



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2024

No. 5

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 10, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARCUS J. MOLINARO 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, 2024, 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.

HONORING MELVIN DANIEL

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the late Melvin Daniel who will be posthumously inducted into the Arkansas Agricultural Hall of Fame in March.

A Bismarck native, Melvin spent 37 years as an agriculture education teacher and FFA adviser for the Glenwood, Lake Hamilton, and Foreman school districts, including 33 years at

Lake Hamilton where he advised the school's first FFA State officer, first American FFA Degree recipient, and trained 33 State-winning FFA judging teams.

Melvin was a dedicated agriculturalist known not only for his dedication to agricultural education and FFA but also for his passion for raising Black Angus and Limousine cattle and for his time spent as director of the Master Gardeners program with the Garland County Cooperative Extension Service.

Although I never had Mr. Daniel as my ag teacher, he taught at a neighboring high school. I spent much time with him and his students at fairs, conventions, and contests. Mr. Daniel had a desire to see all students succeed, whether they were his students or not. I was one of those who benefited from knowing him.

I am honored to stand today and recognize my friend, Mr. Melvin Daniel, for his lifelong commitment to agriculture. His induction to the Arkansas Agricultural Hall of Fame is well deserved, and I know his family and the community are still inspired by his service.

HONORING THE BRAGG FAMILY

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my condolences to the friends and loved ones of the Bragg family from Monticello. While visiting family in Michigan over the holiday, Hope and Don Bragg, their son Kenny and their daughter, Elizabeth, lost their lives in a house explosion. Their son Stephen and Hope's father, Richard Pruden, made it out but are still in recovery.

Hope was a dedicated Arkansas 4-H instructor, and Don was a renowned scientist, who conducted critical research at the University of Arkansas at Monticello that will forever impact forestry in Arkansas and nationwide.

In fact, much of the research that Don conducted has impacted the work

that I have done throughout my career as both a forester and a Member of Congress.

I am thankful for both Hope and Don's contributions to the agricultural and forestry sectors, but, furthermore, I am thankful for their generous contributions to their community.

I was devastated to learn about this tragedy, as I know many were. Hope and Don's absence will be greatly felt and impact many in Drew County and across the country, but they leave behind a lasting legacy of love for science and public service.

My prayers go out to Stephen and Mr. Pruden as they recover from this disaster and the Braggs' friends and families as they navigate this devastating loss.

RECOGNIZING TOM NICHOLS

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Tom Nichols for his distinguished career in broadcast radio. For over 65 years, Tom Nichols has been in the radio business in Arkansas. Since 1958, when he got his start with the Hot Springs DJs, Tom has impacted the Natural State's radio industry beyond measure.

After years of managing KZNG in Hot Springs, Tom and his wife, Polly, became trailblazers in Arkansas radio when they started the first-ever radio station in Pike County in Glenwood. What began as a small AM radio station became the spot for Arkansans in Pike County to receive breaking news and daily entertainment on AM and FM frequencies.

As KWXI grew in Glenwood, Tom and Polly saw a need for quality radio in Hot Springs Village, and, thus, they started KRVE where they still are today. The KVRE call letters mean Village Radio Entertainment, which is exactly what they are all about.

One of Arkansas' last family-owned and operated stations, KVRE is known as being personable and making its listeners feel like friends and family. As

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.

someone who has joined Tom on KVRE for several interviews, I can attest to the familiar and personal environment he and his family have curated in Hot Springs Village.

Tom has not only been able to capture and maintain the nostalgia of hometown radio with local personalities and local news, but he has adapted with the times. You cannot only listen at 92.9 locally, but you can also listen worldwide at KVRE.com.

It is with great honor that I rise today to recognize Tom Nichols and his 65 years of service in radio broadcasting.

HONORING JOSE DE SOSA

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true champion for community empowerment and civil rights in the San Fernando Valley and beyond, the incomparable Jose De Sosa.

Jose De Sosa dedicated over six decades of his life to tirelessly advocating for justice, equality, and the well-being of our community. His passing leaves a void that will be felt by all those lives he touched.

Born in Panama City, Panama, Jose later migrated to New York City where he enlisted in the United States Air Force and served our country for over 10 years.

That service was one of the many milestones he accomplished throughout his life.

Jose met his beautiful wife, Juanita, in 1959. They got married and moved to Pacoima where they raised seven outstanding children.

In his life's works, he demonstrated his commitment to justice and equity over the course of his 36 years working for Pacific Telephone Company which later became AT&T.

In fact, he was a leader in pushing the Pacific Telephone Company to recruit from the Los Angeles Unified School District's Skills Center, improving economic opportunity for Black and Brown students and enabling hundreds of people to secure work and provide for their families in those good-paying jobs.

But Jose's biggest impact on the San Fernando Valley was through his positions with the NAACP, where he served as president of the local chapter, and his various roles as a board member in regional and State-level organizations.

He was the first Afro-Latino to be elected president of a local and statewide NAACP, and he used his Black and Latino heritage to build working relationships between both communities and beyond.

In challenging times during the 1980s, when Pacoima grappled with issues of police brutality from the Los Angeles Police Department, Jose De Sosa emerged as a fearless leader. His un-

wavering commitment to justice was instrumental in banning the use of the carotid choke hold by the LAPD, a pivotal step towards safeguarding the rights, safety, and dignity of all individuals.

He worked with many of my colleagues, such as the legendary Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS and also Congresswoman Diane Watson to hold LAPD accountable.

It is these examples of his incredible leadership that makes Jose De Sosa's impact felt both locally and nationally. This advocacy on behalf of the safety of his community even led to a landmark Supreme Court decision sharply limiting the use of battering rams by law enforcement.

His dedication to protecting the civil rights of all people reverberated throughout our community and set a precedent for justice.

Even in his later years, Mr. De Sosa continued to serve his community with passion and vigor. He remained accessible and responsive to our community, making phone calls and sending emails whenever his assistance was needed to help a good cause.

These efforts included actively informing people about programs that save money through solar energy, demonstrating his commitment to both the environment and sustainability and economic empowerment for all communities.

He also continued to serve on various boards, such as the Valley Interfaith Council, Alicia Broadous-Duncan Multipurpose Senior Center, Boys & Girls Club of San Fernando Valley, Greater San Fernando Valley Optimist Club and Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County.

In fact, the Neighborhood Legal Services' community room in Pacoima is named in his honor.

Mr. De Sosa's legacy is one of resilience, determination, selflessness, and service to all. His life's work has left an indelible mark on the landscape of civil rights and the community and advocacy overall. As we reflect on his contributions, let us remember Mr. De Sosa as an inspiration to us all—a true force for positive change.

