are done watching our government support collective punishment and the use of white phosphorus bombs that melt flesh to the bone.

They are done watching our government, Mr. Speaker, supporting cutting off food, water, electricity, and medical care to millions of people with nowhere to go.

Like me, Mr. Speaker, they don't believe the answer to war crimes is more war crimes.

The refusal of Congress and the administration to acknowledge Palestinian lives is chipping away at my

soul. Over 10,000 Palestinians have been killed. The majority were children.

Let me be clear: My criticism has always been of the Israeli Government and Netanyahu's actions.

It is important to separate people and governments, Mr. Speaker. No government is beyond criticism. The idea that criticizing the Government of Israel is anti-Semitic sets a very dangerous precedent, and it is being used to silence diverse voices speaking up for human rights across our Nation.

Do you realize what it is like, Mr. Speaker, for the people outside of the Chamber right now listening in agony to their own government dehumanizing them, to hear the President of the United States we helped elect dispute death tolls as we see video after video of parents and dead children under rubble?

Mr. Speaker, do you know what it is like to feel rising hate crimes, to know how Islamophobia and anti-Semitism make us all less safe, and to worry that your own child might suffer the horrors that 6-year-old Wadea did in Illinois?

I can't believe I have to say this, but Palestinian people are not disposable. We are human beings just like anyone else. My sity, my grandmother, like all Palestinians, just wants to live her life with the freedom and human dignity we all deserve.

Speaking up to save lives, Mr. Speaker, no matter faith, no matter ethnicity, should not be controversial in this Chamber. The cries of Palestinian and Israeli children sound no different to me. What I do not understand is why the cries of Palestinians sound different to you-all.

We cannot lose our shared humanity, Mr. Speaker. I hear the voices of advocates in Israel, in Palestine, across America, and around the world for peace. I am inspired by the courageous survivors in Israel who have lost loved ones yet are calling for a cease-fire and the end to violence. I am grateful to the people in the streets for the peace movement, with countless Jewish Americans across the country standing up and lovingly saying: "Not in our name."

We will continue to call for a cease-fire, Mr. Speaker, for the immediate delivery of critical humanitarian aid to Gaza, for the release of all hostages and those arbitrarily detained, and for every American to come home. We will continue to work for real, lasting peace that upholds human rights and the dignity of all people and centers peaceful coexistence between Israelis and Palestinians, censures no one, and ensures that no person, no child, has to suffer or live in fear of violence.

Seventy-one percent of Michigan Democrats support a cease-fire. You can try to censure me, but you can't silence their voices.

I urge my colleagues to join with the majority of Americans and support a cease-fire now to save as many lives as possible. President Biden must listen

to and represent all of us, not just some of us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to have the courage to call for a cease-fire and the end of killings.

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

If this was about calling for a cease-fire, we would not have these proceedings.

I was wrong, by the way, when I said that it must have taken a long time to find somebody who hasn't voted for censorship from the other side of the aisle. You didn't find it. The gentleman from the other side of the aisle actually did vote for censorship on a First Amendment right. I find it rather funny. We just researched it. Unless my sources are wrong, the vast majority of the other side of the aisle actually voted for censorship based on a First Amendment right.

I also wanted to say that my heart goes out to the Palestinian people—it truly does—especially those people who were bombed in the hospital, which my colleague knows wasn't from the Israelis.

□ 1515

Yet the statement is contrary to that, even though our intel was very clear, as was our President, very clear. That is what this debate is about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for the time.

With respect to the gentleman from Maryland, I understand the perspective with respect to free speech, and I certainly wish to always stand aside the protection of free speech in this country, but this goes well beyond that.

We are not talking about restraining the gentlewoman from Michigan's ability to speak as an American citizen. We are not talking about punishing her and putting her in jail.

What we are talking about is whether a Member of the House of Representatives, a Member of this body representing this Nation, is justified in putting forward a defense of the actions of Hamas terrorists that murdered innocent Israeli citizens and are holding United States citizens and Israelis hostage. In her own language, she was defending on October 8—a mere 24 hours into the brutal and barbaric attacks in which babies were beheaded, babies were placed into ovens, literally. Moms were raped in a house while their babies were put in an oven. This is a documented account, video evidence, and this is dismissed as resistance to an apartheid state.

My problem is that the gentlewoman is also referring to Joe Biden supporting the genocide of the Palestinian people. The gentlewoman has put forward that by virtue of the United States of America funding, in solidarity the people of Israel in defense of their right to exist, that by virtue of our position as Americans standing in

front of that flag in this Chamber representing 330 million Americans, that by funding and supporting Israel, we are somehow perpetuating the call for violence that we saw unfold right before our eyes on October 7 in the most brutal and heinous acts that some of us have ever seen.

I do not doubt the gentlewoman's sincerity of her concern for her home people and concerns about the attacks on the people of Gaza.

I had some people who called into question that I would put out my public support for my former colleague, JUSTIN AMASH, who lost cousins in a church, receiving missile fire into a building next to a church.

I genuinely pray for the people of Israel, the people of Gaza, the people throughout the world that are now dealing with all of this.

The gentlewoman cannot, as a Member of Congress, be standing up and telling the world that what we saw unfold in attacking Israel is justified. We can't.

Free speech matters. I have grave concern right now about where this institution is going with respect to censures. I voted against the censure last week because I thought it had drafting problems and I thought it had significant concerns it raised.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the work that was done by my friend from Georgia, he put forward a resolution that is worthy of support. I support the resolution and believe that we should pass it.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this censure resolution that is blatantly Islamophobic, anti-democratic, and an utter waste of time.

This resolution is as dishonest as it is unproductive. Any Member who denies that Congresswoman TLAIB has opposed the killing of civilians—Israeli, Palestinian, and American alike—is willfully ignoring the truth.

Representative TLAIB was elected by voters in Michigan to do exactly what she does best: advocate for a better, safer, more just world. She leads with love, speaks truth to power, and seeks justice even when her life and that of her family and her staff are threatened.

As a daughter, mother, sister, friend, advocate, and effective, duly-elected, three-term, first-ever Palestinian-American Member of Congress, she has been a much-needed voice in an institution that has too often failed to listen.

Today, Republicans are again attacking a Democratic colleague just because they don't like what she has to say. It is another shameful but predictable ploy of distraction from the real traffickers of hate who are obsessed with policing progressive women of color.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this offensive resolution for every little girl from Michigan to the Middle East who sees herself when they see the leadership of

Representative RASHIDA TLAIB, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), a Marine Corps general.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of Proverbs 18:21, which says: "Words kill, words give life; they're either poison or fruit—you choose."

I take no joy in standing here today to censure a fellow Michigan Representative, but Congresswoman TLAIB's words and actions are abhorrent and beneath her office.

Representative TLAIB has tripled-down on her anti-Semitic and anti-Israel rhetoric, recently posting a video with protesters chanting, "from the river to the sea," with a follow-up comment explaining that that phrase is a peaceful aphorism about human rights.

However, that quote has long been a rallying cry for supporters of Hamas and other terrorists hell-bent on destroying Israel. "From the river to the sea" refers to the area, of course, between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea, which is the State of Israel.

Jewish Americans are being targeted in their schools and on our Nation's streets. Just yesterday, a California man supporting Israel was murdered during competing pro-Israel, pro-Palestinian rallies.

Words matter and words have real-world implications. Congresswoman TLAIB's continued assault on the only Jewish state in the world, Israel, is reprehensible and this body should come together to support this censure resolution to say to Representative TLAIB: Enough.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB is an important member of our Democratic Caucus and our Michigan delegation. Her voice matters. She is the only Palestinian American in Congress, and this is a representative body. Her perspective reflects many that she represents, especially when it is not twisted.

Congresswoman TLAIB is entitled to the same constitutionally protected freedom of speech and expression that every other American and every other Member of this body has. This resolution is an attack on that fundamental right.

I spent all weekend in Michigan this last weekend talking to all the communities about the meaning of this phrase. There are very strong feelings on all sides. It is very clear that people interpret words in different ways. Personally, I choose not to use a phrase that is offensive to some and that many perceive as a threat, but I also take seriously living in a country that does not restrict, forbid, or censure free speech.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, soulless, disgusting, sickening, reprehensible, and repulsive—these are not my words but the words of my Democratic colleagues when asked about the decision of 15 Members who refused to condemn Hamas' brutal terror attacks on innocent Israelis.

Some of those 15 didn't stop there. Several of these Members have gone on to use their massive platforms to accuse Israel of apartheid, genocide, and war crimes. This rhetoric by Members of Congress is not only careless, it is dangerous.

American cities and the cities around the world have been flooded with anti-Israeli protests. Protestors scream for an intifada. They demand a cleansing of Jews from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea, the destruction of Israel, and the destruction of the United States of America.

They ripped down the pictures of Jewish children and Jewish babies being held hostage in Gaza. It is reprehensible. It is unacceptable.

Hamas is a terrorist organization that does not care about the Palestinian people. Their goal is to wipe Israel from the face of the Earth. Babies were burned alive. Babies were beheaded. Women were raped, beaten, displayed, and then murdered. Children, mothers, grandmothers, fathers, grandfathers, they were all killed.

Anyone who supports this or refuses to condemn it has no place in the United States Congress. I don't like censure—I hate censure—but we have to draw a line in the sand somewhere. We do not entertain hate in this Congress. We confront it, and we must do it with absolute conviction.

This is not a freedom of speech issue. This is an issue of the Congress of the United States having the right to say this is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we should reject this resolution for a few simple reasons: first is protecting this institution. I don't agree with a lot of what people say around here. I think a lot of what my Republican friends say is offensive and even racist, but I don't go around introducing censure resolutions.

If we are going to start censuring anybody who says something we don't like, all we will do from now on is censure each other all day.

The second reason is freedom of speech. My Republican colleagues go on and on about cancel culture, and here they are today trying to cancel someone.

I don't want any lectures from people who are trying to create a 1984-style

thought police. I don't know what is wrong with them, Mr. Speaker. If this is not the high point of Republican hypocrisy, I don't know what is.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my Republican colleagues that they are unleashing something very bad here. They are setting an awful precedent for this institution. This is a very slippery slope.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on this resolution to protect this institution, to protect freedom of speech, and to reject this majority's cynical attempts to divide and distract America.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that if my Republican friends don't like listening to people they disagree with, they should get a new job.

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

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), a marine.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today at what I think is a very serious moment for our country and for the world.

Hate and anti-Semitism are on the rise. Our strongest ally and great friend, Israel, is under siege at the hands of brutal terrorists. As a member of the United States Marines, I know when a Member of the House of Representatives is echoing a line that is a clear call to murder Jews and push Israel off the map—"from the river to the sea."

To be clear, "from the river to the sea," as someone who is Jewish, means to exterminate my people. Never again.

Mr. Speaker, the ADL recently reported that anti-Semitic incidents rose by roughly 400 percent in the 2 weeks following Hamas' evil attack on Israel, which began 1 month ago today.

There is no question that these incidents are a direct result of the hate-filled lies and anti-Semitic rhetoric perpetuated by Members of this body—"from the river to the sea."

What exactly does that mean, "from the river to the sea Palestine will be free." I am happy to educate all of you. It means the extermination of the Jewish people.

I understand that my colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB), thinks that this is some kind of aspirational message. It is a joke.

Mr. Speaker, I do think that this is an aspirational message. But it is not an aspiration of peaceful coexistence. It is an aspiration to the erasure of the State of Israel and its people, the Jewish people who call it home and who have been refugees since the very beginning of time.

□ 1530

It is an aspiration to the genocide of Jews.

Mr. Speaker, I believe strongly that Members of this body should be able to speak their minds freely, but I also think there should be consequences for those who would use their platforms to perpetuate garbage that puts any

American at risk especially because of their religion.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that actions have consequences, and I believe that after a long string of anti-Semitic remarks and hate-filled rhetoric, censure is an appropriate consequence for the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Never again, damn it, means never again.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today in support of my colleague Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB.

All Members of Congress are entitled to freedom of speech. We also recognize that words matter and that they have the power to uplift or to harm others.

While I have joined the statement rejecting certain harmful phraseology that has been used, I believe Congresswoman TLAIB's statement that she did not intend to wish harm to the Jewish community by her words.

Congresswoman TLAIB has all since clarified that she was intending to make an aspirational call for freedom, human rights, and peaceful coexistence, not death, destruction, or hate.

The ability to have free speech but to be willing to discuss and to change and clarify is not just mature but democratic. No Member should express harm to others, and Congresswoman TLAIB has been willing to listen, clarify, and express compassion.

Yet on the other side of the aisle, we have seen repeatedly Republican Members make disparaging comments that have threatened our fellow colleagues and their families.

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 the Virgin Islands.

Ms. PLASKETT. We have had members of the Republican Conference make floor speeches about the great replacement theory that is suggestive of white nationalism.

As a Black woman, I am offended.

Will you censure the co-chair of your Conference, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Ms. PLASKETT. We need to uplift. We need to allow free speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands is no longer recognized.

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

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Congressman Rich McCormick's resolution of censure.

Enemies of civilization are gruesomely bold and clear on their murderous intentions. A heinously revealing declaration of their barbaric intentions by the Iranian puppet Hamas is detailed in the Hamas Covenant of Au-

gust 18, 1988. In the midst of insane provisions is article 7: "The Day of Judgment will not come about until Muslims fight the Jews and kill them. Then, the Jews will hide behind rocks and trees, and the rocks and trees will cry out: 'O Muslim, there is a Jew hiding behind me, come and kill him.'"

They are very clear. What they are talking about is death to Israel and then death to America.

The New York Post is correct in warning last week that we in America are subject to another 9/11 attack being imminent by such people.

The goal of Hamas puppets of Iran is to murder the Jews worldwide. It is fake news about caring for the Palestinian people. This is not about territory. Suffering by the Hamas-oppressed people of Gaza is solely Hamas dictated.

We know the duplicitous wording of "from the river to the sea" is nothing more than a call of mass murder to Jewish people and will then lead to mass murder in America.

Hamas, Houthis, and also Hezbollah are puppets of Iran with their intent, and we are actually in a war we did not choose between dictators with rule of gun attacking democracies with rule of law. This began with the war criminal Putin's invasion of Ukraine on February 24, 2022, and led to the Hamas invasion of Israel on Putin's birthday, October 7.

Over 30 missile attacks have already seriously injured American troops who are serving in this war.

Bold and clear are the dictators with Putin's treatise of July 2021 that Ukraine does not exist; that the Chinese Communist Party that threatens the 24 million people of Taiwan, they don't exist; and Iran chants in English, "death to Israel, death to America."

It is sad to hear how the Iranian propaganda is being promoted by our media and colleges.

As the grateful father of four sons who have served in Iraq, Egypt, and Afghanistan, I appreciate the Israeli and Ukrainian troops for their courage.

Democracies will prevail by building peace through strength.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB is one of only two Muslim-American women elected to this body, and the only Palestinian-American in Congress. She has fought tirelessly and successfully to get clean drinking water for her constituents and to ensure that people have housing and environmental justice.

If we truly want Congress to be a diverse body that represents the diversity of views across this country, then we have to be willing to stand up for those diverse views to be expressed. We don't have to agree with them, but we do have to protect the right to the freedom of speech which this body is absolutely required to do.

Our country and our world are in crisis. People are suffering everywhere. Historic and present traumas for Jews, Muslims, Arabs, South Asians, Sikhs, and so many others are playing themselves out, and we as the elected Representatives of the people should be working together to protect the rights of every American to say what they believe and ensure that we preserve our democracy.

Vote "no" on this terrible resolution.

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

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, in 1893, Katharine Lee Bates wrote "America the Beautiful." In it she wrote: "God shed His grace on thee and crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea."

As the Bible says in Psalm 72:8: He shall have dominion from sea to sea and from the river unto the ends of the Earth.

That is aspirational.

Chanting "from the river to the sea" is not. Chanting "from the river to the sea" is calling for the eradication of Israel. I would hardly define that as aspirational.

My colleague Representative RASHIDA TLAIB has parroted the talking points and the message of Hamas, a terrorist organization whose sworn mission is the destruction of Israel and the eradication of the Jewish people.

Israel is our strongest ally in the Middle East, a beacon of hope, peace, and liberty in the region. It is the only multicultural, multiethnic, and multi-religious democracy. It is not an apartheid state. The oppressor of the Palestinian people is Hamas and the Palestinian Authority.

Mr. Speaker, if you want Palestinians to be free, then reject Hamas, reject the Palestinian Authority, and demand that Hamas surrender.

Calling for a cease-fire that they won't abide to is outrageous. They need to immediately surrender and return the hostages to their families.

My colleague repeated a vile and disgusting lie that Israel bombed a hospital knowing full well that was factually inaccurate and knowing full well that this administration, the Biden administration, advised her it was inaccurate, gave her a private briefing, and still she continued to repeat this vile and disgusting lie.

Why?

It was intended to undermine. It was intended to turn the world against Israel.

Why?

It is because when she chants "from the river to the sea," she believes it. Mr. Speaker, she believes Israel should be eradicated because otherwise you would never, ever repeat that vile, vile statement.

It is not a lie.

That is why we are here. It is not a lie, and that is why we are here.

Paul Kessler was killed for holding an Israeli flag in the United States of America. We are losing respect for the sanctity of life, the rule of law, and the important role of faith.

We must combat anti-Semitism, and it starts with this censure.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH).

Ms. BUSH. St. Louis and I rise today in opposition to this censure resolution and also in opposition to the reckless manner that people in this House speak when they don't realize or don't care that they put targets on the backs of actual people, most of whom are Black and Brown, because of a lack of care and the lack of understanding and a lack of seeing the humanity of folks who look like RASHIDA TLAIB.

It is outrageous that my colleagues are blatantly, blatantly attempting to silence the only Palestinian-American Representative right here.

It is outrageous, but it is not surprising. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising because this place is where 1,700 Members of Congress, this elected body, enslaved Black people. It is not surprising, because they thought it was right.

It is not surprising because this is a place where Members continue to claim that the insurrection on the Capitol just appeared to look like a normal tourist visit.

It is not surprising because this is the place where our Black and Brown staff members repeatedly speak of experiencing racism, sexism, Islamophobia, get pushed off of elevators, xenophobia and more right here in this workplace. This is the place.

Let me say this: She mourns for the 1,400 Israelis who lost their lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Ms. BUSH. She mourns for the 10,000, and she will not stop.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Ms. BUSH. No more lies. Cease-fire now. She takes the death threats that you all send her, Mr. Speaker—The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Missouri is no longer recognized.

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

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON).

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting here not planning to speak at all, then I heard words from the other side of the aisle. They were flowery, they were eloquent, they had passion, they were articulate, they were powerful, and even moving probably to some.

Nevertheless, were they true?

I heard about protecting speech, the First Amendment, and our beloved Constitution.

Who is not for protecting speech, our beloved Constitution, and the First Amendment?

So does the gentleman from Maryland and our friends across the aisle really believe that?

Then when I heard about slippery slope and setting a precedent, on February 4, 2021, MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE was removed from her committees for things that she said before she was a Member of Congress.

On November 17, 2021, PAUL GOSAR was censured for a cartoon that his staff posted. A tasteless cartoon though it be, it was speech.

So we are protecting speech, are we?

It is speech that we disagree with, calling the deliberate killing of innocent civilians resistance, claiming a bombing of a Gaza hospital was done by the Israelis that killed hundreds of people when we knew that was not true, and yet Ms. TLAIB doubled and tripled down on that. That was false, and that was a lie. And then repeating and celebrating a genocidal chant "from the river to the sea." That is not a cartoon, and that is not saying some things, Mr. Speaker, that you said before you were a Member of Congress.

Then we were accused of, oh, it is Islamophobic, or it was pointed out that she was a woman of color or she was the only Palestinian.

What does any of that matter?

This is about words and actions, and we hold everyone to the same standard. We are not trying to jail her. We are not trying to expel her. We are not levying a civil fine. We are not even talking about removing her from committees.

We are simply firmly and formally disagreeing with her and chastising her for her words and her actions.

What she did was not leadership. It was demagoguery of the worst kind, and it was beneath the dignity of this office, her office, and the alleged commitment to peace she claims.

□ 1545

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

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

First and foremost, can we please stop misrepresenting Representative TLAIB's words? She does not want to kill Jews. She is not in support of Hamas. She is speaking as someone who is the only Palestinian American in U.S. history to serve in this body.

Without her voice, we would lack even more empathy for the people of Palestine. We would not have someone with direct personal experience speaking against the siege that is happening now in Gaza.

This body needs empathy and compassion for all people, not just people who look like the majority of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Maybe because of your lack of diversity, you lack the cognitive and emotional ability to recognize diverse opinions when they speak truth to power. You absolutely need to open up your mind to other people and other experiences, especially when they are Muslim, when they are women, and when they are people of color.

You had a Member of your party call my colleague a terrorist and didn't censure her, but we are having this conversation now about your interpretation of words.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, this censure measure is a sham.

When someone who is an American, a Muslim, a woman, and a Palestinian dares to speak out for her people, she is told to be quiet. She is told to stop talking about Palestinian brothers and sisters in the same breath as Jewish brothers and sisters.

My sister RASHIDA is a child of the Midwest, representing the best of Midwestern sensibilities. She also exemplifies a rich tradition of the Islamic faith in the Midwest. She is a bold leader. She is a fair leader. She is a compassionate leader. Most importantly, she is an American.

Standing up for one oppressed people does not negate the oppression of another.

We should be working together to end this terrible suffering, eliminate these sham censures, and get back to the work of the people. That is why they elected us.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ).

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, words hold power. They are intentional representations of our values and our beliefs. Our democracy is at its strongest when we protect the right to dissent, to resist, and to speak truth to power.

However, over the past few weeks, this body has wrongfully and dangerously conflated dissent with hate speech and has willfully characterized acts of resistance as acts of bigotry. Bigotry and hateful speech are real, tangible threats to our shared humanity and our multiracial democracy, and we must address them.

As someone who has heard Members of this body who are not being brought up for censure casually use their platforms to carelessly promote violent, racist, anti-Semitic, Islamophobic, xenophobic, and anti-immigrant language and ideals, I am clear that this resolution is another ill-intentioned attempt to persecute dissenting voices who refuse to stay silent and whose perspective challenges this body and the dominant narrative.

We must resist the urge to scapegoat and vilify those who disagree with us,

and I unequivocally stand with my friend, RASHIDA TLAIB. I will be voting against the resolution, and I encourage my friends to do your job.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, it is glaring hypocrisy when you have Republicans on the other side of the aisle trying to create definitions and say RASHIDA wants to annihilate people when MAX MILLER himself went on TV and said we are turning Gaza into a parking lot and we want to annihilate Palestinians. Nobody condemned him on that side of the aisle.

What is true here is that every single one of them has not acknowledged the fact that Palestinians are dying in the tens of thousands but will continue to say it is us who are not acknowledging humanity.

RASHIDA will stand strong, and the Palestinian movement will continue for liberation until every single Palestinian has the right to live in liberty.

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

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, Hamas terrorists paraglided into a music festival and began an unprovoked spree of violence. Babies were beheaded, young girls raped, hundreds kidnapped, and many murdered in vile ways.

To compare a modern democracy with a repressive terrorist state is wrong, but it is also wrong for Congress to take this action at a time when we have serious issues that we face. To take an action and take down the words, to strike the words, to censure a fellow Member, no matter how incorrect we believe she may be, is wrong.

We lower ourselves when we try to take action against someone else for their words. We all go back to our districts, and thank goodness social media hasn't caught every one of us with everything that we say back in our districts because we would all be standing here.

This is a wrong time to do this. It is the wrong action to take. Let's pass a resolution condemning this kind of language, condemning anti-Semitism on college campuses and elsewhere, but it is absolutely wrong to vote for this motion.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I don't think that my colleagues have caught us in any kind of contradiction when they raised the case of Representative GOSAR, who posted a video on social media depicting himself killing our colleague Representative ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ and also attacking President Biden. This was a true threat. These were fighting words. This is something that is totally within our First Amendment tradition.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a time of terror and war, great polarization and trauma across the world. We must grapple the rule of law to our souls with hoops of steel at this moment. In a time of all kinds of storms all over the world, the rule of law, the Constitution, is our shore, and now is a moment to hug the shore.

Let's defend the freedom of speech for today, for tomorrow, and going forward in the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this article from 11 Alive News, titled: "Metro Atlanta woman killed in Jerusalem: reports," dated November 6, 2023.

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

There was no objection.

[From 11alive.com, Nov. 6, 2023]

METRO ATLANTA WOMAN KILLED IN JERUSALEM: REPORTS  
(By 11Alive Staff)

JERUSALEM, ISRAEL—A metro Atlanta woman was killed Monday morning in a stabbing attack in Jerusalem, news outlets reported.

According to the Atlanta Jewish Times, Elisheva Rose Ida Lubin, 20, grew up in Dunwoody. Gov. Brian Kemp commented on the tragedy and shared the Atlanta Jewish Times' article on social media.

"Marty, the girls, and I are heartbroken by the tragic news of Rose Lubin's death," the governor said.

Kemp said he would keep her family in his thoughts and prayers during this difficult time.