May his memory be a guiding light for future generations as we strive to continue the fight for justice and equality for all. Our thoughts and prayers go out to his family, friends, and all those who were fortunate enough to know this remarkable individual.

I had the honor of recognizing Mr. De Sosa last year right here on the United States House of Representatives floor to commemorate Black History Month as one of our leaders in Pacoima and the San Fernando Valley.

A few years later, we honored him in the community at the Boys & Girls Club of San Fernando Valley. We shared stories and laughed and even cried together.

Mr. De Sosa was married to his wife and partner, Juanita, for 61 years. She

passed recently. They were world travelers, and they instilled that in their children and their descendants.

He leaves grandchildren, great-grandchildren, great-great-grandchildren, numerous nieces and nephews, friends, and acquaintances. We all miss him. May his legacy endure and inspire us to build a more just and compassionate society for everyone.

CRISIS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight how President Biden's open-border policies and Senator SCHUMER's inaction and refusal to pass our Border Security Act is resulting in everyday Americans dying.

In 2023, the overdose death rate topped 112,000 individuals, setting a new record.

Fentanyl is still the number one killer of Americans aged 18 to 45. Mr. Speaker, 70 to 80 percent of all fentanyl in the U.S. comes from the southern border. That is not just me saying it, that is what the Drug Enforcement Administration is saying.

Drug cartels are making \$32 million a week smuggling individuals into our country. Yes, every asylum seeker, migrant, illegal immigrant, whatever you want to call them, that is coming through our southern border is paying the drug cartels, who, in turn, then use that money to continue to poison our children by selling drugs.

The DEA seized 384 million doses of fentanyl. That is enough to kill every single American. The DEA stated that in December of 2022, most of the fentanyl being trafficked was from two cartels, and it is being mass produced at secret factories in Mexico with chemicals being sourced largely from China.

In May of last year, the DEA conducted an operation that resulted in over 3,000 arrests, the seizure of almost 44 million fentanyl pills, more than 6,500 pounds of fentanyl powder, more than 91,000 pounds of methamphetamine, roughly 8,400 firearms, and more than \$100 million.

Yes, the DEA is doing a great job, but look at the pressure we are putting on this agency simply because the President insists on having an open border, and Senator SCHUMER refuses to do his job.

We passed legislation here to add fentanyl and all its analogues to schedule 1, and he refuses to do it over there. We passed the Border Security Act in May, and he has been sitting on it since then. We took action to halt and put sanctions on Chinese entities that are manufacturing and producing this fentanyl, and, yet again, the Senate refuses to take action.

□ 1015

According to the DEA, Mexican criminal organizations are now the

most prominent wholesale-level heroin traffickers in Chicago, Philadelphia, New Jersey, and Washington, and they have a great presence in my city of New York.

Let's talk about New York City. Last year, we saw more than 3,000 people die from drug overdoses in New York City, 80 percent of which were tied to fentanyl. That number has doubled since the New York Democrats and the legislature passed the 2020 bail law allowing traffickers and dealers to be released automatically back onto our streets.

Look at these headlines: "Suspects accused of running \$7M fentanyl ring released without bail"; "NY's lax bail law lets lethal fentanyl peddlers off scot-free"; "NY bail laws required most of 30 drug dealers busted on [Long Island] for peddling 'tranq,' cocaine and fentanyl to be 'automatically released'"; "Mexican cartel smugglers nabbed with \$1.2M worth of meth in NYC—then released thanks to lax bail laws"; "New York man busted with 20K fentanyl pills released without bail"; "Six people busted as part of \$7M drug trafficking ring in Bronx released without bail under new State law," which Kathy Hochul and the Democrats refuse to fix.

The Federal policies of the Democrats, coupled with the policies of my State government, have been a complete failure and disaster, and Americans are dying as a result.

Once again, I urge my Governor and the State legislature to do their job, and I urge our colleagues on the other side in the Senate to do their job. We took action here in the House. We passed multiple pieces of legislation, most predominantly the Border Security Act. I expect CHUCK SCHUMER to care about what is happening in his own State of New York and do the same.

REINSTATE LIMIT ON HIGH-CAPACITY MAGAZINES

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, last year set the record for the highest number of mass murders with a firearm in more than a decade. In fact, 2023 marked yet another year where there were more mass shootings than days in the year.

These events continue to retraumatize our communities and our Nation because no community has been untouched by this deadly epidemic.

One common denominator in these mass murders is the use of large capacity ammunition feeding devices, or high-capacity magazines. These magazines hold 30, 40, or even 100 rounds of ammunition, and they have been used in all 10 of our Nation's deadliest mass shootings. High-capacity magazines increase a shooter's ability to kill or injure large numbers of people quickly.

One event that I still remember starkly is the shooting in Aurora, Colo-

rado, at the movie theater, which is just a few miles from my home. One single perpetrator used an assault rifle and a 100-round magazine to fire 65 shots within just minutes, killing 12 people and injuring 70 others.

Despite the fact that many members of the audience for that movie were either Active-Duty military or veterans who were trained to respond to a situation just like this, they were unable to respond because the volley of bullets was simply too extreme. The high-capacity magazine allowed that shooter to continue firing, pinning people down as shot after shot rang out.

There are so many more examples of this terrible, terrible destruction: Columbine, also right outside my district; Dayton; Las Vegas; Parkland. No other developed country experiences this level of violence from firearms.

Now, I recognize there is not one single piece of legislation that will completely end gun violence, but something must be done. In mass shootings with four or more people killed between 2015 and 2022, high-capacity magazines led to more than twice as many people being killed and nearly 10 times as many people being wounded per incident on average.

It makes sense if you think about it because if you have just a few rounds of ammunition, then those highly trained soldiers and veterans in that movie theater audience would have been able to stop the shooter, tackle him, and disable him after he stopped shooting. Instead, when you can shoot up to 100 rounds in rapid fire, this is not possible.

High-capacity magazines were designed for war. They weren't designed for hunting. They weren't designed for self-defense. Yet, they continue to be used against our fellow citizens in our hometowns and communities.

Experts agree that reinstating the limit on high-capacity magazines would be an effective step in protecting our communities.

Today, Representatives TITUS and SCHNEIDER, along with the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force and I, are announcing that we are filing a discharge petition to bring the Keep Americans Safe Act up for a vote so we can reinstate the U.S. ban on high-capacity magazines.

My bill would prohibit the sale or transfer of any high-capacity magazine capable of holding more than 15 rounds of ammunition. This is legislation that has been passed by this Chamber two times 2 years ago as part of the Assault Weapons Ban and the Protecting Our Kids Act.

It is our obligation as Members of Congress to keep the American people safe and to protect our communities. Now is the time to reinstate the limit on high-capacity magazines.

The petition will now be filed at the desk, and I urge all of my colleagues to sign it. It will take 218 signatures to bring this bill to the floor and to move us one step closer to eradicating the

terrible ravages of gun violence for the American people.

TRUE THREATS TO DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, President Biden marked the third anniversary of the January 6 Capitol riot by calling it a "day that we nearly lost America," and he asked: "Is democracy still America's sacred cause?"

That is an important question. What happened on January 6 was a national disgrace. A riotous mob disrupted the Congress and its congressional responsibility to observe the counting of the votes of the electoral college. To conclude that "we nearly lost America" to a lunatic wearing buffalo horns that day is hysterical hyperbole, to say the least. True insurrections are made of sterner stuff.

When the last of these yahoos was kicked out of this building a few hours later, Congress calmly completed the electoral count and confirmed Joe Biden's election.

Nevertheless, Mr. Biden is correct to raise concerns about the growing threats to our democracy, and he is right that democracy depends on the loser of an election accepting its outcome as the legitimate will of the majority. Many Democrats refused to do that in 2016 and many Republicans in 2020.

Why do so many voters no longer trust the integrity of our elections? Could it be that so many of the safeguards that assure a fair election and an accurate count have been stripped away?

For hundreds of years, we all looked our neighbors in the eye as they handed us our ballots. We all cast our votes in curtained booths where no one could influence us. We all watched our ballots placed in locked containers. At 8 p.m., we knew exactly how many votes had been cast, and a few hours later, we knew the outcome of all the elections.

We all had our say during the campaign, and we waited until the debate was over to make our decision on election day. It was very hard to cheat, and everyone could trust that process.

All that has changed. In recent years, the leftist Democrats have rigged election laws to extend voting over an entire month, accept ballots after election day, harvest ballots by political operatives, use mail-in ballots where there is no chain of custody, prevent observers from unobstructed views of ballot counting, and suppress debate and hide critical information from voters.

Freedom of speech is the beating heart of democracy, yet the left-leaning bureaucracies, increasingly independent of the will of the voters, actively colluded to influence elections by intimidating political opponents, starting with the Tea Party. They have

promoted utterly false narratives, most notably the Russian collusion hoax.

Courts have recently found the government guilty of violating the First Amendment by actively pressuring social media platforms to censor the very political dialogue that is central to the functioning of a democracy. The President even attempted to establish a disinformation czar to decide what information could reach voters.

Our fundamental democratic institutions are also under growing attack. The left has been very clear that it intends to pack the Supreme Court by creating new seats for leftist appointments and to pack the Senate by creating overwhelmingly Democratic States, like Washington, D.C.

Less than 2 years ago, leftist mobs descended on the homes of Supreme Court Justices in an illegal attempt to pressure and intimidate them, yet Mr. Biden's Department of Justice refused to enforce the law that protects jurists from such bullying.

The President has opened our borders and produced an illegal mass migration unprecedented in our history while his party has pushed to permit foreign nationals to vote in our elections, making a mockery of Americans' right to self-determination.

How does Mr. Biden explain the unprecedented acts of his agents seeking to ban from the ballot candidates who directly challenge his candidacy? It is not just the brazen and unconstitutional attempt to keep his leading Republican challenger from the ballot. The agents of his party have been aggressively working to ban Democratic primary challengers as well and seizing from Democratic voters in Iowa the right to have any meaningful say in next week's election, for fear they would not vote for him in sufficient numbers.

Mr. Speaker, our democracy is indeed under attack from the lunatic fringe on both extremes. When we ask which presents a clear and present danger to our democracy, I would respectfully but earnestly suggest the President remove the log from his own eye before he criticizes the speck in his neighbor's.

HONORING KEN SMITH

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to honor the extraordinary career of Ken Smith, who at one time was from Delaware and then Virginia and now makes his home in Florida.

A long time ago, in the faraway land of Delaware, Ken was a young policy assistant to Governor Pete du Pont, after serving as a staff aide during the Nixon administration. His career in education had started in 1973 when President Nixon appointed him vice chairman of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children.

Governor du Pont and Ken made the startling discovery that there was enormous economic, social, and cultural potential residing in adults who had dropped out of high school but were never realized because of educational and career blockages. These were smart kids, but kids who, for whatever reason, had to quit school and go to work.

With the Governor's blessing and leadership, Ken created Jobs for Delaware's Graduates, a model program for intervening with the young women and men most likely to drop out, saving them not just to get them to graduation but to land them in good jobs or at least postsecondary education.

Jobs for Delaware's Graduates worked so well, Governor du Pont shared its success with Republican and Democratic Governors across the country, and many created their own programs. Vice President Walter Mondale was so impressed, he asked them to replicate it across the country. They needed a national leader, and Ken Smith was chosen to be the first—and for more than 40 years the only—CEO and President of Jobs for America's Graduates.

Jobs for America's Graduates launched in four States, including Virginia, and was bipartisan from the very start. Ken wisely cultivated Governor after Governor from both parties to grow the programs in their States, knowing that this was the most secure path to sustained economic growth and to overcome the poverty that cursed our least educated.

Today, Jobs for America's Graduates is helping 75,000 young people per year in over 1,450 high schools, middle schools, and out-of-school programs in more than 40 States.

I had the great privilege of chairing Jobs for Virginia's Graduates for 14 years, always bipartisan. It is now led by the Honorable Eileen Filler-Corn, the first woman speaker in the Virginia House. JVG is serving the kids with barriers to success in over 50 Virginia high schools today.

Ken Smith wisely created a national board to oversee the growth of this most successful high school dropout prevention program. The board chair is always a Governor, and it alternates between a Democratic and Republican every year. We are honored to have Governor Kim Reynolds of Iowa chair the board this year. She succeeded Governor John Bel Edwards last year. A fun fact is that the Jobs for America's Graduates board has more Governors than any other board, including the National Governors Association.

□ 1030

Ken's leadership and advocacy over 40 years has inspired many highlights, from Governor George Bush installing the program in every high school in El Paso, to Governor Mike Pence expanding all throughout Indiana. Our own Virginia Governor, Chuck Robb, served as national chairman; and our current

Governor, Glenn Youngkin, has kept this commitment in his budget.

Remarkably, with Ken Smith at the helm, over 1,400,000 young men and women have graduated from high school, exceeding expectations they and their families had rarely hoped for.

In more than 40 years, Jobs for America's Graduates has never had a graduation rate below 90 percent, and today, the current graduation rate is above 95 percent.

Throughout his career, Ken has been appointed by multiple Presidents to serve as an education adviser given his deep connection and commitment to helping youth.

Thanks to Ken could not be given without saying thank you to his family, of course, who supported him throughout his career. Nora, his wife; Tara and Jennifer, his daughters; and most recently, his two granddaughters continue to support his work.