Lubin was a member of the Israel Border Police, the Wall Street Journal shared in a live updates story about the ongoing Israel-Hamas conflict. She lived in Kibbutz Sa'ad in southern Israel. The WSJ also mentioned that the area was one of the places attacked on Oct. 7.

It's been nearly a month since officials said Hamas attacked Israel in an "unprecedented" move. Thousands of lives have been lost.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I know there is a lot of passion today. I heard a lot of screaming. I heard a lot of accusations, you could say, on both sides.

I don't really care what race, religion, or gender orientation you are. Where I come from in the Marine Corps, we are all shades of green, and we all bleed red. That is the truth. I just care about the person who has my back.

When I was student body president at Morehouse School of Medicine, I was elected by my peers—60 percent females, 80 percent Black, 95 percent liberal. Why? I was elected because I love people. I love people of all sorts. This isn't about who you are. It is about what you represent, what this body represents. That is what this debate is about.

If this is not worthy of censure, I don't know what it is. Representative TLAIB has stoked anti-Semitism in this Nation and undermined our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution to show the world, especially our adversaries, that the United States stands behind our allies and will not back down to terrorists.

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

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

Mr. 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.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Deirdre Kelly, one of his secretaries.

□ 1600

#### TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 838 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. 4820.

Will the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. STEEL) kindly take the chair.

□ 1600

#### 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. 4820) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, with Mrs. STEEL (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, amendment No. 30, printed in part B of House Report 118-261, offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRECHEEN) had been disposed of.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. STRONG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. STRONG. 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 84, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. STRONG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STRONG. Madam Chair, I offer an amendment to H.R. 4820, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies Fiscal Year 2024 appropriations bill.

My amendment is simple. It expresses Congress' support for public housing authorities to conduct drug testing as a condition of receiving benefits.

My colleagues across the aisle will argue that the purpose of this amendment is to punish. I want to be clear: The purpose of this amendment is to protect. It is to protect taxpayer-funded resources and ensure that they are available for those who truly need them and are prepared to make positive contributions to society.

Drug testing would put drug abusers on notice and provide a clear incentive to get off of drugs and to work toward self-sufficiency.

Shouldn't that be something we all support?

We must have protections in place and tools to enforce them which discourage lifelong dependency and ensure these programs are used as they are intended, as a temporary safety net for our most vulnerable and needy, not a way of life for generations.

I am under no illusion that drug testing alone would solve all the problems of abuse and dependency that plague our welfare system. However, I do believe that any tool that helps to accomplish this goal should be fully leveraged and fully supported by Congress.

Drugs are absolutely ravaging our country. It can be seen in every community. In 2020, over 37 million Americans 12 years and older—think about it, 12 years and older—were illegal drug users.

As a first responder, I have seen the devastation and impact of drug abuse on individuals, their families, and our communities. We have a real drug problem on our hands in this country, and it is not getting any better with this administration's border policies which allow massive quantities of illicit drugs, including fentanyl, to pour into our country.

Not only would drug testing ensure the responsible use of taxpayer-funded benefits, it would also provide a valuable opportunity to identify drug users and connect them with existing resources to get the help that they need.

Voting against this amendment ignores the obligation we have to the American people to be responsible stewards of their hard-earned taxpayer money.

Voting for this amendment sends a clear message to each of our constituents: Protecting Federal resources for those who wish to improve their lives and break free from the cycle of dependency is a priority of Congress.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. STRONG).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), and I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the distinguished Democrat whip and former member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Chair, we are 10 days from a GOP shutdown, and instead of finding a bipartisan way forward, instead of working with us to lower costs for families at home, instead of honoring the budget deal that we already agreed to, Republicans have turned around and become a pro-lead poisoning caucus.

Really. Read the bill. They have written a housing and transportation budget that defunds lead removal in low-income housing, lead removal in the homes of 46,000 children.

That is not all. This bill cuts affordable housing construction by two-thirds. It guts transit funding, leaving parents with longer, more dangerous, less reliable commutes.

News flash. Nobody's gas prices were ever lowered by banning Pride flags, but the open discrimination against the LGBTQ+ Americans in this bill will hurt communities in every single one of our districts.

This bill is more of the same from the MAGA Republican majority: Unserious, heartless extremism.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to put children over politics and vote “no” on this bill.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Chair, yesterday President Biden announced significant new funding for passenger rail projects across New Jersey and the Northeast region, first and foremost for the Gateway Program that is the Nation's most critical infrastructure project.

It is a critical win for New Jersey families, and it comes as a result of funding through the bipartisan infrastructure law to get these important projects completed.

By making this investment in Gateway, we will prevent a shutdown of the Hudson River tunnel that could cost the United States economy \$16 billion over 4 years and reduce property values by \$22 billion in New Jersey alone. In fact, every dollar we invest in Gateway will create almost \$4 of benefits for the residents of our region, whether through lower travel costs, faster travel times, improved safety, or reduced highway congestion.

Unfortunately, the Republican majority's appropriations bill is a severe threat to the bipartisan work we have done to revitalize America's infrastructure, especially for passenger rail. The bill guts the main funding source for rail projects—the Capital Investment Grants program—by 85 percent and cuts Amtrak's Northeast Corridor funding by 92 percent. Not only that, but Republican amendments now propose cutting all Capital Investment Grants and Amtrak National Network funding.

These provisions are unacceptable and completely out of touch with the needs of the American people. They put all of our work on Gateway at risk and could eliminate over \$19 billion in economic activity for New Jerseyans and cost tens of thousands of good-paying jobs.

House Republicans' extreme agenda will make it harder for families to get to work or to their kids' soccer games. It will increase their travel costs and will worsen pollution and congestion in New Jersey.

Last Congress, I was proud to work across the aisle to enact historic legislation to revitalize rail in the Northeast region and more broadly to invest in New Jersey's infrastructure. Today, I urge my colleagues to not forsake all that work and to instead reach across the aisle and finish Gateway, strengthen Amtrak and the Northeast Corridor, and improve travel access and reliability for all of our constituents.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. GROTHMAN. 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 84, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, this amendment would increase and decrease the Section 8 housing program to call for a U.S. Government Accountability Office study on: first, the marital demographics of HUD-administered housing program beneficiaries;

Second, the existence and effects of any marriage penalties for means-tested housing benefits administered by HUD—in here, we are getting not only the Section 8 but also the 42 credits and that sort of housing—Third, any recommendations and policy solutions for reducing marriage penalties within the HUD-administered programs.

In the last 80 years in this country, we have had what I believe are means-

tested programs. The practical effect is to discourage marriage and, in particular, discourage men from getting involved in their children's families.

I remember touring a low-income housing project about 5 years ago, and the woman who was administering it, who was a crackerjack girl, really tremendous job, but she pointed out one of her major goals is to make sure she had no men in any of the housing units.

I can believe that a lot of those men, since they weren't husbands, were maybe causing trouble, maybe doing drugs. It brought home the fact that right now an effect, and sometimes goal, of low-income housing projects is to keep men away from their families. This is, of course, only one.

I am highlighting the housing programs because we are dealing with HUD right now. It is, of course, true of all sorts of other income-transfer programs as well. Food stamps, medical programs, and Pell grants all come with their marriage penalties.

We want to focus on this. We want to see if this is a program that largely benefits people who are not married, largely benefits families without men in them. We know that there was a powerful group in this country, whose prescribed purpose, they said, was to get rid of the Western-prescribed nuclear family. We know under Marxism, one of the goals is to get rid of the family.

The purpose here is we want to have hard statistics, a GAO study, on the degree to which we are penalizing families with both parents there.

Madam Chair, we have all sorts of statistics here. My only comment is that, A, it is a little bit more difficult for a child, a little bit more of a tough row to hoe in life if they don't have a man at home.

I think one of the problems we have in some of our inner cities today that not only affects the children, but it affects the parents, because I think for a lot of people the most important thing they do in their life and their motivation for life is getting involved in their children's families, and right now the low-income housing program as well as other income-transfer programs are designed to deny men a role in their children's lives.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 110, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$505,000,000)".

Page 203, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$505,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chair, this amendment will decrease funding for the Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS by \$505 million and move it to the spending reduction account.

AIDS is a horrific disease. We have lots of horrific diseases in our country, but we don't have programs for everybody that gets a disease. We don't have programs specifically for people that get cancer, for example.

We have programs for AIDS because when AIDS was first spreading, people didn't understand it. They thought it would spread like a contagion, that you could get it just because you lived in the same housing development as someone else. Now that we properly understand AIDS, we don't have the same kind of denial of access to housing for people.

We do have need-based housing, and there are people with AIDS who have needs, and some of them currently are even being housed under this program.

The reality is they would still have access to housing if they are qualified for need-based assistance just like every other American. It doesn't eliminate the safety net but eliminates the special, favored treatment.

Why is that important? Well, look. We have to cut something. Ronald Reagan famously recognized that the closest thing to eternal life we will see on this Earth is a government program. There is always a new program, but there is never a time to get rid of an old program.

This program just continues on without real authorization. It just keeps getting appropriated. It is time. It is time to take it away.

It is time to curb our spending. This HUD program spends almost \$3 billion more than it used to spend in discretionary spending.

We are going to have to turn something off. We have over \$33 trillion in debt, and in the next 18 months, we are supposed to add another \$3 trillion. Are we supposed to take spending seriously once we get to \$50 trillion? At some point, people recognize that if something can't continue, it will eventually stop.

It is not compassionate to bankrupt America. We put these programs out there, and we say they are so compassionate, but they are not because they are leading our country toward a crash site. This is going to end in financial ruin.

This is the same kind of point we tried to make when they said, let's close the economy and print money. We are spending more money than anyone will even lend us. The Federal Reserve became the lender of last resort,

and their balance sheet grew by \$5 trillion.

We knew that was going to cause inflation. That is why I created the Sound Money Caucus in July of 2020. They said it wouldn't cause inflation. We said it would. They said it wouldn't hit consumers. We said it would.

They finally acknowledged, well, maybe it will be transitory. That is the phase we are in. How transitory is it?

All this goes back to policy decisions. You might be able to print money, but you can't guarantee that it will keep buying the same amount of stuff. We do have to turn something off. I think this is a tragic situation when anyone has a disease, but we need to turn this program off.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, this program saves lives. HOPWA provides long-term housing assistance, permanent support of housing, homelessness prevention, and support of services to one of the most vulnerable populations—low-income people with HIV.

Housing is the greatest unmet need for people living with HIV, and HOPWA is the only Federal funding dedicated to directly addressing this need.

Multiple studies have shown the lack of stable housing is the most significant factor limiting the use of antiretroviral medications regardless of insurance, substitutes, and other factors. Housing interventions improve stability and access to care. Let's be clear. If passed, this amendment will harm people's access to life-saving treatment.

Let's get down to it. It is not lost upon me that among all the programs in this bill that support people with chronic diseases and other disabilities, this is the only one that has been singled out.

This is a disease that can affect anyone, but HIV disproportionately affects racial and ethnic minorities, the LGBTQI+ community, young people, and people who inject drugs.

It seems to me in an effort to deny resources to LGBTQI+ people in this country, this amendment will worsen health inequalities, exacerbate the opiate epidemic, and otherwise do irreparable damage to our Nation's public health.

It is difficult to overstate the cruelty of this amendment and the damage it would do to public health and to one of our most vulnerable populations.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no", and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chair, the amendment doesn't stop people who have genuine needs as defined by our current needs-based program from receiving assistance.

It maintains the same level of compassion it has for all Americans. It

doesn't treat them with any special distinction. In fact, it restores equality instead of denying it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to this amendment to eliminate funding for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, or HOPWA program.

This amendment would cut off housing support for tens of thousands of people living with HIV. In doing so, we take ourselves back to the 1980s—when the government ignored the needs of those living with HIV and the urgency of the HIV epidemic.

For more than three decades, HOPWA has provided critical support for low-income people living with HIV. HOPWA is a bipartisan program that serves over 75,000 people, providing housing assistance including rental assistance, transitional housing, and permanent housing.

Stable housing is essential for helping people living with HIV to achieve better health outcomes. Linking individuals living with HIV to stable, supportive housing is directly linked to decreased viral load, an 80 percent reduction in mortality from AIDS, and a 57 percent reduction in hospitalizations.

To destabilize housing for 55,000 households and over 75,000 people would create a public health disaster. Cutting funding to HOPWA would cost far more money in increased healthcare costs than investing in this critical program at the outset.

This amendment would significantly impede our Nation's efforts both to support those living with HIV and to end the HIV epidemic.

With Veterans Day on Saturday, I also want to inform my colleagues that 10 percent of HOPWA recipients are veterans.

I strongly oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to join me in calling for continued funding for HOPWA, just as this body has done since 1992.

If the gentleman is truly interested in cutting the deficit, he might consider supporting repeal of President Trump's tax cuts of 2018 where 83 percent of the benefits went to the top 1 percent of the people and which increased the deficit by several trillion dollars.

In summary, I urge the defeat of this amendment for health reasons and for fiscal reasons.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, I am prepared to close.

Madam Chairwoman, research conducted in my home city of Chicago showed that homeless individuals living with HIV had significantly im-

proved health outcomes and transmission risk when provided with HOPWA assistance, and substantial cost savings were achieved by reducing healthcare costs for this population.

For people with HIV, housing is healthcare. That stability is healthcare. It means the difference often between life and death.

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chairwoman, our colleague just makes the point. If Chicago needs a program, Chicago could operate a program. If the State of Illinois needs a program, Illinois could operate a program. If the State of New York needs a program, the State could operate a program. The Federal Government does not need to operate this program.

It disproportionately goes to high-density populations in urban areas. It doesn't affect rural America. Frankly, it federalizes a problem that is much more localized.

It is time to let something finally expire and say this need has largely been met. The health conditions are much more survivable than they were when this program was launched.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to finally trim something that is no longer needed. It restores equality in our social safety net rather than continuing to distort it. Please support my amendment.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. 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 111, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000) (reduced by \$100,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Delaware.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, amendment No. 36. This

amendment highlights the importance of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Pathways to Removing Obstacles to Housing, otherwise known as the PRO Housing grant program and land-use reform policies, which were shortsightedly omitted entirely from this partisan bill that we are reconsidering tonight, H.R. 4820.

This grant program, funded for the first time in fiscal year 2023, is based on broadly supported bipartisan bills, including my Housing Supply and Affordability Act and the Yes in My Backyard Act.

The program incentivizes reform of local land-use policies that hinder the expansion of an affordable housing supply.

Our Nation is facing an affordable housing crisis. We have a shortage of as many as 7 million affordable homes.

This drastic underproduction hurts American families. It hurts communities, businesses, and costs the economy about \$2 trillion per year in lower productivity and wages.

The lack of affordable housing also increases the strain on the labor market with about 9.6 million job openings in the U.S.

From food service to cybersecurity, employers in nearly every industry are struggling to find and retain workers. The bottom line is to take a job, you need to be able to afford to live near that job.

I hear about this problem in almost every meeting that I attend up and down my State. It is a problem that impacts people in Delaware, from our beaches to the cities to the rural communities, and I know it is impacting Americans across this country.

I urge my colleagues to think about the human impact of the lack of affordable housing; extreme stress, homelessness, increased workforce shortages, and poorer health outcomes. It is clear that housing is foundational to our well-being.

Strict land-use policies create artificial restrictions that drive up costs and delay production. In many cases, they are horrific vestiges from the past, where discriminatory redlining broke up communities and prevented all Americans from having access to the American Dream.

□ 1630

Unfortunately, the bill that we are voting on today will squander another opportunity to right those wrongs of the past.

We know the bill in its current form has no chance of becoming law. The lack of meaningful housing reform and support, like the PRO Housing program and land reform policies, are examples of the many fatal flaws with this bill.

The adoption of my amendment will at least signal to the Senate and our appropriations leaders that we need to include the PRO Housing program and land use policy reforms in a final appropriations bill.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Chair, we are going to use \$100 million, to use the Senate's number, to influence what should be a local decisionmaking process on zoning for affordable housing.

We all support affordable housing. That is not really the issue. The issue is who is going to make the zoning decisions within each and every location and jurisdiction throughout this country. We don't believe that it should be the Federal Government imposing its will on local government in those zoning decisions. That should be up to the locals.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my friend's amendment.

According to Up For Growth's recent 2023 report, we have underproduced housing by millions of missing homes across our country. That reality pushes homeownership out of reach for too many Americans, and we have to fix that.

While there is no silver bullet solution to this problem, several studies have indicated that restrictive zoning laws remain among the largest barriers preventing construction of additional housing supply, and that drives up prices.

As a result, Representative FLOOD and I introduced a bill called the Yes in My Backyard Act. Our bill is designed to eliminate some of these discriminatory land use policies and remove some of those barriers that prevent new housing construction across our country.

That bill is consistent with this amendment. My friend and colleague from Delaware and I have championed funding through the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Pathways to Removing Obstacles to Housing grant program. This isn't about forcing any community to do anything. It is about trying to encourage communities to make decisions that allow for more housing construction.

Madam Chair, I am disappointed that this year's bill cuts funding for that program because that hurts our ability to solve this crisis.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Chair, let me reiterate that Washington bureaucrats ought not be getting into the zoning business of local jurisdictions across the United States with \$100 million to influence folks to make decisions that may not be in the best interests of those in the community.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment.

In FY23, we provided funding for a new grant program in the community development fund to support communities that are taking active steps to remove barriers to the construction of new housing.

This is just one piece of the puzzle to help address the affordable housing crisis that American families are facing. This shortage is especially harmful to seniors and people with disabilities, who make up nearly half of the lowest income renters.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support and vote for this amendment.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Chair, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. 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 Delaware will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. GROTHMAN. 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 111, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,650,000,000)”.

Page 111, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,650,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, let's look at the big picture here for a second.

In the year that just wrapped up, the year ending September 30, the Federal Government was borrowing 22 percent of every dollar it spent. That should shock and scare people to death.

We reached a neat agreement that I maybe think the Republicans should be

paying a little more attention to on the debt limit increase. In that debt limit increase, there is going to be a mild cut in spending, discretionary spending. Even if we stick to that amendment, we will go from borrowing 22 percent of everything we spend in fiscal year 2023 up to 23 percent, another percentage increase in the next year.

In other words, we have a pretty scary situation going on here. I think as we approach all these bills, our goal should always be to spend a little less money. It is kind of frustrating when you hear people wanting to spend more money.

Madam Chair, perusing this bill, there seems to be one area that is obviously not the Federal Government's business, which is that of the Community Development Block Grant program. I cannot imagine why it would be the Federal Government's business to get involved in housing or any other sort of construction on a local level.

We are broke, broke, broke out of our mind, and getting more broke every minute. Actually, some of our States are running surpluses. I know Wisconsin right now has a tremendous amount of money, so I thought we could look at the Community Block Grant Program. President Trump, or at least his finance director, tried to get rid of it altogether. Because I am so easygoing, I thought we would introduce an amendment just to reduce it by half, which would save \$1.65 billion in the next fiscal year.

I think one would be hard-pressed to say that these programs have been effective. Like every program that is paid for on a Federal level but administered on the local level, they have all sorts of rules involved that make things unnecessary, costly, and take a longer period of time. Insofar as it is a good program, the States and locals will be able to do it.

I have a list here of things that I don't think we were anticipating when this program began: \$500,000 to expand Niagara County brewing; \$276,000 to fund a skateboard park in North Adams, Massachusetts; \$500,000 in corporate subsidies to persuade Procter & Gamble's Natura acquisition to move to Fremont, California, probably from some other city around this country.

In any event, I think this is a small effort at spending a little bit less money and weaning the local governments off the Federal Government. If they want to do their own stuff, they can.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment and its attack on the resources of Democratic and Republican mayors, Governors, and county officials who rely

on this to close the gap in funding for housing and infrastructure needs in their communities.

CDBG investments reach every corner of every district. In Wisconsin, the cut to the State would be from \$27 million to \$13 million; in Chicago, it would be from \$75 million to \$37 million; and Sheboygan—yes, Sheboygan—would go from \$865,000 to \$432,000.

These investments reach every corner of every district. These funds remain one of the most important resources for State and local governments to rehab affordable housing, upgrade essential infrastructure, promote business redevelopment in distressed areas, and provide services such as job training.

In fact, in fiscal year 2022, the largest share of CDBG program funding was for projects that support rehabbing single-family housing, critical water and sewer improvements, and street improvements.

In Chicago, programs supported by CDBG include lead poisoning prevention, homeownership counseling, and home accessibility repairs for seniors and people with disabilities.

The program also provides high impact, high return on investments for taxpayers, with over \$2.4 billion leveraged across CDBG projects in 2021. From 2005 to 2022, CDBG facilitated the creation and retention of 521,000 jobs, contributed to infrastructure benefiting approximately 609 million individuals, assisted over 980 million constituents through public services, and met the housing needs of nearly 1.8 million households.

This amendment is representative of a larger problem with the Republican appropriation proposals—cutting spending, but only on the backs of low-income and middle-class Americans, and divesting in programs that support job creation and curb the housing affordability crisis, all while making it easier for billionaires and corporations to cheat on their taxes.

Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, I love my colleagues, but the States right now—at least Wisconsin big time—are running a surplus. If the State of Wisconsin feels they need more government involvement in building things, they are perfectly capable of appropriating their funds on their own. If the individual cities want to subsidize one part of town, they are perfectly capable of doing that on their own. There will be less paperwork, and it will be done quicker and at lower costs without Federal Government involvement.

Again, I emphasize that we are borrowing over 22 percent of what we spend as it is. Our goal shouldn't be to look for more things for the Federal Government to do. Our goal should be to go through each and every one of these appropriations bills to look for less before the value of the dollar completely collapses.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUFERFORD).

Mr. RUFERFORD. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, the CDBG program is one of the few opportunities that the Federal Government has where we actually take taxpayer dollars and send them back to the State and local governments to use the way they see fit.

That is the reason I rise in opposition to this amendment. This will cut \$13 million just from the State of Florida and a little over \$4 million just from my district alone.

Madam Chair, having been in local government as a sheriff for 12 years, I can say that CDBG was a tremendous opportunity to help public safety in the way that our community needed assistance. It wasn't a mandate down from bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. It was an opportunity to take tax dollars, return them to the taxpayer, and allow their elected representatives to decide how best to use that money.

For that reason, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment, and I ask all my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1645

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

The Chair understands amendment No. 40 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. HAGEMAN. 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:

On page 177, after section 244, insert the following:

SEC. 245. No funds made available under this title may be used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for remote work performed by an employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development at an alternative worksite within a 50 mile radius of an office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in favor of my amendment No. 43, which would prohibit HUD remote work agreements when the employee is working within 50 miles of a HUD office.

Madam Chair, HUD's handbook defines remote work as an arrangement where the employee is not required to report to an agency worksite on a regular or recurring basis. It then defines two forms of remote work, one being near HUD office, which is within 50 miles of a HUD office, to work remotely.

As an example, it cites an employee who would normally be based in HUD's Robert C. Weaver headquarters in Washington, D.C., who is allowed to work from their home in Arlington, Virginia.

Now, Madam Chair, they are not even trying to hide it anymore. The agencies are baking into their policies unseen benefits and perks for bureaucrats who quite frankly aren't entitled to them and for which the taxpaying public is paying, yet we are not receiving an adequate return on our investment.

Thousands of congressional staffers commute to the Capitol building every morning from the surrounding neighborhoods, whether they live in Arlington, Alexandria, or cities in Maryland. Why can't the agency employees do the same?

Pre-COVID, the oversight of Federal agencies was slim, as was the accountability that the American people are entitled to. Today, it is even harder to monitor the efficacy, the efficiency, and the legal compliance of many agency employees because we don't even know where they are. Are they at home doing laundry when they should be processing applications? Are they picking their children up from school during work hours? Are they taking a 2-hour lunch because there is no oversight? We don't know.

I believe that if you are being paid by the American people, you should work for the American people. My amendment is designed to bring some semblance of accountability back to HUD.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, the remote work agreements addressed in this amendment, where they exist, have been thoughtfully negotiated by OMB, labor unions, and management and have been in place under Republican and Democratic administrations.

To impede on that process with a provision would be yet another Republican overreach that fails to take into consideration any special accommodation employees may need related to remote work.

This prohibition, which fails to address circumstances under which remote work arrangements may be beneficial to the taxpayer or a necessary accommodation for an employee, is not a serious approach to policymaking.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, HUD's remote work policy shows that its employees are not showing up to work at the Robert C. Weaver building but are instead spending their days in the homes, coffee shops, and other locations across the greater D.C. area. My amendment addresses that situation and requires the employees to show up at their job.

Bureaucracy already moves way too slowly, even when the employees are working in the same building, down the hall from one another, and with access to all of the work accoutrements that are necessary for them to do their jobs.

HUD's policy means that today we are not even sure if they are working in the same State. That is unacceptable.

The basic principles of oversight and accountability require that employees go to work. Basic principles of avoiding further waste, fraud, and abuse means not leaving Federal agency buildings barren.