I have known many good human beings in my life. I get to serve in this House, where the great majority of us, Democrats and Republicans, serve because we are trying to make the world and America a better place. I have almost never met a man who has had as great a lifetime impact on far more than 1 million young people than Ken Smith. He has given his life to others and changed those lives with his love, hard work, and his courage.

Ken Smith, in your deserved pretend retirement, I salute you and thank you for your inspiration and your service.

REGAINING OPERATIONAL CONTROL OF OUR BORDER

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

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I visited the southern border last week in Eagle Pass, Texas, to see the situation at our border firsthand and to hear from Border Patrol, landowners, judges, and community members on how this is impacting them.

This was my fourth border visit since I have been in Congress. The crisis at our border is worse than ever.

Just last month, CBP reported 302,000 illegal crossings. That is enough people to fill out the Anaheim Angel Stadium nearly seven times over, just from one month.

I heard from Border Patrol who said they are spreading themselves thin as we see more crossings. They have become caretakers instead of devoting their time to handling the backlog of illegal migrants or working to protect our border.

The border facilities are expensive. In fact, the Del Rio and Eagle Pass facilities alone cost \$25 million to maintain every month. This doesn't include the salaries of Border Patrol agents.

I heard from county leaders who said that every week they perform autopsies on dead migrants found at the border. The price that both migrants and our communities pay is staggering.

Meanwhile, we have some reports of the Biden administration storing unused physical barriers and technologies at taxpayers' expense that could be used to help secure our border.

The numbers are startling, and the stories are heartbreaking. As a mother, grandmother, and immigrant who came here legally as a young girl, seeing these migrants being exploited by cartels breaks my heart.

Let me be clear, there is nothing fair, humane, or compassionate about the Biden administration's border policies. In fact, the Biden administration and DHS Secretary Mayorkas' open border policies have only emboldened cartels, giving them \$32 million a week profit. While cartels line their pockets and funnel fentanyl into our streets and our schools, Americans are endangered, and our Border Patrol is overworked and overwhelmed.

Sadly, this has undermined the legal immigration process and all those who have been waiting and playing by the rules.

This year, marks 100 years of the U.S. Border Patrol. Let's do right by these brave men and women who have dangerous and demanding jobs and give them the tools they need to protect us.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bipartisan border strategy bill to gain operational control of our southern border, and I am committed to do my part in being part of the solution here. The Biden administration must come to the table and do the same.

THANKING MIKE MARKUS FOR HIS DEDICATION
TO THE WATER DISTRICT

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the Orange County Water District general manager, Mike Markus, for his dedicated service to the water district and to ensuring access to clean water for our Orange County communities and residents.

During his impressive 35-year career, Mike managed the implementation of the Groundwater Replenishment System program, which has become the largest potable reuse project in the world with a capacity to hold enough water for 1 million people.

Mike has received many notable and well-deserved awards for his work, including most recently the USC Sonny Astani Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering 2023 Lifetime Achievement Award.

He has been a great resource to me and my office and I appreciate his partnership in supporting our communities. It has been a great privilege to work with his son, Dan, who is the staff director on the House Foreign Affairs Indo-Pacific Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mike for everything, and I wish him a very wonderful and successful retirement.

SOCIAL SECURITY: A PROMISE
FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I wish my constituents back home in the 21st Congressional District and Americans throughout the country a very happy new year. May it bring us good tidings and health, and may the Congress come together to solve some of the critical problems that we are facing in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 83 years ago, the first Social Security check went out. Beginning as a promise for future generations of America, it was an attempt to create a safety net; and it has. Social Security is the major source of income for the majority of people over the age of 65; that accounts for over 70 million Americans.

In my 21st Congressional District, located in California's San Joaquin Valley, nearly 88,000 people depend upon this program for their basic needs: for food, for rent, for groceries. It is critical therefore that we address the issues involving Social Security.

A lot has changed in our country since it was first enacted in the 1930s during the Great Depression. Americans today, those who are receiving, and those who hope to receive Social Security, fear that the future of this vital program and their benefits are at risk, and they should be.

Why? Well, the long-term financial integrity of Social Security is not sustainable, and therefore, we have to fix it.

Instead of fixing Social Security, many of my extreme MAGA Republicans are focused on gutting the program and cutting vital benefits. That is wrong.

Under the leadership of my good friend Congressman JOHN LARSON, House Democrats have put forth a plan of action to secure and expand the benefits of Social Security. The Social Security Act of 2100: A Sacred Trust Act permanently improves Social Security's long-term health by extending the trust fund's solvency, which is critical, without any increase in taxes on the middle class. Let me repeat that: without any increase in taxes on the middle class.

It also repeals the bureaucratic rules, like the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset that prevents law enforcement officers, firefighters, and their families from receiving full benefits. They should receive full benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of this bill because Congress must uphold its promise to all seniors so they can retire with respect and dignity.

What are we talking about? We are talking about America's safety net. American seniors and future generations deserve better. We owe it to them who have spent their entire lives contributing to make their country a better place to live and who are counting on Social Security in their golden years.

Our country needs a roadmap to protect Social Security for generations to come, and this bill will do just that. I

remain committed to upholding the sacred trust that was made many years ago, working together with Republicans and Democrats for all Americans to fix the solvency of our Social Security.

SECURING OUR BORDER

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the challenges we face at the border and immigration in America. We must fix this broken immigration system. We had an opportunity in 2013, and Republicans and Democrats must come together to protect our border, to protect it from human trafficking and from the movement of illicit drugs.

With commonsense action, I believe we can come together to do this. I will continue to work with my colleagues so that we can fix our broken immigration system and secure our border. That is what needs to be done.

HONORING THE LATE SERGEANT
JUAN ERIC CANTU

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an incredible man and former constituent, the late Sergeant Juan Eric Cantu.

Sergeant Cantu honorably served our Nation as a member of the U.S. Army during the war in Vietnam with the 228th Aviation Battalion associated with the 1st Cavalry Division. He deployed to Vietnam from 1966 to 1968 and was a tail gunner on a Chinook helicopter and a fixed rotor mechanic.

He served as commander of Veterans of Foreign Wars, president of Vietnam Veterans of America Chapter 892, and a founding member of AMVETS Post 1111.

Additionally, Mr. Cantu founded the legendary GI Joe's Living Military History Museum in Kinston, which displays memorabilia, uniforms, weapons, and photos from all major conflicts starting with the Revolutionary War and became a place of comfort and solace for veterans to share their stories and heal their wounds.

Those who knew Mr. Cantu described three principles that best defined him: his legendary work ethic, his optimistic nature, and his love for his fellow veterans.

We honor him today. We remember him today. Sergeant Juan Eric Cantu was a humble servant, community leader, and remarkable human.

May he rest in peace and may God bless his family and friends.

MEDICARE FEE CUT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the proposed 3.37 percent Medicare fee cut. When a physician sees a Medicare patient, they do so out of the goodness of their heart. They care for the patient. It doesn't make financial sense.

When you see a Medicare or Medicaid patient, you actually lose money. It

costs more to see patients than you are getting for the cost of care.

When I ran a private practice, I stayed up many, many nights, Saturday nights, trying to find out how to squeeze out money—to find each paper clip, make sure that we knew where the staplers were—just to make sure that we made payroll and that we paid the light bill.

Oftentimes I did not take a salary when we could not do that, but that was private practice. We were our own destiny. We knew how to take care of patients. We had an ownership in patients.

When adjusted for inflation over the last 20 years, the Medicare fee schedule for physicians has been cut by 20 percent.

What other profession expects to be cut year after year rather than receive raises, especially during this inflationary period?

One of ObamaCare's directives was to starve private practice, to force them, to drive them into employment. My former practice is employed now by a hospital. They have done well, but this is an entirely different tenet with patient care.

Physicians are being cut every year in their pay. Hospitals, albeit smaller, get raises every year.

□ 1045

While this still may not be much to carry the cost of care in these hospitals, but why are the people who are providing care to the patients the ones who are being cut?

Why is this a bad model?

It is because I think employed physicians tend to be a different bird from private practice physicians. They tend to be more working on the clock, they tend to decrease efficiency, and they actually increase the cost of care.

There is much more ownership with private practice physicians. When a private practice physician comes into a community, they establish roots, and they become part of the community. They join churches, and they join civic groups.

Unfortunately, the employed physician model as we see it now is much more transitory. There is a contract, and if that doesn't work out, then they move in 3 years. Then patients are left in the lurch. My doctor—it is always my doctor—took care of me for 20 years. That is starting to stop; that is ceasing.

The Medicare fee schedule cuts must stop. This is why I introduced H.R. 6683, the Preserving Seniors' Access to Physicians Act. The legislation stops this year's cut while we work on a permanent solution.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the reasons I came to Congress: to fix Medicare. We are experiencing a critical doctor shortage now, but it is going to be off the cliff in 3 to 5 years, especially with surgeons.

No other profession, as I just said, expects to be cut every year rather than

get raises. Every day now we add 10,000 new patients to Medicare. Imagine a hardware store, Mr. Speaker, where you bought a hammer for a dollar, and you were paid 60 cents. It doesn't make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the bill.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 46 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 (Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California) at noon.

PRAAYER

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

Holy and immortal God, we pause to offer our prayers of both gratitude and grief for Your servant, Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson. Words cannot adequately express our appreciation to You for allowing us to share the journey of life with such a woman of perseverance and presence, leadership and legendary impact. Thank You for allowing her to touch the lives of so many in both her nursing and political careers.

While we mourn Representative Johnson's passing, with hearts bereft of her friendship and mentorship, and with compassion for her grieving family, in the face of the fragility of life, we do not grieve as those without hope. For we trust in the promise she held dear, that those who have departed this life will be united with You in everlasting glory.

May her memory be a blessing, and may Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson be blessed as she rests now from her labor in lifelong service to You and to Your people.

Into Your everlasting arms we commend our lives, and in Your eternal name we offer our prayer.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CELEBRATING KANE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS POST'S CENTENNIAL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate 100 years of the Kane Veterans of Foreign Wars charter located in McKean County.

The Kane VFW post is a top-tier post in the State. In 2023, they qualified and were awarded All State status for the second time and were also awarded the coveted All American Post award for the first time.

The post will mark this anniversary with a celebration at the end of January with numerous guest speakers, camaraderie, and friendship.

The Kane VFW post's first meeting to establish their charter was held on December 11, 1923, in the Eagle Hall, and they were granted their charter on January 29, 1924, with just 79 founding members. Over the years, the club grew in size, serving as a place for veterans and community members alike to gather in fellowship.

Mr. Speaker, VFW posts are so important to our communities because they offer veterans a place to gather together and connect. From hosting local Scout troops to important community meetings, the Kane VFW post has seen it all over the last 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Kane VFW and their dedicated members on this monumental anniversary.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF THE HONORABLE EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

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

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Texas giant, a trailblazer, a leader, my mentor, and my friend, Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson.

Congresswoman Johnson was unrivaled in her ability to deliver for Dallas and Texas. She always put Texans first and fought every day for her constituents in Dallas.

Congresswoman Johnson broke so many barriers. It is not hyperbole to say that I would not be here today serving in Congress if it weren't for Congresswoman Johnson.

Everywhere you look, Texans can see the mark that she made on our State in her 50 years of public service, from improving the VA, to investing in transportation, to fighting for Texans' civil rights, and to her work as the chair of the House Science Committee to pass the Chips and Science Act and invest in high-tech manufacturing.

Texas lost a giant, and I lost a friend. We all mourn this loss for our Texas community.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring awareness to the fact that January is National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

Human trafficking erodes personal dignity and destroys the moral fabric of our society. Sadly, it is the fastest growing illicit trade in the world, with an estimated 40.3 million people living as slaves worldwide.

In this day and age, it is easy to think of human trafficking as a problem that happens elsewhere, but sadly, the U.S. accounts for almost 52 percent of global human trafficking, with the sex trafficking of minors accounting for the largest percentage.

Unfortunately, this problem has been exacerbated by the Biden administration's weak border policies, which criminal cartels are exploiting. Obviously, we need to secure the border immediately and hold traffickers accountable.

During National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, we must reaffirm our unwavering commitment to eradicate this crime against humanity and to support victims of this horrific crime.

BIDEN BORDER DESTABILIZATION

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week, I joined Speaker MIKE JOHNSON and Republican colleagues from 26 States at the border in Eagle Pass, Texas.

What I witnessed and heard was madness. Each month, Border Patrol agents, county sheriffs, and public safety personnel are assaulted with unaccompanied children and tens of thousands of illegal aliens crossing.

Since Biden took office, there have been over 7 million illegal crossings, including 300 on the terrorist watch list. The irresponsible failure of Biden

encourages drug smugglers, human traffickers, and terrorists to enter, with terrorist attacks imminent in America.

Democrats should promote the Republican-passed H.R. 2 border security bill to stop destabilization, as condemned by New York Mayor Eric Adams.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years in the global war on terrorism as it continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America with Biden open borders for terrorists. It is sadly clear there will be more 9/11 attacks across America imminent, as warned by the FBI.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 788, STOP SETTLEMENT SLUSH FUNDS ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 98, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD RELATING TO "STANDARD FOR DETERMINING JOINT EMPLOYER STATUS"; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 38, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO "WAIVER OF BUY AMERICA REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGERS"

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 947 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 947

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 788) to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-18 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 98) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to "Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Highway Administration relating to "Waiver of Buy America Requirements for Electric Vehicle Chargers". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

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

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 947, providing for the House's consideration of several pieces of legislation.