COVID is over. It is time to return to work. The Republican majority has made clear that we believe government employees should be working at their places of employment. My amendment furthers that policy.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

The Chair understands amendment No. 45 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$18,443,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chair, as a traditional courtesy, I am offering this for Mr. BUCK, who has been very kind to us.

This is an amendment I think we have all seen versions of. It is structurally very simple. It moves the appropriation amount back to the 2019 fiscal year.

You all know the reasons. We have all had this discussion and debate here. It is before the pandemic plus-ups, reaching back to a year where the economy was good and the mechanics were good. Apparently the agency seemed to be able to do its work. Here we are a couple fiscal years later, but we keep plugging back in the plus-ups that were supposed to be the pandemic emergency. This actually rolls it back to 2019.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, this amendment makes drastic, indiscriminate cuts from programs in transportation and housing without any regard for the merits of the programs contained in the bill or the people and communities involved across America that would benefit from these programs and rely on them to keep air traffic moving and roofs over their heads.

I want to be clear up front about what this bill would mean. It would result in mass evictions. It would decimate funding for Amtrak operations and rail safety, and it would bring air traffic to a halt. Hundreds of thousands of families would be evicted upon losing rental assistance. The hiring of air traffic controllers would halt, towers would be forced to shut down, and air travel would become at best unsafe and at worst impossible. Funding for Amtrak would be decimated even further than it already is in the base bill, significantly reducing operations.

The amendment trivializes the Appropriations Committee's process and disregards the consideration of Member requests that committee members put into writing bills.

It will result in unimaginable draconian cuts to the very programs Republicans claim to support in their districts to their constituents and which provide critical, basic housing and safety needs. This includes: the FAA's air traffic control operations; Amtrak's operation and maintenance; the Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvement Program, which supports rail safety; housing assistance programs for the elderly and people with disabilities; housing rental assistance vouchers for which cuts would result in mass evictions across the country; all programs that support Tribal housing and infrastructure needs; the Continuation of Care program, which

supports hundreds of thousands of homeless veterans, domestic violence survivors, and youth; the popular Community Development Block Grant program; Community Project Funding, which Republicans and Democrats alike requested to address transportation and housing challenges; and critical investments in port infrastructure.

This amendment would even cut the small amount of defense spending included in the T-HUD bill for critical maritime security programs.

It would not encourage DOT or HUD to do more with less. Simply put, it would force our constituents to do less with less. This is particularly galling, because the bill rescinds enforcement money that will ensure wealthy individuals and corporations pay their taxes, which actually increases the deficit due to lost revenue.

Is it really more important to give the wealthy a tax break rather than provide housing, roads, bridges, trains, and safety services from which all citizens benefit?

Mr. CHAIR, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the appropriations process. I have some sense of how difficult it has been for both sides.

This is the 2019 fiscal budget. Was that really, really that difficult, that draconian?

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 57 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, this is one of those amendments I just felt I needed to make a point here. It is a brutal amendment, but we did some calculations.

Fifty-seven percent of this appropriation within this piece of this budget goes to entities that have their own taxing authority.

Why do we care about that?

Do you realize every dime we are appropriating here, every dime we get to vote on, lives on borrowed money? We borrow every dime of defense and every dime of discretionary if you look at the 2023 budget. It looks like we are going to do the same thing in the 2024 that we are working on right now. We borrowed \$300 billion to \$400 billion of functionally what is Medicare.

I know that no one really wants to go near this because it is radioactive and uncomfortable, but it is math. This is from a couple hours ago, Bloomberg’s headline, Bloomberg Analytics. It is behind the paywall, so if you have a Bloomberg terminal, go look it up, “U.S. Debt Interest Bill Rockets Past a Cool \$1 Trillion a Year.” They are estimating that our interest bill for this fiscal year, total gross interest, is \$1 trillion.

□ 1700

Stop and think about that. That means Social Security is the number one spend, interest just became number two, Medicare just became number three, and defense is now number four. These are numbers we were not supposed to hit for a decade. It is here.

Sometimes I feel like an absolute idiot because I come behind this microphone—and I have done this for years—and we walk through numbers like this. People just stare at you and say, well, that is not interesting, that is math. The math will always win.

Our amendment here is tough, but it makes a point. Is it moral, is it ethical, is it rational to borrow money and give it to entities that have their own taxing authority?

Trust me, I have been the treasurer of the fourth most populous county in the United States. I know how hard it is to be the tax collector. I was the tax collector in Maricopa County. It makes you really popular when that is your title.

Understand what we are doing here. We are going to borrow money to send it to entities that ultimately do have the ability to raise the receipts and revenues.

The last comment I will make on this for my brothers and sisters on the left, how often do they scream at us: We should raise revenues. Okay. Guess what? Talk to your locals. Let them raise the revenues.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I could roll the tape of what I just said last time to respond because these are indiscriminate cuts, but that is not particularly helpful.

If we are here to make a point, let’s make this point. If this is all about reducing the debt, let’s not kid ourselves that we are going to accomplish this beating the hell out of nondefense discretionary. Let’s go back to the Simpson-Bowles discussion and the debt commission that took place back then.

The conclusions they came up with on a bipartisan basis was that anything to be serious had to be big, had to be balanced, and had to be bipartisan. But balanced meant cutting across all the lines.

Now, what we have learned, if you spend any time in this House, is that there are sacred cows. If we are talking to our left and our right, what I would say to my friends on the right is that you got your sacred cows, too. Right now they are mooing everywhere because you are not touching them, and therefore, you are not serious about dealing with the debt.

If you are, let’s remember Simpson-Bowles did come over here one time under the late Mr. LaTourette and our friend, Mr. Cooper. Under Cooper-LaTourette, which was some feigned attempt to do this on a big, balanced, bipartisan basis with no sacred cows, it got 36 votes.

If we are serious about this, let’s talk about the commission and let’s talk about all things. You can agree or disagree, but don’t try to con the American people that we are serious about this, pounding on housing and transportation. It won’t get the job done, and it will do a lot of damage.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I actually give the ranking member kudos for being intellectually honest. That is actually part of my point. The numbers now are brutally uglier than even Simpson-Bowles.

It is one of the things we don’t like to say because it doesn’t look good on a campaign brochure, but functionally every dime of future debt from today into the future is actually demographics. It is healthcare. In 9 years, do we backfill Social Security?

It is intellectually honest to say: We are borrowing every dime we get to vote on as Members of Congress. I keep wanting to say that over and over and over. Every dime of military, every dime of nondefense discretionary is now borrowed, plus, probably my math is about \$4 billion to \$5 billion of mandatory. Now we will live on borrowed money.

Until that starts to hit our intellectual lexicon of what we say and how we think, it makes it very hard to try to

make the argument that if we don't step up and do this, the bond market is going to do it for us.

Remember, we borrowed 8.4 percent of GDP last year. To my brothers and sisters who say the solution is often to raise taxes on the wealthy, the best model says that we can only get about 1½ percent of GDP by maximizing every tax on \$400,000 and up.

Mr. Chairman, 1½ percent isn't anywhere close when you just borrowed 8.4 percent.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I just have to say that across the board 57 percent—and it does look like we are going above the 2023 numbers, but actually we had to start off with a cut of about \$8 billion to fill a hole that was caused by last year's Democratic budget gimmicks and the disasters of the Biden economic plan.

We reduced wasteful spending funding across 19 different DOT and HUD grant programs. We have right-sized spending for transportation infrastructure. We have prioritized two things in this bill: transportation safety and housing assistance for vulnerable Americans. That is where the focus lies.

We have cut significantly from the 2023 numbers. Cutting this bill through indiscriminate across-the-board cuts really abdicates our responsibility to make sure that we are protecting the priorities of this Nation in transportation safety and housing for America's most vulnerable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" on this amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. BURLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the grant program under section 151(f) of title 23, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would prohibit funds from going to the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Program. This grant program was created in 2021 in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to strategically deploy electric vehicle charging stations around the country.

The reason that I filed this amendment is simple. It is not the role of the Federal Government to subsidize the electric vehicle charging industry.

After spending billions of taxpayer dollars and bribing the affluent to buy electric vehicles, it turns out only one-third of the population wants to even buy one or aspires to buy one, and two-thirds are not even considering purchasing one. The two-thirds who are not considering it don't want to be forced to pay for the others.

Maybe you like electric vehicles. In fact, I actually do, personally. I test-drove a Tesla and loved it, but it would be immoral for me to force my neighbors and compel them through the force of government to subsidize my new electric vehicle.

In essence, we are robbing Peter to pay Paul. The fact is, this program will cost taxpayers \$2.5 billion dollars, which will all be debt, for something that most Americans cannot afford and are unable to appreciate.

It is not the government's job to pick winners and losers in the energy market. That is the role of consumers and businesses operating in a free market.

Here we are, once again, using tax dollars to subsidize and force a product on people where there is little demand. If the direct cost to taxpayers doesn't bother you, the indirect costs, including the higher energy prices, the cost of making the electricity grid more reliable, and increased dependence on China are arguably worse.

When the government subsidizes the EV infrastructure, it does so by raising energy prices for everyone. The installation of new charging stations also makes our electricity grid less reliable, further putting Americans at risk to having blackouts, brownouts, or other reliability issues.

Finally, maybe worst of all, it is not just that Americans are being priced out of affordable, reliable energy; it is not just that we are rigging the market against our own constituents, but we are also selling them out to the Chinese Communist Party.

These electric charging stations and electric car batteries require a massive amount of resources from China, which controls the world's critical minerals supply chain.

America was energy independent just 3 short years ago, but through the government electric vehicle scam we have

allowed Communist China to establish an EV monopoly all while Americans get poorer. It is time that we stop forcing Americans to foot the bill for other people and instead focus on making our energy system more reliable and affordable.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, this grant program will provide critical resources toward making community charging stations for electric vehicles available and accessible. Oh, by the way, it will make EVs more popular.

By increasing EV charging stations in communities across the country, we are modernizing our infrastructure, working toward our emission reduction goals, and creating good jobs in the process.

Ensuring that charging stations are visible and accessible in our communities addresses concerns many drivers have when considering making the switch to electric.

By prioritizing funding to projects in rural communities and low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, this program will help blue and red States.

We have heard from State departments of transportation and private partners, like gas stations, who want this funding to build their customer base to bring consumers into their convenience shops. This is a Federal investment in partnership with industry.

Additionally, this Charging and Fueling Infrastructure program is an authorized program, funded through the Highway Trust Fund. Authorizers, on a bipartisan basis, have authorized funding to be used for these purposes.

This funding is wanted and is another important step in the Nation's efforts to battle climate change, meet emission reductions goals, and meet the automobile industry where they are at.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, we didn't have to subsidize or have grant programs to create the very robust infrastructure of fuel stations that exist across this country. It happened on its own through the free market. That is all I am suggesting.

The average price of an electric vehicle now is around \$66,000, and the median income is less than that. It is \$59,000 a year. So when the government subsidizes an electric vehicle infrastructure, it is not free money. It is not free. It is taxpayer money. Because of the situation we are in, this is all debt.

It is not just a one-time cost, as well. These subsidies are a continuous drain on the public funds that could be used for real hard infrastructure that all Americans can use, things like roads and bridges.

The average family is priced out entirely from purchasing an EV in the market but is still paying for it on the back end with higher energy costs, higher taxes, and a less reliable grid.

Ultimately, it is the poorest people in this country who are hit the hardest when the Federal Government redistributes tax dollars to subsidize the EVs for those who can't afford it.

□ 1715

This is basically a reverse Robin Hood. I repeat, it is a reverse Robin Hood. Instead of taking from the rich and giving to the poor, we are taking from the poor, and we are giving it to the rich. We are making them pay taxes on someone else's luxury item while telling them to stop using cheap, reliable energy that they need to survive.

The Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Grant Program is just another classic example of the government picking winners and losers. If Americans want a product, then the market will reflect that without our need to artificially increase the demand.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MRS. CAMMACK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to finalize any rule or regulation that meets the definition of section 804(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment which would restrict funds at the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies from being used to finalize any rule or regulation that would have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more.

Under the Biden administration, regulatory agencies are out of control. We know this. We have seen hundreds of billions of dollars in regulatory costs fall on the shoulders of average Americans without any input from elected Representatives in Congress, indeed, those Americans' elected Representatives.

Agencies that fall under the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development create unreasonable hurdles for American citizens in pursuit of a radical climate change initiative and the so-called sustainable housing development programs.

My amendment seeks to restore congressional oversight over these regulations by requiring that any major rule proposed by these agencies be approved by Congress before they take effect. If Congress chooses to approve them, then so be it. At least the American people's voice will have been heard rather than that of an unelected, nameless, and faceless bureaucrat in a basement somewhere in Washington.

By including my amendment in this bill, we restore Congress' Article I authority by bringing significant regulatory decisions back to the body that is closest to the will and the voice of the people.

We will no longer allow unelected bureaucrats to impose these regulatory costs that are so costly and that are done behind closed doors but rather commit ourselves to more open and transparent governance.

We have already seen the Biden administration's impractical rule to slash greenhouse gas emissions over the next decade inevitably leading to higher vehicle prices for consumers with very little impact on greenhouse gas emissions. This rule is especially burdensome for rural States and districts such as mine where the infrastructure to shift to electrification is not even close to being operable let alone economical.

We have also seen the recent Department of Housing and Urban Development affirmatively furthering a fair housing rule which imposes a burden on small municipalities and public housing authorities and other entities by requiring them to develop equity plans every 5 years.

These plans are extensive and expensive endeavors that require housing authorities to submit numerous details of progress and modifications to HUD. The rule effectively drowns these entities in paperwork while doing nothing to further their missions of providing safe and secure housing for hard-working American families.

Heck, Mr. Chair, we have such a backlog of maintenance through HUD that that is where we should be talking about our moneys going toward rather than another additional burden on the American people.

Lastly, we have seen the Federal Housing finance agency announce that it is hiking loan-level pricing adjustment fees on home buyers with high credit scores and redistributing them to funds for borrowers with low credit scores, essentially penalizing people who have made tough decisions, sacrificed, and worked very hard.

This rule penalizes financially responsible borrowers with additional fees that subsidize housing payments

for borrowers with bad credit. These additional fees can be significant according to a report by the Heritage Foundation and found that if a young homeowner in their thirties were able to invest their additional mortgage expenses at 8 percent annual returns, which is pretty average, that investment could grow by nearly \$31,000 upon retirement. That is not minuscule.

Once again, this rule was created outside the purview of duly elected Representatives.

All in all, my amendment is simple. It restores the people's voice in these significant Federal agency decisions that impact their daily lives. It is time that we restore Article I authority and give the American people the transparent and accountable government that they deserve.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment prohibits the administration or any administration from finalizing any rule or regulation that has a significant impact on the economy. This is just another example of bad policy riders aimed at tying any administration's hands when carrying out the duly enacted laws by a Congress.

It will stop the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development from finalizing rules that keep Americans safe on the roads, in the skies, or in their homes.

This amendment has little to do with an appropriations bill, and it has less to do with supporting American infrastructure, advancing transportation safety, and addressing our housing shortage.

Mr. Chairman, I must respectfully oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am very supportive of this amendment. The gentlewoman has been leading on this topic for quite a while through the REINS Act. I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the two areas that most threaten our democracy right now, and that is rulemaking in executive orders that absolutely go around our Article I authority here in this body.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I would love to see it in every bill that we pass in appropriations.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Florida for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, this is simple. It is about accountability and transparency, and the language of this amendment

was passed in a bipartisan manner earlier this year. This is a no-brainer.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. FRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any Federal law, rule, or regulation that would require an individual to wear a mask on public transportation conveyances and at transportation hubs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit mask mandates on any form of public transit and at transportation hubs.

The COVID-19 pandemic robbed Americans of far too many individual liberties. For 15 months, Americans were required by Federal law to wear masks on all forms of public transportation across the country, on planes, trains, buses, you name it, Mr. Chairman.

Americans were also required to wear a mask while going through security and waiting at the airport, navigating a train station, or waiting at a bus stop.

The government forced Americans to cover up.

The kicker is that multiple studies have shown that wearing masks had an adverse effect on people. Wearing a mask does not actually have a statistically significant effect on preventing the spread of COVID-19. In fact, States without mask mandates, like my home State of South Carolina, had lower death rates from COVID-19 than States with mask mandates.

We also have seen, unfortunately, catastrophic impacts that these mandates have on our children, worsening their communication and social skills and delaying their cognitive development while increasing their vulnerability and decreasing confidence.

My amendment does not prohibit any individual from wearing a mask on public transportation should they choose to do so.

This amendment would safeguard the freedom of all Americans to make important decisions for themselves, in-

cluding whether or not to wear that mask.

This amendment would put an end to Government overreach and protect the freedoms that Americans have. Our Constitution expressly protects those certain rights and liberties for individuals from government interference. We must defend and protect the principles our Nation was founded on and put a stop to extreme executive overreach mandates. This is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. Chairman, also, this amendment previously passed the Senate I think 1 week ago on a bipartisan basis, so I encourage Members of the other side to support this.

We cannot allow policies and practices used during the pandemic to continue for future generations endlessly. Americans are uniquely independent and self-reliant. We as Congress should empower the individual and not government. We should not put a nationwide mandate on the American people again. Mask mandates only give more power to the Federal Government and to the bureaucrats who run this town.

Let's get back to the basics. We the People demand it. I am committed to standing up to this administration's infringement on any individual liberties and working for the American people. Let's ensure that Government overreach comes to an end. Individual freedoms must be protected. It is as simple as that.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I would suggest that this legislation comes from that same denial caucus that if you don't like history then change it or ignore it; if you don't like facts and you don't like science, then you ignore it.

You do that at great risk, Mr. Chairman.

We have had epidemics and we have had pandemics in our past, and we will have them again. If we are not prepared, then we risk people's lives.

This amendment would prohibit the Department of Transportation and its agencies and public transportation operators from complying with any Federal law or regulation that requires an individual to wear a mask on public transportation or transportation hubs such as airports or any other circumstances.

Let's be clear: There is currently no Federal mask requirement in place for users or employees of public transportation, yet this amendment would leave the Federal Government ill-equipped to implement evidence-based policies that protect the health and safety of the public and of essential workers in the event we are faced with another public health emergency such

as a dangerous new COVID-19 variant or another even more deadly pandemic.

In the event of a public health emergency where evidence shows that the use of face masks can prevent transmission and deaths, we must be able to respond quickly and allow agencies like DOT and CDC to provide guidance and measures that protect healthcare workers, caregivers, grocery store employees, retail workers, and so many other Americans who rely on public transportation for essential travel.

This sweeping amendment is unnecessary and puts us all at risk. New variants are an expected part of the evolution of viruses and can be and will be more aggressive, transmittable, or cause even more severe disease than the original strain. We saw that in the great influenza of over 100 years ago.

Our Nation's public health officials need to have options available to them to protect our communities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what evidence-based things that my colleague on the other side was talking about.

Was it the zero masks that were initially prescribed by Dr. Fauci?

Was it one mask?

Was it two?

Was it no mask while vaccinated?

South Carolina never imposed a statewide mask mandate, and I think Congress could learn a thing or two from my home State.

Let's empower individuals to make that informed choice for themselves instead of bogging them down with these burdensome regulations.

This amendment would simply prevent mask mandates from occurring on airplanes, airports, trains, metros, subways, buses, train stations, and more.

We know Americans have been frustrated by this and by the ever-changing guidance coming from this Federal Government. I am proud to stand here today on behalf of these frustrated American citizens who do not want a mask mandate in the future.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this passed in a bipartisan manner in the Senate. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, this form of denial is the same sort of denial that didn't believe in vaccinations when it deals with COVID and when the vast majority of those in ICU units were unvaccinated, risking other people and putting other people's health at risk.

For this and so many other reasons, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1730

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 51 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. GOODEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. GOODEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 203, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 435. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to take an enforcement action under section 578.6(a)(3) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to a center high-mounted stop lamp.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOODEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOODEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to urge passage of my amendment regarding certain enforcement actions with regard to center high-mounted stop lamps.

I know my colleagues probably don't know what that is, but we refer to those commonly as center brake lights. This amendment is intended to prevent the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration from advancing on its misguided effort to overregulate and further confuse the collision avoidance industry that manufactures pulsating brake lights.

These devices, with over 4 million operating effectively today, have a demonstrated track record of improving safety. Studies have shown a reduction in rear-end collisions in excess of 30 percent with the vehicles that have utilized this technology.

These safety devices are simple, aftermarket products installed by dealerships when a vehicle is purchased. They allow the top brake light on a vehicle to pulse rapidly, which provides a heightened visual alert to trailing drivers who may be distracted and don't notice that the vehicle in front of them is braking.

This reduces the likelihood of rear-end collisions and creates a safer environment on our roads, especially in stop-and-go traffic.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to safeguard drivers across the Nation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, this amendment would disrupt the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's ability to enforce rules and regulations when vehicles are not in compliance with current Federal law.

For my colleague concerned about vendors who have been selling pulsing brake lights, it is my understanding

that the issue is now in litigation. We should not be impeding on or presupposing the outcome of the matter that has been referred to the courts.

My colleagues may disagree with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's longstanding interpretation that high-mounted brake lights must be steady burning, not pulsing, but this is not an appropriations issue.

If my colleague feels strongly that NHTSA should be considering new regulations related to the potential benefits of these lights, they should work together through regular order, which would be through the appropriate authorizing committees.

This amendment, as written, would not just address the pulsing light issue. It would impact the NHTSA's ability to conduct compliance investigations involving all high-mounted stop lamps and prevent them from gathering information related to compliance test failures.

In 2021, there were over 1.7 million rear-end crashes involving light vehicles, which resulted in almost 3,000 deaths and over 475,000 injuries. This amendment adds an unreasonable restriction on NHTSA's ability to conduct research and improve public safety on the Nation's roads. We cannot tie their hands to carry out their safety mission.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I suspected I would hear what I just heard, but I would like to correct a few things.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is not doing their job. Congress passed a law ordering them to conduct a study in 2019. They said they would, and they haven't done it yet. Not only have they not conducted a study, but they just recently reengaged on this issue this past summer. They failed to engage with me.

I have sent several letters asking them to do the job that Congress instructed them to do, but they have managed to order those manufacturers of this pulsing brake light to turn over all of their client lists because they wanted to then go after the dealers that have installed these lights and force them to turn over their client lists, and I think that is wrong.

This amendment is intended to force action by NHTSA to step back. If they are not going to do their job, then at least don't get in the way of something that works.

The studies have shown a reduction in rear-end collisions by over 30 percent with vehicles that have these brake lights. I will also point to something that is really shocking to me, frankly, and that is that 10 to 15 States, including Maryland, Texas, California, Utah, and Tennessee, have expressly agreed with the industry's analysis that these are actually helpful to the safety of Americans on the road.

Any time Texas and California agree on something, I am inclined to think it might actually be a good thing.

The other thing I will point out is something that I think many of those watching this debate are afraid to mention, and that is the fact that we have these manufacturers that have these deals that they worked out with these auto dealers, and they make these parts. They talk with these auto dealers and say they can sell this and make this amount of profit. They got all this worked out.

When it comes to this pulsing brake light, it is not a manufacturer-provided part. This is something a private company—and now there are four, five, or six. They all compete against each other. This industry makes these lights and has now dealt with the auto dealers outside of the manufacturers. As a consequence, the manufacturers don't like it.

I am not going to accuse the manufacturers of dealing with NHTSA, but I will say it is very bizarre to me that NHTSA is not going forward with the study that this Congress, in 2019, asked them to do.

It is very bizarre to me that NHTSA, instead of conducting a study, instead of working with members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, like myself, are asking for client lists of this industry. That is just really weird to me, especially when the device that is so controversial is approved by Texas, California, and, frankly, some liberal States that all think this is really great.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues from across the aisle to recognize this is not a partisan issue. This is bipartisan. This is a good amendment, and I hope that we will all vote for it tonight when Americans have gone to bed and we are back here on the House floor voting late tonight. I hope my colleagues from across the aisle will join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for offering this amendment.

Let's be clear: The only entity that has not done its job is NHTSA.

They were directed by Congress to do a study to establish standards and failed to do that. Rather than them being punished, they are now taking it out on manufacturers and dealers.

As Mr. GOODEN said, this is not a safety issue. States have already studied this. We should not be coming in and imposing penalties and restrictions on manufacturers and dealers whenever it is NHTSA that has failed to do its job.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. GOODEN of Texas. Mr. 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. GOODEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate new rules that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

(1) an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more;

(2) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

(3) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, my amendment simply comes in and establishes a threshold by which Congress must be involved in actually approving costs that are imposed upon our constituents.

Mr. Chairman, we all represent somewhere in excess of 700,000 people, and whenever we have unelected bureaucrats carrying out regulations that may impose costs on our constituents, we should have a say in that.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply says that any regulation that has a cost in excess of \$100 million must be approved by the Congress. That is what representation looks like.

Mr. Chairman, we shouldn't be allowing unelected bureaucrats who are sitting in dark cubicles in Washington, D.C., and who don't have a clear understanding of what it is like across America, making these decisions.

This is our job. If we support these regulations, if they provide a positive cost-to-benefit, put us on record supporting it.