The rule provides for H.R. 788, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act, to be considered under a structured rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule also provides for H.J. Res. 98, a joint resolution related to a rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to the "Standard for Determining

Joint Employer Status.” H.J. Res. 98 would be considered under a closed rule, and it also provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 38, a joint resolution nullifying the final rule of the Federal Highway Administration relating to “Waiver of Buy America Requirements for Electric Vehicle Chargers.” It also provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, or their designees, and provides for one motion to commit.

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

Beginning with H.R. 788, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act, Mr. Speaker, we have picked up right where we left off in the first session of the 118th Congress, stopping this administration from overstepping.

During the Trump administration, the Department of Justice went about ending the practice of allowing these third-party settlement agreements. Because the focus of the Justice Department should be delivering justice and doing so under equal application of the law, the Justice Department should not be picking winners and losers. The DOJ should not be in the business of choosing parties far removed from the taxpayer and not directly related to the case at hand to be benefiting from a settlement.

Sadly, from the very onset of the Biden Presidency, this administration has been laser focused on undoing the progress of the previous administration. This administration has consistently and simultaneously overstepped their authority in rulemaking and underdelivered for the American people. That is why we are here.

Following the President’s day-one directive to review reinstating Obama-era policies, the Biden administration began rescinding Trump-era policies.

□ 1215

I think most Americans would agree that the Federal Government should not be requiring settling parties to make donations to unrelated third parties.

I think most Americans would be shocked that these settlement payments don’t go to the U.S. Treasury but to liberal wish-list recipients.

Justice is not best served by this practice and it is why the Trump administration ended the process.

Just as important, ending this practice ensures accountability from the government by preventing those in power from rewarding political allies, as well as protecting this body’s constitutional responsibilities.

We have seen this practice used to push funds to far-left organizations

that use the money to support out-of-touch or woke ideologies. We should put an end to this egregious practice by the Biden administration.

Moving on to the workforce. As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am glad to see consideration of H.J. Res. 98, of which I am an original cosponsor.

This legislation is meant to protect small businesses, particularly franchisees from the Biden administration’s assault.

This resolution is meant to preserve the job opportunities these leaders create and to protect their freedom to run their businesses as they see fit. It also preserves choice and flexibility for prospective employees. This joint resolution will ensure a predictable and rational legal standard for what qualifies as a joint employer.

For an administration that can’t seem to put far-left ideology aside long enough to get our economy on track, I suppose this rule fits in with a larger pattern of stifling economic growth and driving the cost of doing business even higher.

We should be taking up policies that empower employers, not finding ways to make it more difficult to do business in America.

Finally, on to S.J. Res. 38. Similarly, and it seems there is a pattern here, Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution fights back against the Biden administration’s policies that hurt American manufacturers in favor of the Communist Party of China.

S.J. Res. 38 will ensure Buy America requirements are applied and that this misguided Biden rule does not strengthen China over American companies.

We understand the administration wants to force electric vehicles on the American people, and that in order to make these chargers less expensive and to meet their unrealistic green goals, they want to rely on Chinese manufacturers, but we cannot let those political objectives hurt our own American manufacturing while strengthening China at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, as we all have said and highlighted before on the floor, we know the Biden administration’s priority is to pour billions into green energy and clean cars. By rushing to reach arbitrary green and climate agendas, the United States is more likely to solidify China’s control of our energy future rather than save the planet.

Mr. Speaker, we must be strengthening our American manufacturers. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting S.J. Res. 38 as the Senate, including Senate Democrats, have already done.

If the President really wants to veto this bill, despite his administration’s flawed approach, then we should give him that opportunity.

I look forward to consideration of all of these three pieces of legislation, and I urge the passage of this rule.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUGHIN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that for the very first week back of the new year, House Republicans would try to correct course and fix their failing majority.

You would think that after presiding over one of the most unproductive, ineffective, incompetent sessions of Congress in history, certainly since I have been here, that Republicans would use the new year as a fresh start to reset their priorities and to actually work with Democrats to get stuff done.

You would think that they would bring to the floor some big, important piece of legislation to follow through on their promises, or, I don’t know, a bill to stop the government shutdown that is right around the corner.

You would think all of that, but you would be wrong.

Today, we are here for the first meeting of 2024 to consider more junk, more filler, more nonsense messaging bills that do nothing to help everyday people—bills that seek to help their billionaire friends and corporate sponsors.

First is H.R. 788, the so-called Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act. This bill stems from a fruitless Republican-led investigation based on meritless allegations of political bias when the Obama administration’s Justice Department held big banks accountable for their predatory lending practices.

After a full year in the majority, Republicans still have no new ideas or real agenda to help the American public, so they want to pass off this solution in search of a problem from 10 years ago as some big, important new bill.

It is not big, it is not new, and it is definitely not important. It is a waste of our time.

Then we have S.J. Res. 38. This joint resolution is House Republicans’ attempt to weaken President Biden’s Buy America requirements, allowing Federal dollars to be spent on chargers made in competitor countries like the People’s Republic of China. While Democrats and President Biden work to bring jobs back from China, Republicans are eager to do the bidding of billionaire corporations and ship jobs overseas to China.

Now let that sink in.

Finally, is H.J. Res. 98, a resolution that blatantly attacks workers. This bill would weaken their ability to organize and collectively bargain. These three bills have one thing in common, Mr. Speaker: They will not become law. They are going nowhere, and they are a waste of our time.

The way this place is being run is just so absurd. It is pathetic.

We are facing a partial government shutdown by the end of next week. The extreme MAGA Freedom Caucus is once again eager to shut it down.

Now maybe they think a shutdown will help crash the economy, like Donald Trump has said he wants. The leader of the Republican Party spent the week praying for the economy to collapse because he thinks it will help him win the election in November. Imagine that.

Mr. Speaker, that really illustrates the difference between Democrats and Republicans.

We want America to succeed, no matter who is in charge, because we love this country and we put people over politics. Republicans led by Trump are cheering for America to fail and for everyone to suffer because they think it will help them politically.

What a sick, twisted, messed up ideology. They are literally cheering for America to fail. I guess they think that maybe if they shut down the government that that will help.

I heard that the current Speaker was on the telephone with Donald Trump basically begging him to support the deal to fund the government, because let's be honest, that is who run this place: Donald Trump and the MAGA extremists who worship him.

That is the guy, by the way, whose lawyers argued in court yesterday that he can legally assassinate any of us and he can't be held accountable because the President is above the law.