To put things in perspective, Mr. Chair, in the first 2 years of the Biden administration, these very bureaucrats wrote regulations costing Americans \$200 billion. These are hidden taxes, Mr. Chair, that the families we are representing have to pay.

In comparison, during the Trump administration, they actually withdrew regulations costing the American household \$11,000 per household. They withdrew or reduced the costs, yet under this administration, we are watching as thousands and thousands

of additional dollars are being heaped upon these same households.

Let me say it again. That is a hidden tax. If folks want to vote for a tax, put them on the record doing it. If they want to break the backs of American families, put them on the record doing it. Unelected bureaucrats should not be making these decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, this is very similar to a recent amendment discussed by the gentlewoman from Florida, and for the reasons stated as to that amendment, we oppose this amendment, as well.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to put a face on it. The National Association of Manufacturers says that the average business has \$10,000 in regulatory compliance costs per employee. If it is a manufacturer, it is actually double, or \$20,000.

To put a face on it, Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Home Builders has estimated, in a May 2021 study, that the average home costs \$93,000 more—almost \$94,000 more—for the average single-family home as a result of complying with regulations. As a result of this administration's policies on energy, the supply chain, and labor, they estimate that there is an additional \$36,000 to \$38,000 cost on top of that \$94,000.

Mr. Chair, I can't say it enough: We can't afford this administration. Whether it is the energy policy, the regulatory policy, their inflation as a result of \$10 trillion in excess spending that they have imposed over the last few years, we simply can't afford it. American families can't afford it.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The salary of Pete Buttigieg, Secretary of Transportation, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE) and a Mem-

ber opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, my amendment uses the Holman rule to reduce the salary of Secretary Pete Buttigieg to \$1.

Pete Buttigieg has failed to serve the American people as the Secretary of Transportation. He has been busy calling roads racist, enforcing equity action plans, and implementing climate change initiatives rather than strengthening our Nation's transportation and infrastructure systems and responding to emergencies like the train derailment in East Palestine.

□ 1745

He stated there is racism physically built into some of our highways. "Every transportation decision is inherently, in many ways, a decision about equity."

I would argue, people driving on dirt roads every single day in rural America may feel that way, but our Secretary of Transportation, Pete Buttigieg, doesn't care about Americans in rural America. He is more interested in declaring that roads are built on skin color and racism.

He also stated, "Ensuring equity and accessibility for every member of the traveling public is one of the Department of Transportation's highest priorities."

Again, I will point to rural America.

In the same month he was sworn in, his Department introduced racial equities and barriers to opportunities as a consideration for awarding discretionary grants, as if that is how funds should be awarded.

In June 2022, he launched a \$1 billion pilot program aimed at helping reconnect cities and neighborhoods racially segregated or divided by road projects. Under this program, over \$100 million was awarded to tear down and rebuild a freeway in Detroit because it was considered racially divisive. Taxpayer dollars are being used to cover 80 percent of the project's funds.

He has also intentionally tried to deceive the American people, as shown when a video surfaced of him faking a bike ride to a White House Cabinet meeting. The video showed Secretary Buttigieg driving to the White House but stopping in just enough time for his security detail to unload his bike from the back of the gas-guzzling SUV. He then rode his bike for the cameras to the White House as if he had been riding it all along. What a hypocrite. What a liar.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, we now enter the theater of the absurd.

Again, for the second day in a row, let's have two White people talk about

racial equality in the United States because we know so much about it from having, oh, so much experience, but here we are.

The reality of the situation is, this isn't serious, but it is the new normal. If we don't like people, we will pay them \$1. If we disagree with them, we will cut their salary. At some point in time, we have to recognize the fact that we are going to disagree. We are probably going to, for most of the rest of our lives, live in a divided government, so when we disagree with the administration or the administration disagrees with us, is the notion, well, we just won't pay them anymore because it will make a good sound bite or theoretically help us raise money because it sells well at home. However, it doesn't do anything for our constituents.

The reality is, public servants who are doing their jobs and carrying out the policy of the administration they serve should be commended, not demonized. Our government is dependent on being able to attract the best talent to bring their skills to public service.

Despite what has been said, the fact of the matter is, some of the best and brightest out there sacrifice to go back to public service or stay with it when they could do much better in the private sector. Who is going to be willing to do that if their names are dragged in the political mud because someone disagrees with them?

The Secretary is a dedicated public servant. This is not how we solve policy differences. We shouldn't make this personal. We can disagree without being disagreeable. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Georgia has 2 minutes and 15 seconds remaining.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, deserving a taxpayer-funded paycheck is about job performance, not about personalities or identity politics. Let's all recall that Pete Buttigieg was formerly a mayor and was well known as "Pothole Pete" for not repairing all the potholes in the roads in the town that he served. I assure you; this is about defunding his paycheck to \$1, which I think is \$1 too high for a Secretary of Transportation who is failing the American people when it comes to transportation.

While implementing his tyrannical climate agenda through his office and preaching for the government to curb carbon emissions, Pete Buttigieg has reportedly taken at least 18 taxpayer-funded flights on private jets managed by the FAA.

One of these flights was taken to receive an award from a Canadian gay rights organization for advancing LGBTQ rights. American taxpayers don't want to pay for Pete Buttigieg to get awards for the way people have sex.

That is not what the Secretary of Transportation should be doing.

These fraudulent actions of Secretary Buttigieg illustrate that he is not to be trusted in leading our Department of Transportation. While Secretary Buttigieg was taking taxpayer-funded, carbon-emitting private jets to receive LGBTQ awards, he failed to serve the Americans in East Palestine who were devastated by the train derailment and chemical spill earlier this year.

In response to why he hadn't visited the community, he stated that he would visit when the time is right. It turns out, the time was only right after President Trump visited, brought thousands of bottles of water, and pressured Secretary Buttigieg into visiting and maybe doing his job. It took our Secretary of Transportation almost 3 weeks to visit after this unbelievable toxic catastrophe.

Furthermore, under his watch as Secretary, the FAA was forced to order a ground stop for all air traffic in the U.S. due to a system outage. This was the first time in history the NOTAM system has ever failed, and it was the first time since 9/11.

Mr. Chair, my time has expired, and I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Gee, Mr. Chairman, I thought you were just pounding the gavel to break the monotony, but I appreciate that.

I have to be honest, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether this argument is worthy of the dignity of this House, that people who take the highest level of government function, Cabinet-level positions—and again you can disagree with them, Mr. Chairman, all you want, but to make this so personal and to take their orientation to task because you personally don't like the other people or their orientation, when it is absolutely none of your business, where has the Republican Party gone?

How has it gone from a party that said: We are going to let people live their lives; we are not going to intrude on them at all; we are going to let them live personally, and the worst thing government can do is inflict their own beliefs upon them?

That is exactly what the toxic atmosphere of language like we just heard is all about. It is not what we are as a country. Part of that personal freedom extends to everyone, even if they happen to be Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. Chair, I apologize to the Secretary and all the public servants who have to go through this disgraceful kind of treatment.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. It is not worthy of this body. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 55 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Climate Change Center of the Department of Transportation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, my amendment prohibits funding for the Climate Change Center at the Department of Transportation. This Center has recently been reinstated and expanded under the Biden administration to meet the DOT's goals in responding to the climate crisis.

The Climate Change Center creates comprehensive and multimodal approaches to reduce transportation-related greenhouse gases and to improve the resilience of the transportation system to climate change impacts. This Center announces and promotes grant programs that give U.S. taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to universities and nonprofits to research the decarbonization of the transportation sector and to address adverse environmental impacts created by the transportation system.

Never forget, the goal of the Democrats is to take away every single gas and diesel engine, every single combustion engine, and force Americans to drive electric vehicles if they can afford them. While they claim they care about the climate and the environment, they do not care about toxic batteries and where they will be disposed, but they want to use unlimited taxpayer funds to address a climate crisis that does not exist because the climate has always changed. It is not something new.

This Center also works with DOT agencies to implement climate change criteria for grant programs, to devise climate training programs and to facilitate climate change education campaigns for its 50,000 employees across the Department.

For example, the Center is working with the Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to deliver climate information and support to transportation planners and stakeholders to enhance the safety, effectiveness, equity, and resilience of the U.S. transportation infrastructure. These climate educational training programs are for the

USDOT employees to develop a standard of language for use in performance plans for staff engaged in climate change activities.

The entire Center is a complete abuse of U.S. taxpayer dollars and should be defunded immediately.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, my friends across the aisle can turn a blind eye to the wildfires, smoke-covered skies, life-threatening heat waves and extreme weather we now face nearly every day somewhere in this Nation.

We have seen the impacts of climate change in real time, and yet this amendment would hamstring our ability to meaningfully address the accelerating threat of climate change. Ignoring climate change in our approach to the transportation sector would be particularly egregious and irresponsible. It is, quite frankly, not an option.

Our transportation infrastructure is responsible for more greenhouse emissions than any other sector of our economy. This means that our approach to transportation investment can and must be one of the biggest parts of the solution.

Climate change also makes our roads, bridges, railways, and public transit more vulnerable to damage from extreme weather. We have to recognize our climate reality in order to make our infrastructure more resilient and less costly. Instead of rebuilding the same old infrastructure after disrepair, we should be investing in climate-conscious, cost-effective solutions that ensure we build back stronger in order to equip our infrastructure to withstand the test of time and future disasters.

This is a matter of practicality, risk mitigation, and human safety. It also presents a tremendous opportunity to boost our economy by investing in new technologies and creating new jobs.

The Department's Climate Change Center is the agency's hub for research, policy analysis, partnerships, and action on climate change. I suppose some of my Republican colleagues are targeting it because they don't believe climate change is real and, unfortunately, we cannot have a productive debate when one side chooses to ignore scientific evidence and consensus.

Mr. Chairman, it is the functional equivalent of standing in the middle of an expressway, closing one's eyes, and saying there are no trucks. Trucks are coming. This is disheartening and puts our future at great risk.

I wholeheartedly support the Department of Transportation's efforts to create comprehensive approaches to reduce transportation-related greenhouse gases and improve the resilience of the transportation system. I believe the

American people support the cost savings, clean air, new jobs, and healthy environmental future that will come with working to achieve our climate goals.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1800

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, the DOT Climate Change Center is nothing more than an extension of the Green New Deal and just another waste of hard-earned taxpayer money to enforce the Green New Deal, forcing Americans to be transitioned over to electric vehicles, which they do not want.

I thought this was the land of freedom. I thought this was the land where Americans can pick and choose what they would like to buy and what they do not want to buy.

The Green New Deal and the Democrats' willingness to use the government to force Americans against their will to transition over to electric vehicles is nothing more than tyranny.

Here is an example of what comes out of this Climate Change Center—the Biden-Harris administration making \$100 million available to improve EV charger reliability. That was announced on September 13, 2023.

Here is a perfect example about how the Climate Change Center is being used to force Americans to drive electric vehicles, which is their goal the entire time.

The Federal Government's role is not to change how people spend their dollars and what they choose to buy for transportation.

The Federal Government's role, especially when it comes to the Department of Transportation, should be making sure that our roads are drivable and that our bridges are in good condition.

By the way, electric vehicles are heavy. That would put an undue burden on our bridges and on our roads. This is what they should be focused on, not the lie that, all of a sudden, climate change is real.

We have had tornadoes since the beginning of time. We have had earthquakes since the beginning of time. We have had hurricanes since the beginning of time.

This is not a new change in weather patterns. It is not a climate crisis. It is just called weather, and it has to do with seasons.

Another thing. The Biden administration has no right to lie to the American people and make the American people fund their lies.

Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Georgia has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, stating the obvious, that the Department of Transportation's only purpose is to make sure that our roads and our rail systems are safe. The underlying bill, as proposed, dramatically reduces all the funds that do that and makes our rail systems and our highway systems far less safe.

To say that in the middle of a discussion on an amendment that has nothing to do with that is ridiculous, and it is a further reason I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, again, my amendment prohibits funds from being used for the Department of Transportation Climate Change Center because it is a complete waste of taxpayer money.

We are over \$33 trillion in debt, Mr. Chair. The American people cannot afford their money to be wasted and spent on lies.

We need the Federal Government to spend the Americans' hard-earned taxpayer dollars on good roads, good bridges, and good infrastructure.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOYLAN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program established under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment No. 57 to H.R. 4820, which would prevent DOT from carrying out the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program.

The Biden administration's stated goal for this latest government boondoggle is to utilize taxpayer funding to strategically deploy electric vehicle charging stations across America.

Not only is such an endeavor not the Federal Government's responsibility, but this program also doesn't work, won't work, and will end up wasting massive amounts of Federal money.

You need no further evidence than Secretary Granholm's recent experience of trying to take an electric vehicle out for a spin, a trip that ended in disaster and confirmed that EVs are overpriced, unreliable, and infeasible without massive Federal subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, the Biden administration through this policy and others that were buried in the so-called Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act is attempting to use taxpayer money to implement the Green New Deal, a pie-in-the-sky idea that is not only destined to fail but will waste massive amounts of money and further impoverish American citizens.

The Biden administration is pursuing such boondoggles despite the fact that we are already facing out-of-control inflation, increasing energy costs, and bone-crushing grocery bills, all because of Bidenomics, all because this administration is economically illiterate and obsessed with furthering the agenda of the U.N. and the World Economic Forum.

My fellow Wyoming citizens and Americans as a whole are more concerned with the prospects of heating their homes, putting food on the table, and taking care of their families.

Yet, what is the Biden administration focused on? Banning the internal combustion engine and forcing everyone into electric vehicles that won't work effectively in the vast majority of the country.

My amendment is designed to stop the Biden administration from continuing its wasteful and profligate spending on projects that do not provide a benefit to the American public.

Mr. Chair, I urge my fellow Members to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise with a great deal of respect for my colleague but in opposition to this amendment, which seeks to cut funding from the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program.

Here is the reality. The world is moving to alternative transportation. It is not all going to be electric vehicles. It could be hydrogen. It will be others.

Right now, electric vehicles are the future of transportation in this country and in the world, and we are competing in a global marketplace.

As we continue to invest in this EV transition, it is critical that we get the charging infrastructure right. We must do everything within our power to keep America competitive, to make it easier for consumers to make this transition, and that is what this program does.

It plays a vital role in expanding our charging infrastructure, alleviating fears, and creating an interconnected

network that everybody has access to, not just those that have access to expensive chargers.

The National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program provides funding to States to deploy EV charging infrastructure and establishes networks that make them more accessible.

Let's work together to expand EV charging accessibility and invest in American-made EV chargers. We must support and advance through development the production and distribution and the infrastructure nationwide.

To meet these goals, we have to get serious. We have to roll up our sleeves and get to work. Defunding these programs is not how we should be legislating.

To ensure that we have a competitive future and that we are competing in a global marketplace with other countries and their manufacturers, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Rather than supporting our domestic energy production and investing in much-needed roadway infrastructure projects, the Biden administration has opted to continue skewing the definition of infrastructure to pursue its electric vehicle and renewable energy subsidy programs.

The Biden administration, in other words, continues to do the bidding of the Chinese Communist Party and the richest among us who can afford electric vehicles while leaving everyday Americans behind.

Let me be clear. This technology that DOT is pursuing and implementing has a track record chock full of failure, particularly within my State as the freezing temperatures wreak havoc on batteries while also severely limiting the range of these vehicles.

We have story after story of electric vehicles being limited to less than 100 miles in range as they are driven over our high mountain passes in freezing temperatures.

This effort to force everyone into electric vehicles is not only wrong-headed and not within the purview of DOT but downright dangerous.

It is also important to note that under this program, State recipients are expected to construct vehicle charging stations within 50 miles of each other on major highways.

This requirement alone is not feasible when confronted with the reality of Wyoming's vast rural terrain and wide-open spaces.

There are 80,000 vehicles a day that drive across I-80 in Wyoming. I-80 is the most important commercial transportation link from the East to the West Coast, and in Wyoming it varies in elevation from 4,000 feet to 8,000 feet. Electric passenger cars and electric 18-wheelers are simply not feasible in Wyoming.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, let me be clear. This is yet another attempt by the Biden administration to force us to transition to an electric future, whatever that may mean.

It can only do so if it uses our money to artificially prop up the electric vehicle industry that could otherwise never survive in a free market system, at least not in its current space.

Mr. Chairman, it is past time for this administration to halt its wasteful allocation of billions of hard-earned taxpayer money on the infrastructure that is destined to fail.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for remote work arrangements within the Department of Transportation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of my amendment No. 58, which would prohibit the Department of Transportation from funding remote work agreements.

The DOT defines its telework agreements where an employee performs work away from the typical office location and is not expected to report to the agency official work site on a frequent, regular, or recurring basis.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stood in this Chamber and said before on numerous occasions, it is time for our Federal Government employees to return to work.

Under the panic related to COVID-19, we watched as our Federal agency buildings occupancy dwindled to almost nothing. What was the consequence? A substantial reduction in

the timely provision of Federal services to the citizens of this country.

It should not come as a surprise to anyone that when our Federal employees don't show up for work, the work of the Federal Government doesn't get done.

Now, some may say that is okay, but what it means in practice is that our tax refunds are not timely processed, our passport office effectively shuts down, creating enormous backlogs for this important service, and our veterans suffer.

I have now filed several of these let's make our government employees return to work amendments to other appropriations bills. This is a priority of the Republican Members of the 118th Congress and a priority of mine.

I know how hard our miners, farmers, ranchers, waitresses, nurses, construction contractors, home builders, grocery store clerks, and others in the private sector work.

They didn't have the luxury of working from home, COVID or no COVID. They have powered our economy over the last couple of years, and we owe them a debt of gratitude. We also should have enough respect for them to demand that the people who earn a paycheck because of their tax dollars actually show up for work.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, again, this is a very similar amendment to what has been considered before. Those agreements addressed in this amendment, where they exist, have been negotiated by OMB, labor unions, and management and have been in place under Republican and Democratic administrations.

Again, this kind of sweeping prohibition, which fails to consider or address circumstances under which remote work arrangements may be beneficial to the taxpayer or a necessary accommodation for an employee, is not a serious approach to policymaking.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, in pursuing the policy of requiring our Federal employees to work in our Federal offices, I have always been cognizant of the outlier situations whereby someone will need to work remotely. I am not opposed to such flexibility, although that flexibility has now become the rule.

I have left untouched the ad hoc telework programs for these various agencies because we never know when an emergency or unexpected situation will arise. Such an unexpected situation, however, should not become the

norm, and our employees should be required to report to work.

We still have not yet assessed the damage the Federal Government's remote work policy has had on constituent services, congressional oversight, and Federal waste in terms of the unused office buildings and agency officials unaccounted for because they are not being monitored in their official work sites.

Even the GAO admits there is not enough information to assess the long-term impacts of remote work policies, including whether it promotes a productive work environment.

Mr. Chairman, the policy of this Republican majority has consistently been that COVID is over and Federal workers must come to work, and this amendment aims to deliver on that promise.

Unselected agency officials already believe they are unaccountable to Congress and the American people. Remote work further undermines our ability to oversee their activities and to promote providing the very best services that the Federal Government can provide to our citizens.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 59 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to conduct a competitive analysis of mergers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which states: None of the funds made available by this act may be used to conduct a competitive analysis when evaluating mergers.

Beginning January 1, 1989, Congress vested primary authority to review airline mergers with the U.S. Department of Justice. Since that time, the Department of Transportation has deferred to DOJ to determine whether a merger between U.S. airlines should be challenged on competition grounds.

The Department of Transportation's general counsel under President Obama described the DOT's role in airline mergers as follows: "With respect to

DOT's competition and public interest review authorities, DOT's practice has been to use its expertise with respect to the airline industry to provide the Department's views and otherwise assist the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) in DOJ's analysis of airline mergers or acquisitions."

The Department of Justice recently challenged an airline merger. This amendment doesn't have anything to do with that court case. In fact, it is well within DOJ's rights and authority to challenge mergers, but what concerns me is that the DOT's Secretary, Pete Buttigieg, expressed publicly that his Department has "generally not gotten involved in these merger cases, but that is changing today."

Between 2009 and 2016, under the Obama administration, there were nine successful airline mergers. In fact, in over 30 years, the DOT has not prevented the transfer of operating certificates for any airline merger. This begs the question: Why now?

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, let me begin by saying that the sponsor of this amendment, I believe, is on the T&I Committee, which has jurisdiction over aviation and rail. This is an amendment which would be better off being moved forward as an authorizing proposal rather than going forward as an appropriations amendment.

This amendment makes it plain as day that the Republicans are happy to put the interests of big corporations ahead of protecting the American people from corporate greed that increases costs, reduces quality of service, and limits options. Specifically, it prohibits any funds for conducting a competitive analysis of mergers, which raises concerning implications for both airlines and rail.

The Department of Transportation is required by law to certify to Congress that an approved airline merger is in the public interest and provide an analysis of the effects of the merger on competition in the domestic airline industry. Congress itself has set forth in law a list of factors that are considered in the public interest, which includes several related to competition.

Yet, this amendment would prohibit the Department of Transportation from complying with that requirement and from even conducting an analysis or considering factors Congress has specifically identified as important, shirking all responsibility to the public interest.

At the same time, this broad amendment would implicate all T-HUD agencies, also impacting competition in the rail industry and our understanding of competition in the housing market.

The Surface Transportation Board has authority over railroad corporate

mergers and acquisitions and similarly may approve such mergers only when it finds them to be in the public interest. This requires evidence that the proposed merger will affirmatively enhance competition, efficiency, and quality of service.

This amendment ties the hands of the agency with exclusive merger jurisdiction involving railroads, even as the number of Class 1 railroads has fallen from 40 to 6 since 1980.

Further, the Department of Housing and Urban Development would be prevented from conducting any competition-related analyses to inform our understanding of rental markets, even as Americans face rising rents and corporate landlords are caught price-fixing.

Competition is critical to protecting consumers from corporate greed and fostering a flourishing market economy, something we should all fight for.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this misguided amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), my friend across the aisle, the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative State, Regulatory Reform, and Antitrust.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. MASSIE's amendment, which prohibits the Department of Transportation from expediting funds to conduct competitive analyses of mergers.

In 1989, Congress transferred authority to review airline mergers to the Department of Justice. Mr. Chair, 35 years of DOT policy is clear. DOJ has the lead role in reviewing proposed airline mergers, given its statutory authority to enforce the antitrust laws. This is consistent with Congress' determination that the deregulated airline industry should generally be subject to the same application of antitrust laws as other unregulated industries.

I must say that as ranking member of the Administrative State, Regulatory Reform, and Antitrust Subcommittee, I am committed to protecting consumers, competition, and innovation. Before the DOT moves ahead with this new, unprecedented approach, we must take time to evaluate the merits of this policy. This amendment will grant us time to do just that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), my colleague.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. Let me reiterate the point that was just made that this is such a break from the norm in the evaluation of these antitrust analyses going forward. DOJ has had that responsibility.

I particularly thank the gentleman for really staying on top of this. This is clearly an overreach by the Biden administration, and I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure how to phrase this, but I would ask the sponsor of this amendment, through the Chair, a question.

I believe he referred to the Secretary of Transportation's name. I wasn't sure I heard that correctly. If the Chair could ask that the sponsor repeat how he referred to the Secretary of Transportation. Acoustics aren't always great here, so I want to make sure I got it right.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. Yes, well, I would reserve the balance of my time, and I would ask the question through the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman reserve?

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, but I would still like to make sure I heard what I thought I heard.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized and has the right to close.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the answer is that the sponsor doesn't want to repeat what he may have said. I just didn't hear it.

At this point, I am prepared to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, as a member of the Transportation Committee, I had the honor to question Secretary Buttigieg on whether he had this authority and what metrics he would use to exercise this authority.

It was obvious that they don't have any experience in the DOT to review these mergers because they haven't done it. It is for that reason that I urge adoption of this amendment. We don't need redundancy among the Departments. We need an all-of-government approach, and that is what this amendment seeks to do.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this bipartisan amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement section 24220 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (49 U.S.C. 3011 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which states: 'None of the funds made available by this act may be used to implement section 24220 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.'

My amendment is simple. It will defund the Federal mandate that requires all new vehicles after 2026 be equipped with a kill switch that can disable a vehicle if the vehicle has monitored the driver's performance and the vehicle determines that the driver is not performing well.

It is so incredible that I have to offer this amendment. It almost sounds like the domain of science fiction, dystopian science fiction, that the Federal Government would put a kill switch in vehicles that would be the judge, the jury, and the executioner on such a fundamental right as the right to travel freely, but here we are.

It is Federal law that this is mandated, and so I am offering this amendment to defund this mandate.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the ranking member of the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

□ 1830

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Let me be clear. The act that the gentleman is trying to defund does not require auto manufacturers to install kill switches. It does not do that.

Passive drunk driving technology is a vital tool in safeguarding our loved ones and other innocent people on our roads. This new technology offers a lifeline of hope to not only save lives

but to prevent the lifelong emotional toll and gargantuan costs these accidents inflict on families.

Deadly drunk driving accidents can echo across generations, but we can seize this opportunity to stop such tragedies.

Between 2019 and 2021, Florida saw a 31 percent increase in drunk driving crashes. In Mr. MASSIE's home State of Kentucky, 190 people were killed in drunk driving crashes in 2021 alone. That was a 26 percent increase.

When we saw these grim statistics, we acted in a bipartisan fashion in Congress. How often do we see that? Both Republicans and Democrats supported the HALT Act to require auto manufacturers to make this passive technology standard in new vehicles.

The sponsor of this misguided amendment will tell you that he worries about privacy concerns. We heard the same inane calls with seat belt requirements.

You don't have a right to engage in potentially fatal behavior that we know poses a major health threat to public safety.

Passive drunk driving technology is pro-police. This anti-drunk driving technology lightens the load on police officers, allowing them to focus on more pressing safety concerns.

The importance of this technology goes far beyond statistics. It is about saving lives, preventing heartbreak, and making our roads safer. It is a passionate call to action to prevent alcohol-impaired driving from shattering the lives of those we hold dear.

This amendment, I understand, was dubbed the kill switch amendment, and it does not require a kill switch. It simply requires passive technology to help us prevent drunk driving.

In the name of the 406 people who were killed by a drunk driver in my own State of Florida last year alone, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. Let's take steps to reduce deaths due to drunk driving, not increase them.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, drunk driving is a serious problem. That is why 31 States already have a law to implement interlock ignition technology where if you have been convicted of a DUI that you have to pass this test in order to operate your vehicle. This Federal law that I seek to defund goes far beyond that, and I regret that I have to spend some of my time reading the law to the other side of the aisle, but I will do that.

This law that was passed in a 1,000-page bill 2 years ago requires that automobiles can passively monitor the performance of a driver—not the blood alcohol content, but the performance of a driver of a motor vehicle—to accurately identify whether that driver may be impaired—not drunk; it says impaired—and prevent or limit motor vehicle operation. That is a kill switch.

Now, the question is how much time do you have once your dashboard tells you that it doesn't approve of your

driving? What if you are a single mother and you're out in bad weather and you're trying to avoid some obstacles, ice perhaps, and you have swerved three times and your dashboard says swerve one more time and you are going to be put over to the side of the road, that you will have 100 yards to park this vehicle in the middle of nowhere with your children in the back seat?

This isn't some fantastical scenario. This is what will happen if this is implemented. This is the law. I have read it to you here.

Now, you maybe should have read it 2 years ago when you all voted for it on that side of the aisle, but it was in a bill that was 1,039 pages long. I can understand how you don't know what the law has in it, but I have read it to you.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, more than 10,000 people die every year from drunk driving crashes. Drunk drivers are seven times more likely to be involved in a fatal crash than a sober person.

You would think that the Republicans would want to do something about it. Democrats have done something about it and said that NHTSA now will have drunk driver prevention technology.

This technology has the potential of saving thousands of lives, and I don't see that you are agreeing that we should be saving those lives. I would say we should all vote against the drunk driver protection act.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, we actually don't know how this technology is going to work. They don't know over at the DOT either, because we have sent a letter to them, that they haven't responded to yet, asking them: Will this have cameras inside the car? Will it monitor your eyes to see if you are focused on the road? Will it have cameras on the outside of the car?

How will it know what your performance is relative to the road that you are driving on, if it doesn't, in fact, know which road you are driving on? Will it need to know where you are when you are driving? If so, who has access to this data? Who has access to those cameras?

Will the Fourth Amendment be followed? Will you require a warrant for your insurance company to access this data? Will you require a warrant for the government to access this data? Once your car has been disabled and now you are on the side of the road

with your children in it, for reasons you don't understand, how long until the police show up? What if you truly are disabled and you are over to the side of the road, does anybody show up?

How long do you have to get out of the vehicle? Who decides when your vehicle kill switch is disabled and you get to drive again? Who is going to adjudicate that on the side of the road? What if it is rush-hour traffic? What if you know you have already got points against you, according to your dashboard, and it has monitored your performance and now somebody's pet is in the road? Do you swerve to miss it and get your car disabled?

What if there is an emergency vehicle approaching from behind you and you know the right thing is to swerve off the road and let that vehicle pass? What if after you have done that three times and now your car says do it one more time and we are going to leave you on the side of the road?

This is in the law. This will become law in 2026, every vehicle manufactured after that. It is not about drunk driving. If it were, it would just be about blood alcohol content.

This law has far more than that in it. It violates the Fourth Amendment. It violates so many amendments. It violates things that are so fundamental to our rights that they are not even in the Constitution, like the right to travel.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment. It will defund the law that was passed 2 years ago that the other side of the aisle doesn't even know exists.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

This amendment seeks to prohibit funding for the implementation of a bill known as the Honoring the Abbas Family Legacy to Terminate (HALT) Drunk Driving Act. I wrote it. I am the sponsor.

The HALT Drunk Driving Act honors the Abbas family from Michigan who were tragically killed in a car accident by a drunk driver. It requires NHTSA to do a rulemaking to create rules for impaired driving prevention technology in new vehicles to stop these tragedies from continuing to occur.

Thirty-seven alcohol-impaired driving deaths happen every day, equivalent to a death every 39 minutes. Studies show that the HALT Act would save over 10,000 lives annually. Our constituents agree. We need to stop drunk driving by making impairment prevention technology standard in new vehicles. If the technology exists to prevent drunk driving, why wouldn't we consider it?

Let me close by saying this amendment and the sponsor mischaracterized what the HALT Act is. It does not mandate kill switches or allow data collection that invades vehicle occupants' privacy. I protect data privacy

in vehicles probably more than the sponsor of this does. That is ridiculous. It doesn't monitor how you drive.

This amendment is an insult to every American who has been hurt or lost loved ones to drunk driving, including the Abbas family. Let's honor the memory of those affected by drunk driving.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, let me close by saying this. I gave the gentleman from Kentucky an opportunity to clarify his pronunciation of Secretary Buttigieg's name. I have the belief that he purposely mispronounced it to disrespect him. If he wants to correct that by correctly pronouncing it, I would yield the time to him.

As they say, it speaks for itself.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. MCCORMICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer my amendment No. 61 to H.R. 4820, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2024.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, enforce, or otherwise carry out the following:

(1) Executive Order 14037 (relating to strengthening American leadership in clean cars and trucks).

(2) Executive Order 14057 (relating to catalyzing clean energy industries and jobs through federal sustainability).

(3) Executive Order 14096 (relating to revitalizing our Nation's commitment to environmental justice for all).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chair, my amendment would prohibit funds from this act from implementing President Biden's burdensome and misguided Executive Orders 14037, 14057, and 14096.

Executive Orders 14037 and 14057 set the following goals for the Biden administration's out-of-touch energy policy regulations: 100 percent of the electricity of the U.S. to be carbon pollution free by 2030 on a net annual basis; 100 percent of vehicles purchased by the government to be zero emissions by 2035; and that 50 percent of all new passenger cars and light trucks in the United States be electric vehicles by 2030.

These economically harmful goals represent Democrats' desire for central government planning that is not driven by public demand but by bureaucrats deciding what they think is best for our diverse, vibrant Nation of over 330 million people.

A prime example of Democratic failed policy initiatives is the story of the electric bus manufacturer, Proterra, a company that received extremely high praise from President Biden, as well as other administration officials.

According to President Biden, Proterra was getting us in the game for sustainable transportation. Well, after receiving millions upon millions of dollars in Federal Government funding, on August 7 of this year, Proterra filed for bankruptcy—this is not the first time this thing has happened where a government-subsidized company has gone bankrupt—citing a multitude of reasons, including the 9-figure debt. That does not sound sustainable to me.

Almost 2 years ago, the Department of Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg said that America should purchase electric vehicles so that they won't have to worry about gas prices again. Instead, they will have to worry about supply-chain disruptions and critical mineral sourcing, not to mention the cost of these vehicles.

Now, I don't know about the average American, but I guarantee you they don't spend an extra \$17,000 per year on gas. The average cost of an electric vehicle is over \$60,000 and on average costs \$17,000 more than a gas vehicle. This does not take into account if the battery goes bad. It will, and it costs about \$17,000 to replace that, too, which means people are going to be relying on the government for more subsidies.

These types of statements show just how out of touch the leftwing officials in the Biden administration can be. Switching to electric vehicles, or whatever future technology, must come naturally through free-market forces. Mandating a change is building an entire vehicle market on an expensive house of cards, and it will eventually come crashing down, just like Proterra.

Just as concerning is Executive Order 14096 and its crusade for so-called environmental justice. Mr. Chair, instead of simply declaring what is true and promoting environmental conservation, which most people would agree is a good thing, the Biden administration makes this about cultural

Marxism, oppressor versus the oppressed. This is toxic rhetoric.

Instead of tackling economic hardships facing Americans, the fentanyl crisis in our communities, the crisis along the southern border, and multiple crises overseas, the Biden administration is creating a narrative that fits their dark view of American history and executive policy that negatively affects Americans.

□ 1845

Everyone wants clean air, safe water, and access to the outdoors for all. Let's not make this about something it is not.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, we simply oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, Congress should not allow valuable taxpayer dollars to fund these executive orders that do nothing to help the American people.

Those demanding EV vehicles know the impoverished cannot afford them, which will cause even more dependence on government. That is the built-in harassment package that liberals have created—regulate people into dependence on government so they must vote for bigger government that can never be paid for but will forever be empowered over those who would otherwise be free to live the full measure of the American Dream.

Mr. Chairman, ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. NEHLS, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The salary of Ann E. Carlson, Acting Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the salary of

Ann Carlson, who is the acting administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, to \$1.

While we abhor her radical climate change agenda, questionable ethics investigation, and overall policy decisions, the reason for my amendment is because Ms. Carlson is serving as acting administrator after she failed to clear the Senate confirmation process for the position.

In March of 2023, the Biden administration submitted Ms. Carlson's nomination for the National Highway Traffic Safety administrator. Before the Senate could vote on her nomination and after Senator CRUZ led an effective opposition, the White House pulled her nomination once it was obvious that she was not going to be confirmed.

After the Senate effectively rejected her nomination, the White House nominated her to that same role as an acting official anyway, circumventing the Advice and Consent clause in the United States Constitution on Presidential nominations.

I view this as a constitutional overreach and a violation of the Federal Vacancy Reform Act, and so do our counterparts in the Senate.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, do we really want to target dedicated public servants and threaten their livelihoods because we disagree with them?

These public servants are doing their jobs, carrying out the policy of the administration they serve. They should be commended, not demonized.

Our government is dependent on them in our ability to attract the best talent to bring their skills to public service. We shouldn't be penalizing public servants who are representing the administration they serve based on these policy disagreements.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, in September of this year, 13 Republican Commerce Committee Senators sent a letter to President Biden urging him to immediately replace Ms. Carlson and appoint a new nominee.

The letter highlights that since Ms. Carlson's nomination is a violation of the Federal Vacancy Reform Act, all the agency's actions while she has held herself out as acting administrator should be voided.

This is an unacceptable situation for the Department of Transportation. Congress represents a coequal branch of government, and this administration isn't a monarchy. Congress must hold this administration accountable, and I urge all Members to vote for my amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. NEHLS from Texas, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Electric or Low-Emitting Ferry Pilot Program established under section 71102 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds being made available for the Federal Transit Administration's Electric or Low-Emitting Ferry Pilot Program.

This \$250 million program simply serves to further Joe Biden's radical climate change agenda and fund Green New Deal pet projects to support coastal elitists in blue States.

As an example, the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority received \$3.4 million to construct a new zero-emissions ferry. The Casco Bay Island Transit in Portland, Maine, received \$3.6 million to replace a passenger ferry with a new ferry equipped with a diesel hybrid propulsion system. The Kitsap Transit in Kitsap County, Washington, received \$7.7 million to replace a diesel vessel with a new, environmentally friendly battery-electric passenger-only ferry and necessary charging infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on. This is not the taxpayers' burden to bear these individual pet projects that I just named.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, my colleague is already trying to undo the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, which

included funding to improve and expand ferry service in rural and urban communities across the country.

These funds allow places like Georgia, Representative BUDDY CARTER's district, to acquire ferries and install charging stations to build on the innovation necessary to protect our waterways, reduce costs, and lower emissions.

These projects allow communities to work within and across States where waterways are shared and there are mutual benefits to advance technology. These funds also support the use of alternative fuels, which include, but is not limited to natural gas, hydrogen, and electricity.

Innovation should be championed by the Federal Government rather than discouraged, and our industry partners should be able to trust that we will stand behind bipartisan goals to create this pilot.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, those words are just another banner of pet projects. This is what the public is sick and tired of in this country, especially when we are \$33 trillion in debt.

Overall, ferries play a minor role in the United States transportation system, providing roughly 1 percent of the public transportation trips in 2019—1 percent. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act more than tripled the annual dedicated ferry funding, setting aside \$2.3 billion, with a b, for ferry funding.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, stop this boondoggle, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The salary of Julia Gordon, Assistant Secretary for Housing and the Federal Housing Commissioner, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment reduces the salary of Julia Gordon, who is the Assistant Secretary for Housing and the Federal Housing Commissioner, to \$1.

Ms. Gordon has a long history of anti-police rhetoric that makes her unfit for public office. Among other things, she retweeted an inflammatory post that described police officers as “the people killing us.”

She also suggested in a letter that she wrote—not a tweet or a retweet—that cases of police violence are not just outliers but “. . . stem from flawed and biased systems that require structural change.”

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, it can only be described as disgraceful to target dedicated public servants and threaten their livelihoods.

Our government is dependent on their skills and their dedication to the job to help this country go forward.

Ms. Gordon has been a strong advocate for and a hands-on practitioner working to expand access to homeownership and wealth building for millions seeking the American Dream.

If you have an issue with the policy, let's discuss that and not penalize her and other public servants.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, in response, it is her words that are inflammatory in a day and time that is uncalled for. My view is shared by the National Sheriffs' Association, a leading law enforcement group that opposed her nomination.

Ms. Gordon also has a troubling history of denigrating her fellow Americans residing in southern States, as I do. She retweeted an article that asserted the South has rejected nearly everything that is good about this country and has become just one big nuclear waste site of extremely radicalized resentment. That is unheard of.

We should not spend another dollar on paying her salary. By the way, she makes \$158,500, and when you add all the other things with it, she is probably closer to \$200,000.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt my amendment, and I yield the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SMUCKER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consider the social cost of greenhouse gases in the development and implementation of a budget for a Federal agency, in any Federal procurement processes, or when preparing an environmental review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits use of funds for the consideration of the social cost of greenhouse gases—and I don't know how they define social costs—in the development and implementation of budgets, Federal procurement, or environmental reviews.

□ 1900

President Biden is directing agencies to consider the flawed social cost of greenhouse gases in the development and implementation of budgets, the Federal procurement process, and environmental reviews.

Democrats use the social cost of greenhouse gases metrics to justify sweeping climate policies and strict regulations. This impacts everything from purchasing goods and services, conducting environmental reviews of all kinds, and levying climate penalties against private businesses.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to yet another attack on scientific consensus and on evidence-based approaches to addressing our climate reality.

This amendment would prohibit any agency funded in this bill from considering the social cost of greenhouse gases in budget formulation, procurement processes, or environmental reviews. It is an unconscionable denial of reality.

The social cost of carbon is simply an estimate, in dollars, of the economic costs or damage that will result from emitting one additional ton of greenhouse gases into the air.

Climate change has tangible and measurable economic impact on a myriad of aspects of our economy from agriculture to healthcare to infrastructure and energy use.

When heat waves, drought, or extreme storms affect crop yields, that

loss costs our economy and disrupts our food supply.

When smoke from wildfires and extreme heat or cold cause illness and death or homelessness increases due to extreme weather displacing people from their homes, that costs our healthcare and emergency service systems.

When hurricanes, flooding, and mudslides destroy critical infrastructure, supply chains are disrupted, and time and money must be spent to rebuild.

We know, beyond a doubt, that greenhouse gas emissions lead to increased atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> which leads to a warming climate which leads to more extreme weather and rising sea levels.

In 2022, the cost of climate and weather disasters in the United States totaled more than \$165 billion. In every decade since the 1980s, the average annual cost of these disasters has increased substantially.

The amendment before us would prohibit agencies from considering measurable and tangible economic costs when making policy and spending decisions. It would literally prohibit accounting for reality.

This is a whole new level of climate denialism, not just a personal denial of overwhelming scientific evidence and consensus, but a sweeping prohibition on ever acknowledging and considering certain evidence that Republicans would rather ignore.

This is, of course, particularly egregious in the case of the Department of Transportation, given that our transportation infrastructure is responsible for more greenhouse gases than any other part of the economy.

I can't overstate the recklessness and cynicism of enacting a prohibition on accounting for reality into the law.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the gentleman's amendment. In fact, in the underlying bill, we have included in section 126 a prohibition on the Department of Transportation from imposing requirements on State and local governments to prove emission reductions as a condition of receiving funds.

Nonetheless, the gentleman's amendment is even more comprehensive, which I support, because it would cover programs across this entire bill and several of the Biden executive orders that would harm our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage all of our colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as Sheriff Rutherford said, the social cost of greenhouse gases is an extremely inefficient policymaking tool that can be manipulated.

The Biden administration continues to use unproven figures to attempt to

justify its radical environmental policies that drive up the cost of every family in this country today.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 435. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled “Equal Access in Accordance With an Individual’s Gender Identity in Community Planning and Development Programs” published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Register on September 21, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 64763).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits the use of funds for the implementation of the rule entitled “Equal Access in Accordance with an Individual’s Gender Identity in Community Planning and Development Programs.”

My amendment defunds an Obama administration’s Housing and Urban Development rule that requires equal access for individuals in accordance with their gender identity in shelter programs that are funded from HUD’s Office of Community Planning and Development. This means women and young children can be housed in shelters with a male stranger simply because these men identify as women.

Mr. Chairman, think about the impact this has on residents of female-only shelters when men who claim to be women are allowed to share bathrooms and shower access.

These concerns are not hypothetical. In California, nine homeless women filed a civil complaint after a homeless shelter enabled sexual harassment because a male identifying as a female entered the shelter and showered with a woman. In Alaska, a faith-based shelter filed a lawsuit because female residents would rather sleep in the woods in extremely cold temperatures than get harassed alongside a biological male.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would prohibit HUD from continuing to carry out an existing rule that ensures that all individuals have equal access to many of HUD’s core shelter programs in accordance with their gender identity.

I am not sure why my colleagues are so intent on targeting such a vulnerable population, but I find it unconscionable.

This amendment would do serious harm to our efforts to protect one of the most vulnerable populations, LGBTQ youth, who comprise up to 40 percent of the homeless youth population and who are 120 percent more likely to experience homelessness than non-LGBTQ youth.

These young people are at an incredibly high risk of abuse on the streets. A study by True Colors United found that among homeless transgender youth: 75 percent had been victims of physical, emotional, or sexual abuse; 25 percent had been victims of intimate partner violence; and 20 percent had been victims of sexual exploitation or trafficking.

In addition, LGBTQ youth are two to three times more likely to commit suicide. Transgender youth also have high levels of HIV/AIDS, mental health problems, and substance abuse disorders.

When these young people arrive at a shelter, they are not a safety risk to others. They are desperate for help. We should be doing everything that we can to make sure these alternatives exist to living on the streets, and then when they ask for help, they are not turned away.

Frankly, it is not that difficult to help these people who need assistance while respecting their identities.

More than 300 domestic violence and sexual violence organizations have signed a national consensus statement agreeing that it is appropriate to serve transgender women alongside other women.

This amendment is not based on the facts. In reality, transgender women are particularly vulnerable to abuse in housing systems themselves. One survey found that over one-half of transgender respondents who stayed in a shelter in the past year were verbally harassed, physically attacked, and/or were sexual assaulted because of their gender identity. We should be doing more to protect this population, not less.

To ensure continued progress toward ending youth homelessness, we cannot roll back rules that ensure basic equal access rights and protect transgender youth from discrimination and violence when seeking shelter.

This amendment would lead to increased numbers of unsheltered homeless LGBTQ youth.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing we even have to debate this. It

just shows that my friends on the opposite side of the aisle support the perpetrators of the crime rather than the victims of the crime.

Forcing women and children to share their private spaces with biological men is wrong. It is dangerous in any setting, but especially in a setting as intimate and vulnerable as a homeless shelter.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fact that the safety of individuals who sleep in single-gender shelters is of the utmost importance. It doesn’t mean provisions cannot be provided elsewhere for other individuals, but in this case, we need to ensure that people are both comfortable in their surroundings and are protected as they are coming out of difficult situations.

The proposal also puts burdens on religious organizations who might feel differently about gender identity than the current administration.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to purchase or lease a vehicle for use by the Secretary of Transportation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, my amendment prohibits funds from being

used to purchase or lease a vehicle for use by the Secretary of Transportation.

Two years ago, Secretary Buttigieg was gifted with a taxpayer-funded Mustang Mach-E for dedicated use. The retail value of this electric SUV was valued at more than \$40,000 and proudly assembled in Detroit, Michigan, USA, the auto capital of the world.

No. I am just kidding.

The Ford Mustang Mach-E has since been recalled for battery issues. Apparently the battery cannot handle owners flooring it. It was made in Mexico by foreign workers.

Putting aside the Secretary's own tone-deaf decision to use taxpayers' funds to purchase a not-made-in-America vehicle, Mr. Buttigieg's noted proclivity for the finer things in life apparently extended to any mode of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. OGLES, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration titled "Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards for Passenger Cars and Light Trucks for Model Years 2027-2032 and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Heavy-Duty Pickup Trucks and Vans for Model Years 2030-2035", and issued on August 17, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 56128).

combat global warming, in the first 2 years of the Biden administration, Mr. Buttigieg took at least 18 flights using taxpayer-funded private jets.

Make no mistake, there is no excuse for Secretary Buttigieg to waste taxpayers' money on private planes when commercial options were readily available to him.

Mr. Chair, I urge passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. OGLES, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration titled "Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards for Passenger Cars and Light Trucks for Model Years 2027-2032 and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Heavy-Duty Pickup Trucks and Vans for Model Years 2030-2035", and issued on August 17, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 56128).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, access to affordable, reliable cars and trucks is critical to every facet of American life.

Instead of ensuring that Americans have access, the Biden administration has included a multifront fight against the internal combustion engine as a centerpiece of its war on American consumers.

On this front, it is the new corporate average fuel economy standards, known as CAFE, for 2027 to 2032, which ratchet fuel economy standards to require automakers to meet a fleet average of 58 miles per gallon.

You might as well put a top on a riding mower. Good luck with trying to get that kind of mileage.

Based on EPA's list of most efficient vehicles, no vehicle for model year 2023, even including the small hybrids, reaches 58 miles per gallon. A bicycle would probably be over 58 miles per gallon. There is no path to reaching a fleet average, which would include larger vehicles, that high in less than 10 years.

These standards will fail to increase actual vehicle efficiency because automakers already know that the goal is unachievable, and they won't waste their time trying to comply.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, NHTSA has issued a proposal to update fuel economy standards for passenger cars and light trucks, and that proposal is going through a public comment review period. Why would we stop that?

Fuel economy standards aren't new. These standards spur the auto industry to innovate in improving fuel economy to the benefit of consumers and the environment.

The administration's July proposal increases these standards to advance energy security, reduce carbon emissions, and save families money at the pump.

The rule is going through the rulemaking process, and constituents and concerned parties can and should weigh in, but let's be clear about what improving fuel economy standards can do. This rule would save consumers more than \$50 billion on fuel over vehicles' lifetimes. It would reduce our dependence on oil, saving more than 88 billion gallons of gasoline through 2050. It would prevent more than 900 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the equivalent of taking more than 233 million vehicles off the road from 2022 through 2050.

By increasing fuel economy standards, we would be decreasing costs for Americans at the pump, which is something my colleagues claim to be so concerned about, but how dare such an improvement come with positive benefits like carbon emission reductions.

I support the administration's proposal to go through the rulemaking process to improve fuel economy standards to reduce costs for drivers, promote American energy independence, and reduce carbon emissions.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, this is more than just words. This is going to force American taxpayers to pay fines for falling short, which will increase the price of any new car with an internal combustion engine by thousands of dollars.

Biden has made it clear all along that his goal isn't to improve gas-powered cars but to eliminate them in favor of electric vehicles. If you talk to any car dealer, no one is buying them. Unless they had subsidies, they wouldn't be selling.

For many drivers, EVs simply aren't a viable option. They may not have a garage and may rely on street parking. They may live in an area where the electric infrastructure can't support the fast charging of an EV. They may drive long distances where, when you run out of electricity, good luck.

Mr. Chair, I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1915

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, if there is one thing that my colleagues, Republican or Democrat, can agree on, it is that government corruption undermines faith in our Republic, and none more than this present administration.

It would, therefore, be astounding to see or hear any Democrat attempt to justify opposition to this simple amendment that would prohibit funds for air travel by the Secretary of Transportation, or any other, in economy class on a commercial flight.

In February, we learned that the Office of Inspector General at the Department of Transportation was opening an audit into Secretary Buttigieg's extensive use of private jets. Despite the Secretary's own rhetoric on the need to

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for transit-oriented development.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the use of any funds in this act for so-called transit-oriented development.