I mean, what the hell is wrong with these people? Not a peep, not a whisper from any of my Republican colleagues. Not a single one of them who is willing to stand up and display some courage and say that the former President should not be above the rule of law.

We may be back, Mr. Speaker, and it may be a new year, but it is clear it is the same old Republican majority trying to distract from their own disarray and division and doing the bidding of Donald Trump instead of working for the American people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, these arguments merely are misdirection. The executive branch has the power under the Constitution to enforce the laws.

When wrongdoers violate Federal law, any settlement with the government should be focused on three things: compensating victims, redressing harm, and punishing or deterring unlawful conduct.

Settlement agreements that require donations to outside parties do not accomplish those goals. Required donations do not compensate victims, as the funds go to outside third parties not involved in the litigation, and they do not punish and deter unlawful conduct, particularly as settling parties can reduce their fines from \$2 to \$1 for each dollar donated.

Moving on to criticisms against H.J. Res. 98 about franchisees. It is a hysterical argument that broadly misses the mark.

Employees of franchisees are still entitled to protection under the National

Labor Relations Act. They are still able to organize labor unions if they so choose. Franchisees are subject to collective bargaining laws, worker safety laws, fair wage laws, and franchisors, just as other large companies are.

One of the concerns that we have is that there will be disastrous consequences under this rule. I just find that is not the case. We are promoting small business owners and franchisees above these woke policies that harm the American employer and the American worker.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we can talk about these filler bills all day, but the fact of the matter is they are going nowhere. We are wasting our time doing this.

We should be focused on making sure that Republicans don't shut the government down beginning at the end of next week.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a measure that unambiguously states that the people's House will keep its promise to the American workers and senior citizens. We will protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for future generations, two important programs that my Republican friends are constantly attacking.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD), to discuss our proposal.

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the previous question. Instead of focusing on policies that would make life better and easier for Americans, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are constantly wasting time on legislation to disrupt long-standing laws, to pass bills that would offshore American manufacturers, make it more difficult for workers to receive a fair shake, and prevent the Federal Government from holding big corporations accountable.

Rather than focusing on these issues, our time would be better spent ensuring that our seniors have access to the benefits that they have earned.

Social Security and Medicare are more than just important government programs, they are commitments made by one generation to the next.

Since my first term in Congress, I have worked tirelessly to protect these critical benefits, fighting back against extremist cuts that would gut our Nation's cornerstone economic security programs. The fight goes on because the GOP is still hell-bent on eliminating these programs.

Social Security and Medicare are overwhelmingly popular because they provide critically important benefits, not only to our seniors, but to other vulnerable Americans, as well.

My constituents and all Americans have paid into these programs, and they are counting on them for a dignified retirement and essential healthcare.

It is also critical that we work to ensure that the Social Security Administration and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services have the resources that they need. Despite the fact that Social Security is by far the most popular and necessary program in our country, the Social Security Administration does not receive the funding that it desperately needs to support many of the most vulnerable in our community and across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring that our seniors can receive the benefits they have earned should not be a partisan debate.

I hope that my Republican colleagues agree and that we can find bipartisan commonsense solutions to this pressing issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can focus on more pressing legislation, like funding our government and reaffirming our commitment to seniors and the more vulnerable members of our society, and reaffirming our commitment to Social Security and Medicare.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, if I had one word to describe what I hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including the administration, it would be gaslighting.

My colleagues claim that we don't want to help everyday Americans. My colleagues claim that we are offshoring American jobs when the very bills we are considering here today are trying to fight against doing precisely that.

They claim that we are trying to hurt businessowners.

We are trying to help businessowners by giving them more flexibility to engage in employee relationships as they see fit. We are trying to bring American jobs back by supporting our American manufacturers over Chinese manufacturers. We are trying to compensate victims over woke ideological groups.

It is more gaslighting from our colleagues on the left. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will recognize that and will join us in support of this legislation.

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

□ 1230

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just respond to the gentlewoman that one of the differences between Democrats and Republicans is the Democrats have historically been and continue to be on the side of workers and on behalf of small businesses in trying to bring as

many jobs back from places like China as possible, and we would be doing that no matter who is in charge in the White House because we put people above politics.

I contrast that with my friends on the other side of the aisle who seem to be cheering for America to fail and who work overtime to try to demean our workers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article that appeared in The New York Times titled: “Trump says he hopes any economic crash happens in 2024 so he isn’t blamed.”

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

There was no objection.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 9, 2024]
TRUMP SAYS HE HOPES ANY ECONOMIC CRASH HAPPENS IN 2024 SO HE ISN’T BLAMED.

(By Maggie Astor)

Former President Donald J. Trump said in an interview on Monday that he believed the economy would crash—and that he hoped it would happen in the next year so the blame would fall on President Biden’s administration.

We have an economy that’s so fragile, and the only reason it’s running now is it’s running off the fumes of what we did,” Mr. Trump told the conservative commentator Lou Dobbs in an interview broadcast Monday evening on the MyPillow founder Mike Lindell’s platform. “It’s just running off the fumes. And when there’s a crash, I hope it’s going to be during this next 12 months, because I don’t want to be Herbert Hoover.”

President Hoover presided over the 1929 stock market crash that started the Great Depression.

Mr. Trump is hoping to capitalize on voters’ economic concerns, as a number of polls have shown that voters trust him and other Republicans more than they trust Mr. Biden to handle the economy. In the interview, he criticized Mr. Biden’s and congressional Democrats’ spending on infrastructure and renewable energy.

The Biden campaign has been frustrated by a disconnect between positive economic indicators—including strong G.D.P. growth, increasing jobs and higher wages—and negative public opinion. Many Americans are still struggling to get by, mortgage rates are high, and while inflation has fallen significantly from the peaks of 2022, those price increases still weigh heavily on voters’ minds.

Andrew Bates, a White House spokesman, condemned Mr. Trump’s comments hoping for a downturn and said the former president’s policies “would worsen inflation with tax giveaways to rich special interests.”

“A commander in chief’s duty is to always put the American people first, never to hope that hard-working families suffer economic pain for their own political benefit,” Mr. Bates said. “Republican officials should welcome the economic progress President Biden is delivering, instead of revealing twisted true colors that would shrink the American middle class in the name of their own cynical self-interests.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let that sink in. The leader of the Republican Party, the person whom they are all falling over each other to try to support, is cheering for our economy to crash because it might help him politically.

It is not about the American people, it is not about workers, and it is not about businesses. It is about him.

What happened to the Republican Party?

The obsession with Trump and all of this is not only disappointing, but it is scary. Again, I will go back to the way I began this debate. The legislation we are considering today is three nothing burgers. None of these bills are going to become law. They are just filler. They are an excuse for us to be able to meet when what we should be doing is making sure that the government remains open and that it doesn’t shut down at the end of next week.