Contrary to the claims of proponents of such communities, they do not increase ridership on transit lines. Rather, they just ensure taxpayers subsidize development that would likely happen anyway.

Moreover, like transit investment generally, they do not create economic growth. Instead, these communities just subsidize the growth that would likely have occurred naturally.

This is a giveaway to developers in large urban areas, as most areas do not have the population density to support these communities. It does not address the more fundamental issue plaguing our Nation's transit systems than driving down ridership, which is the problem. Doing so will only result in wasted Federal resources that would be better directed toward core highway and bridge projects.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, this amendment, which would very broadly prohibit funding for transit-oriented development, "so-called" because that is what it is called, is yet another example of vague and sweeping overreach.

Communities in all of our districts rely on flexible HUD and DOT funding to close the gap on critical housing, transportation, and community infrastructure projects. Yet, this amendment would limit a recipient's ability to locally pursue different projects to determine where and how the community wants to invest.

Cities, towns, and suburban areas may pursue transit-oriented develop-

ment, which is simply an approach to urban development that aligns housing, commercial, and transit development for a variety of reasons unique to that community.

If a community wants to pair housing and transit development to save costs, reduce traffic congestion, increase access to essential goods and services, attract businesses, or connect Americans to good jobs, the Federal Government should not prohibit them from doing so.

Mr. Chairman, I find this place amusing in that we are for States' rights until we are not. We are Federalists until we are not. Apparently, it just depends on where you stand on an issue rather than whether they really believe in local jurisdictions having control over their own destinies.

No program in the underlying bill requires that funds be used for transit-oriented development, and there is no reason to adopt a restriction that prevents the use of funds for one particular approach to urban development.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, the gentleman says that Federalism is good sometimes but not other times, and States' rights are important sometimes but not other times.

Let me be clear: We are not talking about the transit lines themselves. This is transit-oriented development.

Let me break it down for everybody here. There is a transit line running somewhere. There is not a lot of ridership on it, so we have to boost the ridership. What that means is that we are going to subsidize some developer to build housing or whatever other development adjacent to the line to hope that those people will then get on that transit line. That is what is happening here.

You know what happens next. We subsidize the development. Then, the people who get into that development take their cars to wherever they are going and don't ride on the transit line.

If you have to have transit lines, God bless you. That is awesome. If you want to ride them, God bless you. That is awesome. There is no reason whatsoever that this is a Federal requirement or a Federal nexus at all to build developments next to transit lines.

If States and localities want to do that, if they want to subsidize them, God bless them, too. They should do that, but people in Pennsylvania shouldn't be supporting transit-related development in California any more than people in California should be supporting it in Illinois. That is no Federal nexus.

If Illinois wants to do it, they should. If Pennsylvania wants to do it, they should. We shouldn't require every taxpayer in the country to pay for transit-oriented development to boost ridership on the lines that don't have any so that we can justify the lines and then build more lines without any ridership.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, let us go back to the reality of the situation. I live in a transit-oriented development. I can walk 15 seconds outside my front door, get on the Red Line, and go downtown in Chicago, and I do. Many people do.

There is a reason we encourage transit-oriented development. It actually gets more people to ride transit, which is a good thing because they are not burning gasoline, not creating more climate change. It is better for the economy. It gets people to their jobs quicker and safer. If they want to do this, and it is an option and works the way that it actually does from personal experience, great.

What I said about people being for States' rights and not being for States' rights when it is inconvenient, I am implying that this amendment does just the opposite of what my father's Republican Party used to say, which is we are not going to dictate to local governments how they should function, how they should operate. This is a page out of the opposite book, and it is a horrible idea.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this is an awesome idea. I am glad that the gentleman can walk 15 seconds outside his door and get on the train and, as he says, more quickly and safely get to his destination. That is great. That is good for him.

If my colleague wants to pay for that, he should. If Illinois wants to pay for that, they should. I shouldn't have to pay for it.

By the way, while my colleague is talking about quicker and safer, of course, there are no metrics to support any of that.

I have no interest in riding mass transit. My daughters get on the bus every morning, and I remind them, as they are standing up there at the bus stop in the freezing cold waiting for the bus, that I hope they enjoy their mass transit. I hope they enjoy their public transportation because it is inefficient. It is not getting them there more quickly.

Riding in America's cities on mass transit, my colleague said it is safer. It seems like crime is on the rise in every single city. It is not "seeming so," it is so. It is not safe. It is not safe here in the Nation's Capital to ride on transit. It is not quicker. It is not safer. I am providing the same metrics to prove my point that you provided to prove yours, which are none.

□ 1930

Mr. Chair, this is about federalism. This is about subsidies and boondoggles and things that we can't afford while we are \$33 trillion in debt.

If somebody wants to build, if some developer wants to build next to the transit line because they think it will

help them sell their properties in their development more quickly, they should do that. Taxpayers shouldn't be involved.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the notice of proposed rulemaking of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration titled "Heavy Vehicle Automatic Emergency Braking" and issued on July 6, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 43174).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the use of funds to finalize, implement, or enforce the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's rule mandating automatic emergency braking systems on new commercial vehicles.

Isn't that wonderful, another mandate? Making the world better, making America better, making us more free, making everything more affordable, except it is not.

The IIJA, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, required the Department of Transportation to issue a mandate for heavy-duty trucks to be equipped with automatic emergency braking systems. It also required the DOT to consult with the commercial vehicle user community and address any existing deficiencies with automatic emergency braking systems before issuing its mandate.

The issue is that DOT has failed to meet both requirements, or any requirement.

There are real and legitimate concerns about false activations of the systems that remain unaddressed and must be dealt with before proceeding with any requirement.

Moreover, an integrated safety system with an automatic emergency braking system can add up to \$5,000 to the cost of a single truck. Oh, but it is always worth it. It is always worth it. We are going to be more safe if we have this stuff.

Meanwhile, we can't get anybody to drive a truck anymore. That is why we

are looking at automated trucks without drivers in them because we have depleted the truck driving industry. We have driven everybody out because they can't afford to get in or stay in.

With fleets operating on exceedingly tight margins, this mandated cost increase presents a barrier to entry for new market participants. It will also likely result in extending the life of current vehicles, causing these operators to miss out on the safety improvements of newer trucks that they won't buy.

I know it is counterintuitive, but when these rules are made, they never think about the additional cost that the truck owner or the person that wishes to buy a truck or replace a truck is going to have to incur. They just assume, well, they will just spend the extra \$5,000.

This is not where it ends. This is just one system. There are multiple systems on these new trucks and all new equipment. They just keep adding and adding.

Well, I don't understand why the cost of everything goes up. I can't figure it out. If you are on the left you can never figure those things out. It is because of you and the things that you do. That is why.

Moreover, this will likely result in an older truck fleet in the U.S., which is actually probably more dangerous because people are not going to replace trucks because they don't have the extra \$5,000. I know you think all truck drivers are made of money, but they are not.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, according to data from NHTSA's Fatality Analysis Reporting System and Crash Report Sampling System, heavy vehicles are involved in about 77,000 crashes a year, resulting in over 500 fatalities and almost 34,000 injuries.

NHTSA estimates that the proposed rule would prevent over 16,000 crashes a year, saving over 100 lives and reducing over 8,000 nonfatal injuries annually once all vehicles covered under this rule are equipped with AEB.

The rule is going through the rulemaking process, and constituents and concerned parties can and should weigh in, but we shouldn't stop the process altogether. I support the administration's proposal to go through the rulemaking process and appreciate that NHTSA is looking into ways of making our roads safer.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Illinois says that we ought to just go through the rulemaking process.

However, as I told you, there are real and legitimate concerns that have not been addressed, and that is why you go through the rulemaking process. It is not just a perfunctory, well, we asked for your input, and we got it. Now we are just going to disregard it and do what we want to anyhow, which is exactly what the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is doing, which is why we cannot fund this.

It is our government. The government serves us. It is not the other way around. It is just another example where we act like we are Oliver Twist begging for more gruel. The gruel is ours, Mr. Chairman, and we should not have to beg for it as the citizens of this country. This government belongs to us, not the other way around.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Keynesian economics, I guess, aside, the gruel belongs wherever the gruel belongs, but public safety belongs to everyone else. It is not just the trucking industry, it is the people who are involved in those injuries, as well. We need to be concerned about them.

The rulemaking process has existed under every American President during our lifetime. It is part of the democratic process. It should be respected. If people want to participate, fine, that is the way it should operate.

Mr. Chair, for all those reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, my colleague says that we should respect the rulemaking process. Maybe some of my colleagues here in Washington don't understand, don't recognize, won't acknowledge that this government has gotten too big, and the rulemaking process is really meant to shut out voices across America.

It is we here in Congress who should be making these rules, not unelected bureaucrats who have no accountability to the people that they impose these rules upon. It is we who should be doing this.

By the way, there were some folks who came in, they said, We oppose your amendment. We want this emergency braking system on trucks.

I said, Well, how about on your trucks?

Oh, no, no, we don't want it on our trucks. We want it on their trucks. We want it on someone else's trucks.

Everybody wants someone else to pay the freight until it comes to their doorstep, then they are not interested.

Mr. Chairman, this government is too big. This is an example of it. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to implement any of the following executive orders:

(1) Executive Order 13990, relating to Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science To Tackle the Climate Crisis.

(2) Executive Order 14008, relating to Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad.

(3) Section 6 of Executive Order 14013, relating to Rebuilding and Enhancing Programs To Resettle Refugees and Planning for the Impact of Climate Change on Migration.

(4) Executive Order 14030, relating to Climate-Related Financial Risk.

(5) Executive Order 14057, relating to Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability.

(6) Executive Order 14082, relating to Implementation of the Energy and Infrastructure Provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.

(7) Executive Order 14096, relating to Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania offering the amendments that he has offered. I am offering here an amendment that I have offered to other appropriations bills affecting other agencies that would prohibit any of the funding in this bill, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill, from being used to carry out President Biden's executive orders on climate change.

We have had success in moving this amendment on previous appropriations bills because, frankly, it is fairly obvious to most people in the Chamber, certainly to most Americans, that these executive orders are out of step and out of touch with where the American people are. They are pushing a radical agenda that is completely devoid of recognition of what is happening in every American's life right now, that they can't afford to buy even the home they live in, much less the fuel they need for their cars, buy the car that they need, be able to afford to pursue any of the initiatives put forward in terms of solar panels and other things because we are driving up the price of energy, making it impossible for people to live their lives because we are pursuing a radical agenda.

By the way, it is making us completely dependent on China at a time when we should be decoupling from China. It is at a time that is making it where we are not holding Iran accountable, and we are actually enriching Iran right now with our energy policies.

We are not sanctioning Iran. We are allowing them to sell oil to China. We

are advancing this agenda because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to put out this notion of climate change as being more important than the inflation that is wrecking the American family. I have had Members on the other side of the aisle testify to this in the Rules Committee. They literally have said that.

They are prioritizing this agenda over the American family today who cannot afford an automobile, cannot afford the gasoline to put in the automobile, cannot afford the energy prices in their homes, electricity, and can't even afford the houses because of what this administration has done with their policies to drive up the price of energy with a radical agenda.

In this case, Secretary Buttigieg is on a mission to overhaul the transportation sector saying, "Transportation ought to be responsible for the biggest share of the solution." DOT has established a Climate Change Center with the goal of decarbonizing the transportation sector by 2050.

In July of 2022, the Secretary said, "The more pain we are all experiencing from the high price of gas, the more benefit there is for those who can access electric vehicles." Right there is the agenda of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Right there is the agenda of the Biden administration. They want the American people to feel pain. Those are the words of the Secretary of Transportation.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, no one remembers who Edward Everett is. He spoke for a couple hours at Gettysburg. That speaks for itself.

There really doesn't need to be much in response to those who deny that climate is an existential threat, so I will just say two lines.

According to the data collected by NASA, the past 9 years have been the warmest years since modern record-keeping began in 1880. The 10 warmest years on record in world history have all occurred since 2010 in recorded temperatures.

We have to address that reality, and the fact is, our transportation infrastructure is responsible for more greenhouse gas emissions than any other sector of our economy. It needs to do the most to reduce that threat, as well.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, the problem is that if you listen to our Secretary, we saw that in 2 months after he made those comments, California asked EV owners to stop charging amid a heat wave.

Secretary Granholm literally pushed aside a pregnant woman and her family from the ability to charge at a charging station in order to do a photo op.

That is what we are doing. This is all about projecting an image. It is not about the real-life impact on American families. That is the truth. For example here, one of the Secretary's appointees to DOT's Advisory Committee on Transportation Equity—don't get me started on that—has said: "All cars are bad." All cars are bad.

This is about undermining the American way of life, and the fact of the matter is, if you eliminate the internal combustion engine—by the way, the internal combustion engine that is sitting in President Biden's 1967 Corvette—which I believe is a 327; I don't think he has the 427—doesn't get exactly a great deal of really good gas mileage and, in fact, is spewing out a whole lot more carbon than the average American's vehicle. By the way, I am totally fine with that because it is a great car, a great example of American awesomeness, to be clear.

The fact is when you have got an appointee of the Committee on Transportation Equity saying, "All cars are bad," that tells you exactly what the situation is.

If you eliminate the internal combustion engine, that will do nothing when you know that China has 1,100 coal-fired plants. We have about 250, and China is building a couple coal-fired plants a week, and we think that we are going to impact CO<sub>2</sub> production around the world?

How about we develop nuclear power? How about we let the American people live their lives? How about we let the American people not have their lives get crushed with radical policies?

That is why this amendment should be adopted.

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

□ 1945

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, we were quoting Dickens before. There is a line in Shakespeare. I will let somebody else fill in the rest of the lines. "It is a tale . . . full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

We are the first generation to feel the effects of climate change. We are the last generation that can do anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same, and 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 amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SANTOS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The salary of Polly Trottenberg, Deputy Secretary of Transportation, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SANTOS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Chair, flight patterns have become a silent threat to the health and well-being of Americans. One might ask: What does that have to do with this amendment?

Well, citizens of New York's metropolitan area and the continental United States are ceaselessly burdened by aircraft noise and pollution.

Residents in NY-3 have been begging elected officials like me to support mitigation efforts to give citizens plagued by ceaseless, noisy, and polluted skies a reprieve.

Taking aim at Deputy Secretary of Transportation Polly Trottenberg is not a punishment but rather a wake-up call holding her accountable for her inaction.

By reducing her salary to \$1, we send a strong message that the well-being of Americans should be the top priority, not the convenience of a select few.

Mr. Chair, the fight against harmful flight patterns doesn't end with Polly Trottenberg. We must also demand transparency, accountability, and a comprehensive review of flight patterns across the country.

It is time to put the health of our communities first and ensure that every decision made in the aviation industry reflects our values.

Let's work together in this body of Republicans and Democrats alike to make a real difference in our communities.

For years, NY-3's constituents and communities just like it have asked for help, and now I will put it in the RECORD and let it be known that a "no" vote is a vote against accountability for the people who allow millions of Americans to suffer under the arbitrary rules of the Department of Transportation, FAA, and air traffic control, to name a few agencies.

I urge adoption of my amendment to set a new tone and to have accountability for the people suffering from a lack of leadership on this segmented issue of our decaying transportation infrastructure under this administration.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, just for reference, the last statement made—this is the first administration in my lifetime that has passed a comprehensive infrastructure bill of this magnitude.

To suggest that it is going the opposite direction while supporting a bill

that guts much of that effort belies comprehension.

I sometimes wonder what people will think in the future when they ask us, dad or granddad, what did you do in Congress?

The best you can say is I cut a dedicated public servant's salary to a dollar because I disagreed with them.

Ms. Trottenberg has an extensive, 25-year-plus public sector career in all levels of government, including stepping up to serve as acting administrator for the FAA to help ensure this country and our global partners could continue to rely on the safety of our national airspace system.

We again should not be penalizing public servants who are representing the administration they serve based on policy disagreements. I can't imagine our Founding Fathers thinking this would be a good idea, but it is, I guess, the new normal.

It is no reason to support this amendment. I encourage my colleagues to oppose it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Chair, my colleague from across the aisle, he speaks with honesty, and I believe so, but I will say this: To call a public servant a bureaucrat, I think that is disingenuous, and the American people are sick and tired of us considering people who fail at their jobs continuously to continue to keep their jobs.

I think it is cutting back bad government, I think it is holding government accountable, and I think it is holding people who are inept accountable.

Ms. Trottenberg's time as FAA administrator was abysmal with very little accountability, with very little done. I stand strong that we should adopt my amendment.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, it is clearly our responsibility to hold people accountable. There are a number of ways to do that: call them to testify, question them all day long, say whatever you want in public within reason. It is quite another thing to make it so they can't do the job because you are only paying them a dollar a year. It is outside the realm, the barriers here, of what we are supposed to be about.

At some point, we went outside the norms. I have come to believe that norms are almost as important as the Constitution. You don't treat people this way.

They couldn't imagine that we would do this to each other. They had that foundation that is so critical, and the law is almost as critical.

I am starting to believe that the way we treat each other is the most important norm. If we can't act with a baseline sense of decency and respect that nobody's going to work for a dollar a year, respectfully, you are just messaging and insulting other people and disrespecting the dignity of this House.

We can and we must do better.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and 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. SANTOS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. SELF

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 435. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the Equity Action Plan of the Department of Housing and Urban Development established pursuant to Executive Order 13985 entitled "Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which would prohibit funds from going toward implementing, administering, or enforcing the equity action plan of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This plan clearly violates the Federal civil rights law that has been in place since the 1960s. The intent of the Fair Housing Act is clear: to prevent "discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of dwellings based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status, and disability."

In other words, individuals with the financial means to rent or purchase a home cannot be discriminated against.

Unfortunately, the executive order signed by President Biden, and the equity action plan laid out by the Department of Housing and Urban Development stretches the definition of "fair housing" far beyond the original intent of Congress.

This administration has twisted the definition of the word "equity" to mean the exact opposite of fair and impartial treatment under the law.

Equity is the administration's way of manipulating the rule of law to offer preferential treatment to various constituency groups.

Rather than addressing the merits of those in need, the administration is conjuring up groups of individuals who have been assigned a predetermined victimhood status.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, again, it has to be pointed that there is a level of being completely ridiculous that two straight White men are debating all the issues of equality and equity as if we have faced them all our lives. We can't be the judge or the jury in this country on who should be served by the Federal Government.

While we are probably not the best people to speak on the issue, let's try to make clear what I think my colleagues are really saying. What they are really saying is they don't like diversity, and they absolutely don't like inclusion. They don't want to address discrimination against people of color, LGBTQ people, people with disabilities.

They don't want to build a Nation that supports people at the greatest risk of homelessness. Not caring allows them to ignore this insurmountable problem, but it doesn't make it less real.

It is not radical to want to build a country that is welcoming to all people from different backgrounds, but they do want you to believe that our country has reckoned with its history of discrimination.

They want you to believe that these issues are things in the distant past. They are wrong. They are attempting to legislate away those who look, think, or feel differently. That is not American. That is authoritarianism.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my deep concern about the Biden administration's equity action plan at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

We must ensure that American tax dollars allocated to HUD are spent based on financial need and readiness, not the Democrats' divisive social justice agenda.

These equity action plans direct the department to give special attention to individuals based on their race or if they identify as transgender or gender nonconforming. These criteria have no place in providing affordable housing and ending homelessness.

Helping Americans out of homelessness or helping them to buy their first home should be based on only preparedness and creditworthiness.

Anything else does them a disservice in the long run, as evidenced by the housing collapse of 2008, which was the result of unscrupulous promotion of subprime loans.

It is a fundamental tenet of our Republic that we treat all Americans equally, regardless of their race or creed. If any American is struggling, they should have equal access to assistance.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ROSENDALE. The Department of Housing and Urban Development should support those who are in need and ready to receive or help—no need for equity action plans.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support Congressman SELF's amendment.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chair, when considering the mission of this equity action plan, it becomes clear that instead of rewarding people based on their merits, the government is attempting to pick winners and losers.

This policy would negatively impact Americans by creating the potential of another housing crisis, as my good friend mentioned, and exacerbating existing problems embedded in our economy.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, again, in a moment of self-awareness, we are a bunch of straight White guys talking about social justice.

When did a social justice agenda become a bad thing? Again, who am I to say, but weren't the leaders of the civil rights movement leading a social justice agenda?

Does anyone imagine that that notion that we read about, as you go down to the archives, toward a more perfect union, does anyone think that we have met that and that housing and transportation have to be fundamental toward the ends of that agenda that we talked about?

In the end, wasn't Lincoln saying that 87 years ago—every once in a while, we have to ask ourselves did we really mean it when we said that we were all created equal?

We have to ask ourselves that today. We still have a long way to go, and it runs through all our systems, including our transportation and our housing systems. It is not a bad word.

Someone needs to stand up to you when you do this. It is wrong. This amendment is wrong. This bill is horrible because of these things.

I oppose it, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

□ 2000

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chairman, let me be very clear. We are discussing an executive order here.

Mr. Chair, if this is so important, bring a bill to the floor of the House. Do not give us an executive order. It is clear that this executive action plan will be rejected by the courts because it is in violation of the 14th Amendment.

This administration is clearly attempting to hide under layers of bureaucratic red tape and, in the process, grow the administrative state and

erode the power that voters have invested in this body. This action plan is, in fact, so radical that it won the endorsement of Marxists, who openly proclaim: "Keep dismantling the organizing principle of this society."

We should not fund this initiative. It is time for Congress to do its job by directing taxpayer dollars to priorities that affect all of our constituents.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, 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, Mr. SMUCKER, 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. 4820) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

---

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE AMERICAN FOLKLIFE CENTER IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 2103(b), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress on the part of the House for a term of 6 years:

Ms. Amy Kitchener, Fresno, California

---

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7455(a), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. BISHOP, Georgia

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 8468(a), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy:

Mr. DELUZIO, Pennsylvania

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-79)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2023.

Our relations with Iran have not yet normalized, and the process of implementing the agreements with Iran, dated January 19, 1981, is ongoing. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12170 with respect to Iran.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 7, 2023.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 838 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. 4820.

Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY) kindly take the chair.

□ 2501

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. 4820) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, with Mr. TIFFANY (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. 74 printed in Part B of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) 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 B of House Report 118-261 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 34 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 36 by Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER of Delaware.

Amendment No. 37 by Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 46 by Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona.

Amendment No. 47 by Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona.

Amendment No. 57 by Ms. HAGEMAN of Wyoming.

Amendment No. 59 by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 60 by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 62 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 64 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 66 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 73 by Mr. SANTOS of New York.

Amendment No. 74 by Mr. SELF of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 34, printed in part B of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 144, noes 282, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 609]

AYES—144

Aderholt	Fox	Mills
Alford	Franklin, Scott	Mooney
Allen	Fry	Moore (AL)
Armstrong	Fulcher	Moran
Arrington	Gaetz	Murphy
Babin	Gallagher	Nehls
Baird	Good (VA)	Norman
Balderson	Gooden (TX)	Obernolte
Banks	Gosar	Owens
Barr	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Bean (FL)	Graves (MO)	Pence
Bentz	Green (TN)	Perry
Bergman	Greene (GA)	Pfluger
Bice	Griffith	Posey
Biggs	Grothman	Reschenthaler
Bilirakis	Guest	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (NC)	Guthrie	Rose
Boebert	Hageman	Rosendale
Bost	Harris	Rouzer
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Roy
Buck	Hern	Santos
Burchett	Higgins (LA)	Scalise
Burgess	Houchin	Schweikert
Burilson	Hudson	Scott, Austin
Cammack	Huizinga	Self
Carl	Hunt	Sessions
Carter (GA)	Jackson (TX)	Smith (MO)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Smucker
Cline	Jordan	Spartz
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Clyde	Kustoff	Stefanik
Collins	LaHood	Steube
Comer	LaMalfa	Strong
Crane	Lamborn	Tiffany
Curtis	Latta	Timmons
Davidson	Loudermilk	Van Drew
De La Cruz	Luna	Van Duyne
DesJarlais	Luttrell	Van Orden
Donalds	Malliotakis	Walberg
Duncan	Mann	Waltz
Estes	Massie	Weber (TX)
Ezell	Mast	Wenstrup
Fallon	McCaull	Westerman
Ferguson	McClain	Williams (TX)
Finstad	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Fischbach	McCormick	Wittman
Fitzgerald	Miller (IL)	Womack
Fleischmann	Miller (WV)	Yakym

NOES—282

Adams	Clarke (NY)	Frankel, Lois
Aguilar	Cleaver	Frost
Allred	Clyburn	Gallego
Amodei	Cohen	Garamendi
Auchincloss	Cole	Garbarino
Bacon	Connolly	Garcia (IL)
Balint	Correa	Garcia (TX)
Barragán	Costa	Garcia, Mike
Beatty	Courtney	Garcia, Robert
Bera	Craig	Gimenez
Beyer	Crawford	Golden (ME)
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Goldman (NY)
Blumenauer	Crockett	Gomez
Blunt Rochester	Crow	Gonzales, Tony
Bonamici	Cuellar	Gonzalez,
Bowman	Davids (KS)	Vicente
Boyle (PA)	Davis (IL)	González-Colón
Brown	Davis (NC)	Gottheimer
Brownley	Dean (PA)	Granger
Buchanan	DeGette	Green, Al (TX)
Bucson	DeLauro	Grijalva
Budzinski	DelBene	Harder (CA)
Bush	Deluzio	Hayes
Calvert	DeSaulnier	Higgins (NY)
Caraveo	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Carbajal	Dingell	Hinson
Cárdenas	Doggett	Horsford
Carey	Duarte	Houlahan
Carson	Dunn (FL)	Hoyer
Carter (LA)	Edwards	Hoyle (OR)
Cartwright	Ellzey	Huffman
Casar	Emmer	Issa
Case	Escobar	Ivey
Casten	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Castor (FL)	Espaillat	Jackson (NC)
Castro (TX)	Evans	Jacobs
Chavez-DeRemer	Feenstra	James
Cherifius-McCormick	Fitzpatrick	Jayapal
Chu	Fletcher	Jeffries
Ciscomani	Flood	Johnson (SD)
Clark (MA)	Foster	Joyce (OH)
	Foushee	Joyce (PA)





Joyce (OH) Morelle Schrier  
 Kamlager-Dove Moskowitz Scott (VA)  
 Kaptur Moulton Sewell  
 Kean (NJ) Moylan Sherrill  
 Keating Mrvan Simpson  
 Kelly (IL) Mullin Slotkin  
 Kelly (MS) Murphy Smith (NJ)  
 Khanna Nadler Smith (WA)  
 Kildee Napolitano Sorensen  
 Kiley Neal Soto  
 Kilmer Neguse Spanberger  
 Kim (CA) Newhouse Stansbury  
 Kim (NJ) Nickel Stanton  
 Krishnamoorthi Norcross Stauber  
 Kuster Norton Stefanik  
 LaHood Nunn (IA) Babin Good (VA)  
 LaLota Obernolte Steil Banks Gooden (TX)  
 Landsman Ocasio-Cortez Stevens Bean (FL)  
 Langworthy Omar Strickland Bentz Greene (TN)  
 Larson (CT) Pallone Swalwell Biggs Grothman  
 Latta Panetta Sykes Bilkakis Guest  
 LaTurner Pappas Takano Bishop (NC)  
 Lawler Pascrell Thanedar Boebert Hageman  
 Lee (CA) Payne Thompson (CA) Brecheen  
 Lee (FL) Pelosi Thompson (MS) Buck  
 Lee (NV) Peltola Thompson (PA) Burchett  
 Lee (PA) Perez Titus Burgess Houchin  
 Leger Fernandez Peters Tlaib Burlison  
 Letlow Pettersen Tokuda Cammack  
 Levin Pingree Tonko Carter (GA)  
 Lieu Plaskett Torres (CA) Cline Johnson (SD)  
 Lofgren Pocan Torres (NY) Cloud Johnson (NE)  
 Lucas Porter Trahan Collins Johnson (SD)  
 Luettkemeyer Pressley Trone Comer  
 Lynch Quigley Turner Crane  
 Magaziner Ramirez Underwood Davidson  
 Malliotakis Raskin Valadado DesJarlais  
 Manning Reschenthaler Van Orden Donalds  
 Matsui Rodgers (WA) Vargas Duncan  
 McBath Rogers (KY) Vasquez Dunn (FL)  
 McCarthy Ross Emmer McClain  
 McCaul Ruiz Easey Estes McClintock  
 McClellan Ruppersberger Velázquez Fallon McCormick  
 McCollum Rutherford Wagner Fitzgerald  
 McGarvey Ryan Walberg Foxx  
 McGovern Sablan Wasserman Fry  
 Meeks Salazar Schultz  
 Menendez Salinas Waters  
 Meng Sánchez Watson Coleman  
 Mfume Sarbanes Wexton Adams Clark (MA)  
 Miller-Meeks Scanlon Wild Aderholt Clarke (NY)  
 Molinaro Schakowsky Williams (GA)  
 Moolenaar Schiff Williams (NY)  
 Moore (WI) Schneider Wilson (FL)  
 Moran Scholten Womack Arrington  
 NOT VOTING—10

D'Esposito Phillips Tenney  
 Jackson Lee Radewagen Webster (FL)  
 Kiggans (VA) Scott, David  
 Larsen (WA) Sherman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2143

Ms. GARCIA of Texas changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 612.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 47, printed in part B of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), 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 104, noes 325, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 613]

AYES—104

Alford	Fulcher	Mooney	Keating	Moskowitz	Scott (VA)
Allen	Gaetz	Moore (AL)	Kelly (IL)	Moulton	Scott, Austin
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Nehls	Kelly (PA)	Moylan	Scott, David
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Norman	Khanna	Mrvan	Sewell
Banks	Gosar	Ogles	Kildee	Mullin	Sherman
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Palmer	Kiley	Murphy	Simpson
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Perry	Kilmer	Nadler	Slotkin
Biggs	Grothman	Posey	Kim (CA)	Napolitano	Smith (MO)
Bilirakis	Guest	Rose	Kim (NJ)	Neal	Smith (NJ)
Bishop (NC)	Hageman	Rosendale	Krishnamoorthi	Neguse	Smith (WA)
Boebert	Harris	Rouzer	Kuster	Newhouse	Sorensen
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Roy	LaHood	Nickel	Soto
Buck	Hern	Santos	LaLota	Norcross	Spanberger
Burchett	Higgins (LA)	Sessions	Landisman	Norton	Stansbury
Burgess	Houchin	Smith (NE)	Langworthy	Nunn (IA)	Stanton
Collins	Kustoff	Smucker	Larson (CT)	Obernolte	Ocasio-Cortez
Comer	Lamborn	Self	Latta	Omar	Stefanik
Crane	Lesko	Hunt	LaTurner	Owens	Steil
Davidson	Luna	Sessions	Lawler	Pallone	Stevens
DesJarlais	Luttrell	Smith (NE)	Lee (CA)	Panetta	Strickland
Duncan	Mace	Smucker	Lee (FL)	Pappas	Swalwell
Dunn (FL)	Massie	Spartz	Lee (NV)	Pascrell	Sykes
Emmer	Mast	Steel	Lee (PA)	Payne	Takano
Estes	McClain	Steube	Leger Fernandez	Pelosi	Thanedar
Fallon	McClintock	Strong	Letlow	Peltola	Thompson (CA)
Fitzgerald	McHenry	Tiffany	Levin	Pence	Thompson (MS)
Foxx	Miller (IL)	Timmons	Perez	Thompson (PA)	Titus
Fry	Mills	Wittman	Peters	Tlaib	Tokuda
		Zinke	Timmons	Plaskett	Torres (CA)
			Manning	Pingree	Torres (NY)
			Quigley	Tonko	Underwood
			Ramirez	Raskin	Valadao
			Turner	McBath	Van Orden
			Valadao	Reschenthaler	Velázquez
			Witman	Rodgers (WA)	Vargas
			Wittman	McClellan	Velázquez
			Zinke	Rogers (AL)	Vasquez
				Williams (TX)	Veasey
				McGarvey	Ruiz
				McGovern	Wagner
				Rutherford	Walberg
				Menendez	Wasserman
				Meng	Schultz
				Meuser	
				Mfume	
				Salazar	
				Watson	
				Coleman	
				Wenstrup	
				Scanlon	
				Molinaro	
				Williams (GA)	
				Moore (UT)	
				Schiff	
				Moore (WI)	
				Schneider	
				Wilson (FL)	
				Moran	
				Scholten	
				Schrier	
				Yakym	

NOT VOTING—9

D'Esposito Larsen (WA) Sherrill  
 Jackson Lee Phillips Tenney  
 Kiggans (VA) Radewagen Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2146

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 57, printed in part B of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN), 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 191, noes 238, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 614]

AYES—191

Aderholt	Garcia, Mike	Mooney	Garbarino	Lofgren	Sablan	Sarbanes	Aderholt	Gonzales, Tony	[Roll No. 615]
Alford	Gimenez	Moore (AL)	Garcia (IL)	Lucas	Salinas	Sánchez	Alford	González-Colón	Moolenaar
Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)	Garcia (TX)	Lynch	Sánchez	Schakowsky	Allen	Good (VA)	Mooney
Amodei	Good (VA)	Moran	Garcia, Robert	Magaziner	Sarbanes	Schiff	Amodei	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Arrington	Gooden (TX)	Moylan	Golden (ME)	Manning	Schanlon	Amodei	Gooden (TX)	Moore (UT)	Moore (UT)
Babin	Gosar	Murphy	Goldman (NY)	Matsui	Schakowsky	Barr	Gosar	Moran	Moran
Baird	Graves (LA)	Nehls	Gomez	McBath	Schiff	Barr	Granger	Morelle	Granger
Balderson	Graves (MO)	Newhouse	Gonzalez,	McCaul	Schneider	Barr	Babin	Graves (LA)	Morelle
Banks	Green (TN)	Norman	Vicente	McClellan	Scholten	Barr	Scott (VA)	Moynan	Moynan
Barr	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)	González-Colón	McCollum	Schrier	Barr	Baird	Graves (MO)	Murphy
Bean (FL)	Griffith	Obernolte	Gottheimer	McGarvey	Scott (VA)	Balderson	Green (TN)	Nehls	Nehls
Bentz	Grothman	Ogles	Granger	McGovern	Scott, David	Balderson	Greene (GA)	Newhouse	Newhouse
Bergman	Guest	Houlihan	Green, Al (TX)	Meeks	Sewell	Barr	Harris	Palmer	Palmer
Bice	Guthrie	Owens	Grijalva	Menendez	Sherman	Barr	Harshbarger	Panetta	Harshbarger
Biggs	Hageman	Hoyer	Harder (CA)	Meng	Spanberger	Barr	Hern	Panetta	Hern
Bilirakis	Harris	Pence	Hayes	Mfume	Stansbury	Bost	Higgins (LA)	Pence	Higgins (LA)
Bishop (NC)	Harshbarger	Perez	Huffman	Molinaro	Slotkin	Bost	Bergman	Perry	Bergman
Boebert	Hern	Perry	Ivey	Himes	Smith (WA)	Brecheen	Buchanan	Pfluger	Buchanan
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Pfleuger	Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Strickland	Buchanan	Hinson	Posey	Hinson
Brecheen	Hill	Posey	Jackson (NC)	Neal	Bucshon	Hinson	Houchin	Reschenthaler	Houchin
Buchanan	Hinson	Reschenthaler	Jacobs	Swalwell	Burchett	Houchin	Issa	Rodgers (WA)	Issa
Buck	Houchin	Rogers (KY)	Jayapal	Nickel	Thompson (CA)	Cammack	Jackson (TX)	Rodgers (AL)	Jackson (TX)
Bucshon	Hudson	Rose	Jeffries	Norcross	Thompson (MS)	Cammack	James	Rogers (KY)	James
Burchett	Huizenga	Rosendale	Johnson (GA)	Norton	Titus	Carey	Rose	Rogers (PA)	Rosendale
Burgess	Hunt	Rouzer	Kamlager-Dove	Ocasio-Cortez	Takano	Titus	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer	Johnson (LA)
Burlison	Issa	Rutherford	Kaptur	Omar	Burlison	Takano	Johnson (OH)	Roy	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Jackson (TX)	Keating	Pallone	Titus	Calvert	Burgess	Rutherford	Rutherford	Rutherford
Cammack	James	Salazar	Panetta	Takano	Burgess	Hunt	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)
Carey	Johnson (OH)	Santos	Kelly (IL)	Pappas	Burgess	Hunt	Jordan	Salazar	Salazar
Carl	Johnson (SD)	Scalise	Khanna	Tonko	Ciscomani	Jordan	Jordan	Jordan	Jordan
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Kildee	Pascarella	Torres (CA)	Cline	Joyce (OH)	Joyce (OH)	Scalise	Scalise
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin	Kiley	Torres (NY)	Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Joyce (PA)	Schweikert	Schweikert
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Self	Kilmer	Trahan	Clyde	Kean (NJ)	Kean (NJ)	Scott, Austin	Scott, Austin
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Sessions	Kilmer	Peltola	Carl	Johnson (LA)	Johnson (LA)	Self	Self
Collins	Kelly (PA)	Simpson	LaHood	Porter	Trone	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Sessions	Sessions
Comer	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)	LaHood	Pallone	Underwood	Rutherford	Rutherford	Kelly (PA)	Kelly (PA)
Crane	Lamborn	Smith (NE)	LaLota	Panetta	Comer	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Smith (CA)	Smith (CA)
Crawford	Langworthy	Smith (NJ)	Leahy	Pingree	Valadao	Ciscomani	Jordan	Smith (MO)	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Latta	Smucker	Landman	Pappas	Tonko	Correa	Jordan	Kustoff	Kustoff
Curtis	LaTurner	Steel	Quigley	Quigley	Vargas	Crane	Crane	LaHood	LaHood
Davidson	Lee (FL)	Stefanik	Larson (CT)	Ramirez	Schultz	Davidson	Davidson	Smith (NE)	Smith (NE)
De La Cruz	Lesko	Steil	Lawler	Raskin	Waters	De La Cruz	De La Cruz	Smith (NJ)	Smith (NJ)
DesJarlais	Letlow	Steube	Lee (CA)	Rodgers (WA)	Watson Coleman	Langworthy	Langworthy	Stauber	Stauber
Donalds	Loudermilk	Strong	Lee (NV)	Rogers (AL)	Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Tennet	Tennet
Duarte	Luetkemeyer	Tenney	Lee (PA)	Ross	Wexton	De La Cruz	De La Cruz	Stefanik	Stefanik
Duncan	Luna	Thompson (PA)	Leger Fernandez	Ruiz	Wild	DesJarlais	DesJarlais	Timmons	Timmons
Dunn (FL)	Luttrell	Tiffany	Levin	Ruppersberger	Williams (GA)	Latta	Latta	Turner	Turner
Edwards	Mace	Timmons	Lieu	Wilson (FL)	Wilkerson	Watson Coleman	Watson Coleman	Valadao	Valadao
Emmer	Malliotakis	Turner	Zinke	Womack	Womack	Watson Coleman	Watson Coleman	Van Drew	Van Drew
Estes	Mann	Van Drew	Zinke	Womack	Womack	Watson Coleman	Watson Coleman	Womack	Womack
Ezell	Massie	Van Duyne	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Watson Coleman	Watson Coleman	Zinke	Zinke
Fallon	Mast	Van Orden	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Feeenstra	McCarthy	Wagner	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Ferguson	McClain	Walberg	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Finstad	McClintock	Waltz	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Fischbach	McCormick	Weber (TX)	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Fitzgerald	McHenry	Wenstrup	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Fleischmann	Meuser	Westerman	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Foxx	Miller (IL)	Williams (NY)	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Franklin, Scott	Miller (OH)	Williams (TX)	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Fry	Miller (WV)	Wilson (SC)	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Fulcher	Miller-Meeks	Wittman	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Gaetz	Mills	Yakym	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke	Zinke

NOES—238

Adams	Carter (TX)	Davids (KS)	D'Esposito	Larsen (WA)	Schweikert	NOT VOTING—9	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR	The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).	There is 1 minute remaining.
Aguilar	Cartwright	Davis (IL)	Jackson Lee	Phillips	Spartz	Diaz-Balart	LaTurner	Steube	Valadao
Allred	Casar	Davis (NC)	Kiggans (VA)	Radewagen	Webster (FL)	Estes	Lettow	Strong	Van Drew
Armstrong	Case	Dean (PA)				Lettow	Lettow	Tennet	Womack
Auchincloss	Casten	DeGette				Lettow	Lettow	Thompson (PA)	Yakym
Bacon	Castor (FL)	DeLauro				Lettow	Lettow	Williams (NY)	Zinke
Balint	Castro (TX)	DelBene				Lettow	Lettow	Williams (TX)	Zinke
Barragán	Chavez-DeRemer	Deluzio				Lettow	Lettow	Wilson (SC)	Zinke
Beatty	Cherifilus	DeSaulnier				Lettow	Lettow	Wittman	Zinke
Bera	McCormick	Diaz-Balart				Lettow	Lettow	Yakym	Zinke
Beyer	Chu	Dingell				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Bishop (GA)	Ciscomani	Doggett				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Elizéy				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Blunt Rochester	Clarke (NY)	Escobar				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Bonamici	Cleaver	Eshoo				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Bowman	Clyburn	Espaillet				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Boyle (PA)	Cohen	Evans				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Brown	Cole	Fitzpatrick				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Brownley	Connolly	Fletcher				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Budzinski	Correa	Flood				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Bush	Costa	Foster				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Caraveo	Courtney	Foushee				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Carbajal	Craig	Frankel, Lois				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Cárdenas	Crockett	Frost				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Carson	Crow	Gallego				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke
Carter (LA)	Cuellar	Garamendi				Lettow	Lettow	Zinke	Zinke

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 59, printed in part B of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), 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 211, noes 220, not voting 8, as follows:

Adams	Carbaljal	Crockett							
Aguilar	Cárdenas	Crow							
Allred	Carson	Fitzpatrick							
Armstrong	Auchincloss	Carter (LA)							
Auchincloss	Bacon	Cartwright							
Balint	Banks	Case							
Barragán	Barr	Castro (TX)							
Beatty	Beatty	Castor (FL)							
Bera	Bera	Castro (TX)							
Beyer	Beyer	Chavez-DeRemer							
Bishop (GA)	Bishop (GA)	Cherifilus							
Blumenauer	Blumenauer	McCormick							
Blunt Rochester	Blunt Rochester	Dingell							
Bonamici	Bonamici	Clark (MA)							
Bowman	Bowman	Clarke (NY)							
Boyle (PA)	Boyle (PA)	Cleaver							
Brown	Brown	Clyburn							
Brownley	Brownley	Espaillet							
Budzinski	Budzinski	Flood							
Bush	Bush	Foster							
Caraveo	Caraveo	Foushee							
Carbajal	Carbajal	Frankel, Lois							
Cárdenas	Cárdenas	Frost							
Carson	Carson	Gallego							
Carter (LA)	Carter (LA)	Garamendi							





Jackson (IL)	Morelle	Schrier	[Roll No. 619]	Gallego	Malliotakis	Sánchez
Jackson (NC)	Moskowitz	Scott (VA)	AYES—212	Garamendi	Manning	Sarbanes
Jacobs	Moulton	Scott, Austin		Garcia (IL)	Matsui	Scanlon
James	Moylean	Scott, David		Garcia (TX)	McBath	Schakowsky
Jayapal	Mrvan	Sewell		Garcia, Robert	McClellan	Schiff
Jeffries	Mullin	Sherman		Golden (ME)	McCullum	Schneider
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Sherill		Goldman (NY)	McGarvey	Scholten
Joyce (OH)	Napolitano	Simpson		Gomez	McGovern	Schrer
Kamlager-Dove	Neal	Slotkin		Gonzalez	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Kaptur	Neguse	Smith (NJ)		Moran	Vicente	Scott, David
Kean (NJ)	Newhouse	Smith (WA)		Granger	Menendez	Sewell
Keating	Nickel	Sorensen		Moylan	Gottheimer	Sherman
Kelly (IL)	Norcross	Soto		Graves (LA)	Meng	Sherrill
Kelly (PA)	Norton	Spanberger		Graves (MO)	Green, Al (TX)	Slotkin
Khanna	Nunn (IA)	Banks		Nehls	Mifune	Smith (WA)
Kildee	Obernolte	Greene (GA)		Green (TN)	Moore (WI)	Sorensen
Kiley	Ocasio-Cortez	Barr		Newhouse	Harder (CA)	Soto
Kilmer	Omar	Griffith		Hernan	Hayes	Spanberger
Kim (CA)	Owens	Bacon		Grothman	Higgins (NY)	Stansbury
Kim (NJ)	Pallone	Bean (FL)		Balderson	Himes	Swalwell
Krishnamoorthi	Panetta	Bentz		Bergman	Horsford	Takano
Kuster	Pappas	Boebert		Bice	Houlahan	Thanedar
LaLota	Pascrall	Bost		Hageman	Hoyer	Neal
Landsman	Payne	Brecheen		Palmer	Hoyle (OR)	Stanton
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Buck		Rodgers (WA)	Jayapal	Stevens
Lawler	Peltola	Buchson		Rogers (AL)	Jeffries	Pallone
Lee (CA)	Pence	Burchett		Rogers (KY)	Rose	Panetta
Lee (NV)	Perez	Burgess		Rodney	Johnson (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Lee (PA)	Peters	Burgess		Rosendale	Jackson (IL)	Thompson (MS)
Leger Fernandez	Pettersen	Burlison		Rouzer	Jackson (NC)	Titus
Levin	Pingree	Tonko		Rodgers (WA)	Kamlager-Dove	Pascrall
Lieu	Plaskett	Calvert		Jacobs	Pelosi	Tlaib
Lofgren	Pocan	Torres (CA)		Rutherford	Titus	Tokuda
Lucas	Porter	Torres (NY)		James	Keating	Tran
Lynch	Pressley	Trahan		Roger (OH)	Kelly (IL)	Takano
Mace	Quigley	Carl		Johnson (SD)	Salazar	Thanedar
Magaziner	Ramirez	Carter (GA)		Johnson (IA)	Santos	Vargas
Malliotakis	Raskin	Underwood		Jordan	Kilmer	Vazquez
Manning	Rogers (AL)	Ciscomani		Joyce (OH)	Scalise	Wasserman
Matsui	Rogers (KY)	Cloud		Collins	Kilmer	Wasserman
McBath	Ross	Clyde		Kim (CA)	Kim (NJ)	Wasserman
McCarthy	Ruiz	Vasquez		Comer	Scott, Austin	Underwood
McClellan	Ruppersberger	Velázquez		Kustoff	Kuster	Plaskett
McCullum	Ryan	Wagner		LaHood	Landsman	Vargas
McGarvey	Sablan	Wasserman		LaLota	Pocan	Vazquez
McGovern	Salazar	Schultz		Crawford	Porter	Wasserman
Meeks	Salinas	Curtis		LaMalfa	Pressley	Wasserman
Menendez	Sánchez	Waterson		Davidson	Lee (CA)	Wasserman
Meng	Barbanes	Watson Coleman		Lamborn	Quigley	Velázquez
Meuser	Scanlon	Wexton		De La Cruz	Lee (NV)	Ramirez
Mfume	Schakowsky	Wild		Langworthy	Ramirez	Raskin
Moore (UT)	Schiff	Williams (GA)		DesJarlais	Lee (PA)	Lee (PA)
Moore (WI)	Schneider	Williams (NY)		Latta	Lopez	Waters
Moran	Scholten	Womack		LaTurner	Lopez	Watson Coleman
NOT VOTING—11						
Amodei	Hudson	Phillips		LaTurner	Levin	Watson Coleman
Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	Radewagen		Lee (FL)	Ruiz	Wexton
D'Esposito	Kiggans (VA)	Webster (FL)		Duncan	Lofgren	Wild
Griffith	Larsen (WA)			Letlow	Lynch	Williams (GA)
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR						
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.						
□ 2204						
So the amendment was rejected.						
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.						
AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN						
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 66, printed in part B of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), 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 212, noes 217, not voting 9, as follows:						
[List of 212 Ayes]						
[List of 217 Noes]						
[List of 9 Not Voting]						
NOES—217						
Adams	Carter (LA)	Cuellar		Davids (KS)	Jackson Lee	Phillips
Aguilar	Cartwright	Davids (IL)		Estes	Kiggans (VA)	Radewagen
Allred	Case	Davis (NC)		Ezell	Larsen (WA)	Webster (FL)
Auchincloss	Casten	Dean (PA)		Fallon		
Balint	Castor (FL)	DeGette		Ferguson		
Barragán	Castro (TX)	DeLauro		Finstad		
Beatty	DeGangi	DelBene		Fitzgerald		
Bera	DeGette	Deluzio		Fleischmann		
Beyer	DeLuzio	DeSaulnier		Fox		
Bishop (GA)	McCormick	Dingell		Fry		
Blumenauer	Chu	Doggett		Fulcher		
Blunt Rochester	Clark (MA)	Dobkin		Gaetz		
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	Escobar		Gallagher		
Bowman	Cleaver	Eshoo		Garbarino		
Boyle (PA)	Clyburn	Espalliat		Garcia, Mike		
Brown	Cohen	Evans				
Brownley	Connolly	Fitzpatrick				
Budzinski	Correa	Fletcher				
Bush	Costa	Flood				
Caraveo	Courtney	Foster				
Carbajal	Craig	Foushee				
Cárdenas	Crockett	Frankel, Lois				
Carson	Crow	Frost				
NOT VOTING—9						
Buchanan	Tiffany			Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	Phillips
D'Esposito	Timmons			Kiggans (VA)	Kiggans (VA)	Radewagen
				Larsen (WA)	Larsen (WA)	Webster (FL)
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR						
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.						
□ 2207						
So the amendment was rejected.						
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.						
AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SANTOS						
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 73, printed in part B of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SANTOS), 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 112, noes 318, not voting 8, as follows:						

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 112, noes 318, not voting 8, as follows:





□ 2224

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.

## HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

□ 2230

HAPPY 134TH BIRTHDAY,  
MONTANA

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

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wish the State of Montana a happy 134th birthday. On November 8, 1889, Montana was the 41st State admitted to the Union, and it is truly a blessing to call it home.

Montana boasts a rich heritage and is home to some of the Nation's most pristine public lands, including Glacier National Park and the crown jewel of the National Park System, Yellowstone.

However, what truly makes Montana special is the people. Montanans are hardworking folks who value our traditions and cherish our freedoms and our liberties. There is a reason that Montana is the most patriotic State in the Nation.

Our Montana way of life is second to none, and it is an honor and a privilege to represent the Treasure State here in Congress, which is why we will continue to fight to protect our way of life.

Happy birthday, Montana.

## TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank President Biden for his continued commitment to the American people.

Recently, the Biden administration announced billions of dollars in Federal funding for bridges, subways, and road projects in the Northeast Corridor.

The funding included \$3.8 billion for a new Hudson River tunnel between New Jersey and New York. The current tunnel is 113 years old, and any service delays could cost the country \$100 million in lost economic activity and disrupt service for 200,000 travelers a day.

President Biden understands the importance of the project, and his administration has provided almost \$11 billion in Federal funding for it in the last 4 months.

This funding will help millions of future travelers get to their destinations faster and safer, and it is another example of his great work as President.

## CONGRATULATING DAWN BAKER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dawn Baker on her induction into the Silver Circle.

Ms. Baker is a native of Riceboro, Georgia, and attended both Liberty County and Chatham County public school systems.

In 1989, Ms. Baker began her career at WTOC and joined the legendary group of past WTOC honorees, including Doug Weathers, Pat Prokop, Mike Manhattan, Jody Chapin, and Craig Harney with this designation.

The longtime WTOC anchor was recently inducted into the Southeast Chapter of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences' Silver Circle with a ceremony in Atlanta.

To be eligible for the Silver Circle, one must have 25 or more years of service and have made significant contributions to one's craft in the Southeast region.

We congratulate Ms. Baker on her remarkable achievement. Her dedication to serving the people in the First District is greatly appreciated, and we cannot think of anyone more deserving of this award.

## HONORING THE LIFE OF LISA STANLEY

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

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and service of Decatur Township Supervisor Lisa Stanley who passed away this weekend after a long health battle.

Lisa Stanley was a dedicated public servant, a lifelong member of the Decatur community, and a fierce advocate for equality and justice.

Whether it was helping women with high-risk pregnancies, working with members of the Boys and Girls Club, or serving Illinois and the citizens of Decatur, Lisa spent her entire career fighting to make a difference.

As we mourn her loss, let us remember her contributions to our community and send our thoughts and prayers to her loved ones and everyone who has been touched and inspired by her life of service.

## HONORING THE LIFE OF LARRY COX

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of former Knoxville City Council Member Larry Cox who passed away on October 18 at the age of 81.

Larry grew up in North Knoxville where he attended Fulton High School and went on to serve for five terms on the city council.

Larry cared deeply about his community, the young and the old alike. He led the Knoxville Falcons Youth Sports Organization and ended up having the Larry Cox Senior Center named after him for his contributions to our great community and to our senior citizens.

He was a dear friend to me and my predecessor, Representative Jimmy Duncan. While I was in the Tennessee State Legislature and when I was county mayor, Larry would always call on behalf of the constituents or folks that he no longer represented, and they just needed some help.

He never called about anything for himself. He was always advocating for those around him and his community. He gave back to his community in every way he could, and he made such a positive impact on those around him.

Larry is survived by his beautiful wife, Brenda; his daughter, Brooke; his son, Shane; and his three grandchildren.

He will be deeply missed by his family and friends and missed by me, as well, Mr. Speaker. Our community loved him very much, and he will be very missed.

## MOURNING THE LOSS OF PAUL BAFFICO

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, as Veterans Day approaches, I rise today to mourn the loss of Paul Baffico, a dear friend and pillar of our local veterans community.

We met 30 years ago while working together at Sears. Over the years, I learned the full breadth of his story and the depth of his character. Paul served in Vietnam in the 101st Airborne Division, participating in 206 combat assaults.

Like so many of his era, Paul was not welcomed home the way he deserved. It was an experience that informed his career and his volunteering throughout his life.

Paul committed his life to serving our Nation's veterans. For more than 15 years, Paul volunteered as a docent at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C.

In 2012, he founded the Lake County Veterans and Family Services Foundation, engaging with and advocating on

behalf of thousands of veterans and families.

Paul was a big man and leaves an even bigger legacy, and his memory will forever be a blessing.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an oral history Paul shared with the Pritzker Military Museum & Library in 2013.

[From Pritzker Military Museum and Library, Nov. 17, 2023]

PAUL BAFFICO, FIRST LIEUTENANT

Paul Baffico's story of service truly represents the turmoil our nation faced in the early 1960s—a college student in San Francisco who chose to enroll in the ROTC as Americans were becoming more and more divided on the issue of the Vietnam War. Baffico served with the famed 101st Airborne Division in an area that saw heavy action, before returning home to a community that either couldn't—or wouldn't—understand what the military's sacrifice had been about.

Differing from some of the public universities at the time, the school that Baffico attended—the University of San Francisco—had a requirement that all students participate in ROTC for their first two years with the option to continue on voluntarily after that. Despite the more conservative nature of the school, the university's proximity to landmarks of 60s counter-culture—Haight-Ashbury, The University of California at Berkeley, and San Francisco itself—made putting on a uniform and going to class that much more intense in an environment where heated debates about Vietnam were raging. Watching as peers were pulled out of class and taken to the draft board, however, and hoping to postpone being drafted himself, Mr. Baffico chose to continue with ROTC after the school's initial requirements had been met.

After completing his undergraduate studies, Baffico was trained as a Signal Officer at Ft. Gordon, Georgia before moving on to Ft. Sill, Oklahoma, and finally landing at Ft. Hood, Texas. From there, he deployed to Vietnam and joined up with the 101st Airborne Division as a Signal Platoon Leader at Camp Eagle, in the hotly contested DMZ. From the time he landed in Vietnam—coming into Tan Son Nhut and making the 30-minute drive by jeep to Camp Eagle—Baffico was enveloped by the dangers of the conflict that would be ever-present in his 206 combat assaults.

One day, in particular, stands out to Baffico and represents the intensity he experienced:

As dawn broke on the morning of May 6th [1970] I was called to Division Tactical Operations Center (the Situation Bunker) and told that Firebase Henderson was under heavy attack and partially overrun. It was a sapper attack and the ammo dump was on fire and cooking off. My three men had been hit: two killed and one MEDEVAC'd out. The battle was at full peak and the only working communications for the entire firebase was the Pathfinder radio (LZ air traffic control). I was ordered to get a new team and equipment ready and get them installed at Henderson within 45 minutes regardless of the situation. I was not to leave the firebase until my men were in place and the equipment was back on air.

That during his interview Baffico chooses to focus on issues of leadership surrounding this moment, and what it means to support the troops in such a situation, is perhaps telling of how hard it is to revisit certain moments in the past. Mr. Baffico does suggest it took him many years to be able to even write about that day. The understanding of leadership that Baffico took

away with him that day continued to shape him as he came home to a community protesting the war in Vietnam; as he married and raised a family, and as he began a long career with Sears Roebuck & Co.—a company that understood his service and supported him.

Baffico, who lives in Lake Bluff, Illinois and is one of the founders of the Lake County Veterans and Family Service Foundation, takes time each month to volunteer at The Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C., where he talks with visitors about the war-time sacrifices he witnessed and what it actually means to be of service to your country.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 366. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to treat certain individuals who served in Vietnam as a member of the armed forces of the Republic of Korea as a veteran of the Armed Forces of the United States for purposes of the provision of health care by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 8, 2023, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-2348. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines, LLC Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1996; Project Identifier AD-2022-01361-E; Amendment 39-22570; AD 2023-20-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2349. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1992; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00414-T; Amendment 39-22568; AD 2023-20-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2350. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1040; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-01512-T; Amendment 39-22558; AD 2023-19-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2351. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Operations) Limited and British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1643; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-01649-A; Amendment 39-22555; AD 2023-19-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2352. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1213; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-01615-T; Amendment 39-22561; AD 2023-20-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2353. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1499; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00458-T; Amendment 39-22565; AD 2023-20-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2354. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Régional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1641; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00598-T; Amendment 39-22557; AD 2023-19-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2355. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Epic Aircraft, LLC Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1503; Project Identifier AD-2023-00197-A; Amendment 39-22566; AD 2023-20-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2356. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31511; Amdt. No.: 4082] received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2357. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31510; Amdt. No.: 4081] received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2358. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Philadelphia, PA [Docket No.:

FAA-2023-1800; Airspace Docket No.: 23-AEA-15] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2359. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Warrenton, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1692; Airspace Docket No.: 23-AEA-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2360. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Inclusion of Additional Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) Out Technical Standard Orders; Incorporation by Reference [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1836; Amdt. Nos.: 43-53 and 91-371] (RIN: 2120-AL70) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2361. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Uvalde, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1747; Airspace Docket No.: 23-ASW-15] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2362. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-36 and Establishment of RNAV Route T-675; Northcentral United States [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1325; Airspace Docket No.: 23-AGL-17] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## 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. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 6253. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to make awards to cover regulatory costs relating to licensing certain first-of-a-kind advanced nuclear reactors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 6254. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review on the Public Buildings Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 6255. A bill to require the Secretary of State to report an assessment of the Conflict and Stabilization Operations Bureau, including whether the Bureau should be maintained, explanations of its function, and cost analysis of the Bureau; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 6256. A bill to require that the Chief Information Officer of the Bureau of Information Resources submit an annual report that lists all the information technology procurement awards and contract that were awarded over \$10,000,000; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BALINT:

H.R. 6257. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare coverage of ambulance services that do not include transportation; 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. BANKS (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. HAGEMAN, and Mr. MOONEY):

H.R. 6258. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to disqualify any State that discriminates against parents or guardians who oppose medical, surgical, pharmacological, psychological treatment, or clothing and social changes related to affirming the subjective claims of gender identity expressed by any minor if such claimed identity is inconsistent with such minor's biological sex from receiving funding under such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 6259. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to establish record-management plans in order to be accredited or continue to be accredited, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER:

H.R. 6260. A bill to provide for certain reviews of the use and safety of Federal buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER:

H.R. 6261. A bill to direct the Comptroller General to conduct a review on the impact of crime on public building usage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, and 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. DAVIDSON (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BIGGS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. MACE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CAREY, Ms. CHU, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIEU, and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon):

H.R. 6262. A bill to implement reforms relating to foreign intelligence surveillance authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 6263. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide basic and emergency supplemental living assistance grants under the student support services program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 6264. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the maximum stipend amounts provided under Upward Bound projects; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 6265. A bill to direct the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to update the mission statement of the Commission to ensure li-

censing and regulation is efficient and is in alignment with the policies stated in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EZELL:

H.R. 6266. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, with respect to authority of contract security personnel of the General Services Administration Public Buildings Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 6267. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish Election Day as a Federal holiday; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 6268. A bill to enable timely licensing reviews for nuclear reactor facilities at brownfield sites and retired fossil fuel sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 6269. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish headstones, markers, and medallions for graves of certain enslaved individuals and individuals who performed military functions despite ineligibility to serve in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Ms. BALINT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THANEDAR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. RAMIREZ, and Mr. McGOVERN):

H.R. 6270. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to authorize the establishment of, and provide support for, State-based universal health care systems that provide comprehensive health benefits to State residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, Oversight and Accountability, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. FINSTAD, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mrs. HINSON, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. NUNN of Iowa):

H.R. 6271. A bill to amend certain agricultural laws with respect to the definition of biofuels and sustainable aviation fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE of Alabama:

H.R. 6272. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 with respect to the issuance of quality control guidance issued by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOYLAN:

H.R. 6273. A bill to extend the authorization of certain grants to the governments of Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and 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. OWENS:

H.R. 6274. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish a State innovation demonstration authority; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. PEREZ (for herself, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 6275. A bill to prohibit brand name drug manufacturers from compensating generic drug manufacturers to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable product manufacturers to delay entry of biosimilar and interchangeable products, 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. PERRY:

H.R. 6276. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to identify the utilization rate of certain public buildings and federally-leased space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 6277. A bill to amend the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 to improve such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 6278. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to identify two Federal agencies to consolidate into the GSA Headquarters Building, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. STEEL (for herself, Mr. BERA, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 6279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain wearable devices to be purchased using health savings accounts and other spending arrangements and reimbursement accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VASQUEZ (for himself, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SALINAS, and Ms. CARAVEO):

H.R. 6280. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for certain U.S. Customs and Border Protection operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Ways and Means, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VASQUEZ (for himself, Mr. McCaul, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. CARAVEO, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina):

H.R. 6281. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the punishment for certain offenses involving children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. VASQUEZ (for himself, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. CARAVEO, and Mrs. TRAHAN):

H.R. 6282. A bill to require a report on detainees in U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) custody, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. GOSAR:

H.J. Res. 97. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Justice relating to “Office of the Attorney General; Home Confinement Under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. Res. 849. A resolution reaffirming the State of Israel’s right to exist, condemning antisemitism in all forms, and rejecting false equivalencies between democracies and terrorist organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself, Mr. CARSON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. OWENS):

H. Res. 850. A resolution designating the House Press Gallery as the “Frederick Douglass Press Gallery”; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### 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. CURTIS:

H.R. 6253. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

To advance nuclear energy by authorizing the Secretary of Energy to make awards to cover regulatory costs relating to licensing certain first-of-a-kind advanced nuclear reactors.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 6254. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review on the Public Buildings Service, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 6255. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution in that the legis-

lation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause ‘to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or any Department or Office thereof.’

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Secretary of State to report an assessment of the Conflict and Stabilization Operations Bureau, including whether the Bureau should be maintained, explanations of its function, and cost analysis of the Bureau and for other purposes.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 6256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause ‘to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or any Department or Office thereof.’

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require that the Chief Information Officer of the Bureau of Information Resources submit an annual report that lists all the information technology procurement awards and contract that were awarded over \$10,000,000 and for other purposes.

By Ms. BALINT:

H.R. 6257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Medicare reimbursement for EMS

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 6258.

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 I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

The single subject of this legislation is:

Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act reform

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 6259.

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:

This bill amends the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to establish record-management plans in order to be accredited or continue to be accredited, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER:

H.R. 6260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for certain reviews of the use and safety of Federal buildings, and for other purposes

By Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER:

H.R. 6261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Comptroller General to conduct a review on the impact of crime on public building usage, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 6262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Government Surveillance

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 6263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Post-secondary education

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 6264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Education

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 6265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To advance nuclear energy by directing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to update the mission statement of the Commission to ensure licensing and regulation is efficient and is in alignment with the policies stated in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

By Mr. EZELL:

H.R. 6266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title 40, United States Code, with respect to authority of contract security personnel of the General Services Administration Public Buildings Service, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 6267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Elections

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 6268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would advance nuclear energy by directing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to identify and report on the regulations, guidance, or policy necessary to license and oversee nuclear facilities at brownfield sites and other sites with retired fossil fuel facilities.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 6269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Recognizes individuals who performed military service while enslaved or otherwise legally prohibited from serving on basis of their race, gender, sex, or ethnicity. The legislation would allow the final remains of these individuals to be memorialized with a headstone or marker from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 6270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health Care

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 6271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution."

The single subject of this legislation is:

To expand agriculture markets through promotion of aviation renewable fuels.

By Mr. MOORE of Alabama:

H.R. 6272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 with respect to the issuance of quality control guidance issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. MOYLAN:

H.R. 6273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article one of the United States Constitution Congress has the power to enact this legislation.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To adjust policy regarding host communities for migrants from the Freely Associated States

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 6274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Workforce

By Ms. PEREZ:

H.R. 6275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

health

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 6276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Directs GSA and OMB to identify utilization rates for public buildings.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 6277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To improve the sale and transfer of federal assets.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 6278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Directs GSA to identify two federal agencies to consolidate into the GSA headquarter building.

By Mrs. STEEL:

H.R. 6279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health Care

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 6280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 the Congress.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Border Security

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 6281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 the Congress.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Public Safety

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 6282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 the Congress.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Detention Oversight

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.J. Res. 97.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Disapproving of the Justice Department final rule "Office of the Attorney General; Home Confinement Under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act"

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 345: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 409: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 472: Mrs. LUNA.

H.R. 529: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.

H.R. 531: Mr. PALMER and Mr. CISCOMANI.

H.R. 537: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 542: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 594: Mrs. FOUSHEE.

H.R. 595: Mrs. FOUSHEE.

H.R. 619: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. BERA, and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.

H.R. 732: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 733: Mr. PALLONE.  
 H.R. 743: Mr. GOODEN of Texas and Mr. FRY.  
 H.R. 793: Mr. DONALDS.  
 H.R. 807: Mr. YAKYM, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, and Mr. TORRES of New York.  
 H.R. 847: Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 936: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.  
 H.R. 953: Mrs. DINGELL.  
 H.R. 974: Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 977: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 987: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. CAREY, Mr. BALDERSO, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. MANN, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mrs. KIM of California, and Mr. BENTZ.  
 H.R. 1015: Mr. WITTMAN.  
 H.R. 1044: Mrs. PELTOLA.  
 H.R. 1097: Mr. KEATING, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. MOYLAN, and Mr. ELLZEY.  
 H.R. 1222: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 1235: Ms. SHERRILL and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.  
 H.R. 1247: Ms. PINGREE.  
 H.R. 1279: Mrs. STEEL and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.  
 H.R. 1321: Mr. ISSA.  
 H.R. 1325: Mrs. RAMIREZ.  
 H.R. 1477: Mr. BACON and Mr. LAHOOD.  
 H.R. 1488: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. DELUZIO.  
 H.R. 1492: Mr. FINSTAD.  
 H.R. 1516: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. LAJOTA, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, and Mr. GARBARINO.  
 H.R. 1526: Mrs. HAYES.  
 H.R. 1679: Mr. GOMEZ.  
 H.R. 1705: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.  
 H.R. 1708: Mr. GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 1728: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 1770: Mrs. BEATTY.  
 H.R. 1777: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.  
 H.R. 1788: Ms. PINGREE.  
 H.R. 1833: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
 H.R. 2374: Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
 H.R. 2377: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.  
 H.R. 2441: Mrs. RAMIREZ.  
 H.R. 2584: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. BACON, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 2663: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. TRAHAN.  
 H.R. 2666: Mr. FERGUSON.  
 H.R. 2673: Mr. BANKS, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. DUNN of Florida, and Mr. SARBANES.  
 H.R. 2706: Mr. HARDER of California.  
 H.R. 2726: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2766: Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
 H.R. 2878: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.  
 H.R. 2918: Mr. KEATING.  
 H.R. 2941: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 2957: Mrs. WAGNER and Ms. BROWNLEY.  
 H.R. 3005: Mrs. FOUSHEE.  
 H.R. 3063: Mr. MORELLE.  
 H.R. 3074: Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.  
 H.R. 3086: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 3090: Mrs. RAMIREZ.  
 H.R. 3170: Mr. NEGUSE and Ms. DE LA CRUZ.  
 H.R. 3171: Mr. BACON.  
 H.R. 3238: Ms. BARRAGÁN and Mr. BAIRD.  
 H.R. 3239: Mr. RUIZ.  
 H.R. 3253: Mr. McGOVERN.  
 H.R. 3269: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3327: Mr. EZELL and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.  
 H.R. 3336: Mrs. FLETCHER.  
 H.R. 3350: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. PINGREE.  
 H.R. 3376: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
 H.R. 3382: Mr. FROST and Mr. GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 3413: Mr. DUARTE.  
 H.R. 3470: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.  
 H.R. 3475: Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. McGOVERN, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. LEE of Florida, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. TURNER.  
 H.R. 3519: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.  
 H.R. 3520: Mr. FERGUSON.  
 H.R. 3537: Ms. LEE of California and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.  
 H.R. 3548: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.  
 H.R. 3599: Mr. RYAN.  
 H.R. 3646: Ms. DEGETTE.  
 H.R. 3662: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 3689: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
 H.R. 3690: Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. VAN DUYNE, and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.  
 H.R. 3850: Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.  
 H.R. 3894: Mr. MOULTON, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. SORENSEN, and Ms. CRAIG.  
 H.R. 3933: Mr. FERGUSON.  
 H.R. 3961: Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
 H.R. 3970: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHOLTE, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. PANETTA.  
 H.R. 3982: Mr. LAHOOD.  
 H.R. 4175: Mr. WOMACK.  
 H.R. 4238: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.  
 H.R. 4261: Ms. CROCKETT and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 4315: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.  
 H.R. 4326: Ms. BUSH, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TRONE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. NICKEL.  
 H.R. 4335: Mr. WOMACK.  
 H.R. 4370: Mr. MORAN.  
 H.R. 4385: Ms. LEE of Nevada.  
 H.R. 4391: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 4565: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
 H.R. 4569: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. DELUZIO, Mrs. FLETCHER, and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 4632: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.  
 H.R. 4721: Mr. GIMENEZ and Mr. BAIRD.  
 H.R. 4758: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 4812: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 4819: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 4844: Ms. SPANBERGER and Ms. BUDZINSKI.  
 H.R. 4852: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.  
 H.R. 4937: Ms. SEWELL.  
 H.R. 4945: Mr. LANGWORTHY.  
 H.R. 5008: Ms. PORTER.  
 H.R. 5012: Ms. WEXTON.  
 H.R. 5041: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. LEE of California.  
 H.R. 5044: Mr. BABIN.  
 H.R. 5046: Mr. DELUZIO.  
 H.R. 5051: Ms. SCHRIER.  
 H.R. 5064: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, and Mr. BOWMAN.  
 H.R. 5073: Mr. LAHOOD.  
 H.R. 5077: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 5134: Ms. PINGREE.  
 H.R. 5138: Mr. MANN.  
 H.R. 5140: Mrs. HAYES.  
 H.R. 5147: Mr. VAN ORDEN.  
 H.R. 5175: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H.R. 5329: Mr. NEGUSE.  
 H.R. 5353: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 5399: Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. VALÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.  
 H.R. 5401: Ms. WILD, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ALLRED, and Ms. DE LA CRUZ.  
 H.R. 5526: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 5545: Mr. TRONE.  
 H.R. 5585: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.  
 H.R. 5667: Mr. LEVIN and Ms. TOKUDA.  
 H.R. 5669: Ms. STANSBURY and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
 H.R. 5707: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. KUSTOFF.  
 H.R. 5793: Mr. McGARVEY and Ms. SCHRIER.  
 H.R. 5807: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
 H.R. 5826: Mr. RUTHERFORD.  
 H.R. 5834: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
 H.R. 5845: Mrs. HOUGHIN.  
 H.R. 5854: Mr. MULLIN.  
 H.R. 5863: Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. OMAR.  
 H.R. 5866: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 5871: Ms. SHERRILL and Ms. BALINT.  
 H.R. 5896: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 5928: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. NEGUSE.  
 H.R. 5934: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. TRONE, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. MORELLE.  
 H.R. 5937: Mr. TRONE.  
 H.R. 5949: Mr. BIGGS.  
 H.R. 5995: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 6001: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. MCCORMICK.  
 H.R. 6031: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. MFUME.  
 H.R. 6039: Mr. GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 6062: Mr. SABLÁN.  
 H.R. 6087: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MC CORMICK, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. OMAR, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LIEU, and Mr. LAWLER.  
 H.R. 6091: Mr. TRONE.  
 H.R. 6093: Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. ROSS, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, and Ms. STEVENS.  
 H.R. 6110: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 6114: Ms. FOXX, Mr. SMUCKER, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. CAREY, and Mr. KUSTOFF.  
 H.R. 6124: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 6140: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 6143: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina and Ms. STEFANIK.  
 H.R. 6144: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.  
 H.R. 6147: Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 6148: Ms. TLAIB.  
 H.R. 6170: Mr. CRANE.  
 H.R. 6174: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.  
 H.R. 6175: Mr. PALMER.  
 H.R. 6200: Mr. HARRIS.  
 H.R. 6211: Mr. BAIRD.  
 H.J. Res. 65: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.J. Res. 96: Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CASE, Ms. HAGEMAN, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. BARR, Ms. PORTER, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. SABLÁN.  
 H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.  
 H. Res. 262: Mr. KEATING.  
 H. Res. 561: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H. Res. 600: Ms. STEVENS.  
 H. Res. 697: Mr. GIMENEZ.  
 H. Res. 793: Mrs. MCCLAIN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. SPANBERGER.  
 H. Res. 806: Ms. CARAVEO and Ms. SABLÁN.  
 H. Res. 828: Ms. TOKUDA.  
 H. Res. 830: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. BAIRD.  
 H. Res. 837: Mr. MULLIN.  
 H. Res. 839: Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. BOWMAN.  
 H. Res. 844: Mrs. FLETCHER.  
 H. Res. 845: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Ms. VAN

November 7, 2023

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H5547

DUYNE, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ALFORD, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.