Quite frankly, that business should have been done last year, but Republicans continue to fight amongst themselves and can’t seem to be able to get anything done. Again, this is the most unproductive and useless Congress, I think, in history.

So, again, I would just simply say that we all need to figure out a way to pass legislation that will not adversely impact our economy and to find areas of common ground where we can actually get stuff done, but this is not what we are doing today.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are just at it again, aren’t they?

They keep bringing up bills that protect big corporations and banks instead of helping Americans and protecting working families.

We saw it when Republicans tried to cut funding for the Consumer Product Safety Commission and to weaken the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. These are agencies that the American people trust and they want because these are agencies that stand with consumers.

Our consumers need and want someone in their corner. Republicans, however, keep trying to restrain the Federal agencies who are charged with defending and protecting our consumers, including today, the Department of Justice.

H.R. 788 is another attempt to protect those same big banks and big corporations, the ones that pollute our communities and put their own profits over people’s ability to stay in their homes.

For example, Bank of America made a lot of money by selling subprime mortgages before the 2008 financial crisis. Bank of America hurt regular peoples’ ability to buy and stay in a home of their own. So the Department of Justice went after Bank of America, and they entered into a settlement agreement to hold that bank accountable. That settlement required the bank to pay damages to the Americans who were directly harmed by its actions.

We know that what the Bank of America and all those greedy corpora-

tions did was to more than just hurt the consumers of that bank, it hurt the housing market itself. It made it harder for families to buy homes. Their actions led to the Great Recession.

So the settlement that the Department of Justice did made sure that Bank of America had to pay nonprofits to address the larger systemic harm the bank caused. Those settlement funds helped provide resources for housing, counseling, homeownership, and more. In Iowa, nonprofits provided down payment assistance and demolished decaying homes. In Indiana, the bar foundation provided legal aid in foreclosure cases.

These are good things.

Why would we want to stop them?

Apparently, however, Republicans didn’t like the fact that the Department of Justice was standing up to bad actors because H.R. 788 would block that help.

H.R. 788 would handcuff the Department of Justice so it could not demand a bad actor pay for the harm it caused to our society.

I must remind everybody that, just as we heard from our ranking member, we are dedicating a whole week to this bill and some others that would overturn actions that our Americans need to protect them to move us forward in protecting our climate.

We are doing all of this instead of what?

We are not funding the government, are we?

Do any of these bills deal with any of the issues that Americans want us to do?

These bills show us that Republicans cannot govern. Instead, they are continuing to put profits over people, and we must reject this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, this has been the most incompetent, ineffective, and unproductive Congress in the history of the United States of America. The fact that we are here considering these nonsense, do-nothing bills is just the latest example.

This Republican majority has been a failure and a total embarrassment. I could spend all day comparing our record with theirs. Republicans have had pathetically few bills of substance enacted into law, and on must-pass legislation, every single time it has been Democrats who have had to step up to give Republicans the votes that they needed to get things across the finish line. The gentlewoman can’t rebut that because there is nothing to rebut. Republicans have done nothing of importance. I don’t even know why they want to be in charge, quite frankly, since they have wasted away their time in the majority.

It is not just me saying that. It is them. Congressman CHIP ROY who sits on the Rules Committee said: “I want

my Republican colleagues to give me one thing, one thing, that I can go campaign on and say we did. One. Anybody sitting in the complex, if you want to come down to the floor and come explain to me one material, meaningful, significant thing the Republican majority has done. . . .”

More recently, Congressman ANDY BIGGS said: “We have nothing to go out there and campaign on. . . . It is embarrassing.”

Congresswoman DEBBIE LESKO said: “We can’t get anything done around here. It is very frustrating.”

What do Republicans say when they go home and voters ask: What have you done? What have you done?

What do you tell them?

What do you say to somebody who asks: Why are you more concerned about Hunter Biden than about our constituents?

You people need to touch the grass, get a grip, and get some help. Republicans have turned this place into one big SNL skit, except this isn’t funny. We have serious business to get done around here, and they are just openly admitting that they cannot govern.

They have no new ideas or problems that they want to solve. Their whole platform is built around using division and anger to distract from the unmitigated disaster that is this Republican majority. The only hope around this place is that it is an election year and their gross incompetence will probably lose them the House come November.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do better, and there needs to be more urgency in this Chamber about making sure that the government doesn’t shut down next week.

The one job, that no matter who is in charge has, is to make sure that the lights stay on here, that we don’t stop the functioning of Government, and that we don’t turn our backs on the American people.

Yet, we are getting perilously close to that moment when there could be a shutdown. It is disgraceful that we are here debating these filler bills that are going nowhere and that we are not working on real business that will help real people in this country and help pave the way for a better future.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would note that with Republicans being in the majority, one major accomplishment is that we have stopped a lot of bad things potentially from happening that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle might wish to push forward.

We have before us the opportunity to move legislation here that could have a positive effect on the everyday lives of all Americans, whether that is pushing back on overreach of the bureaucratic state or protecting job creators. The

choice before us in this rule is clear, and we must take action.

We must be taking actions that improve this economy and fight inflation, but, again and again, we see this administration making it harder and not easier to do business in America. It defies logic.

Apparently, there is no cost too high for this administration or my Democratic colleagues when it comes to this pursuit, not even the fact that China stands to benefit from one of these rules and the American manufacturer stands to lose. The American people stands to lose. The American people know better.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to moving these bills 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 Mr. McGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 947 OFFERED BY
MR. McGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 40 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 (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS) 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 947; and

Adoption of House Resolution 947, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 788, STOP SETTLEMENT
SLUSH FUNDS ACT OF 2023; PRO-
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
H.J. RES. 98, PROVIDING FOR
CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL
UNDER THE RULE SUBMITTED
BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELA-
TIONS BOARD RELATING TO
“STANDARD FOR DETERMINING
JOINT EMPLOYER STATUS”; AND
PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF S.J. RES. 38, PROVIDING FOR
CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL
UNDER THE RULE SUBMITTED
BY THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY AD-
MINISTRATION RELATING TO
“WAIVER OF BUY AMERICA RE-
QUIREMENTS FOR ELECTRIC VE-
HICLE CHARGERS”

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. 947) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 788) to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 98) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to “Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status”; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Highway Administration relating to “Waiver of Buy America Requirements for Electric Vehicle Chargers”, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 300, not voting 19, as follows:

	[Roll No. 2]	YEAS—213
Aderholt	Armstrong	Baird
Alford	Arrington	Balderson
Allen	Babin	Banks
Amodei	Bacon	Barr

Ocasio-Cortez	Ruppersberger	Swalwell
Ogles	Ryan	Sykes
Omar	Salinas	Takano
Pallone	Sánchez	Thanedar
Panetta	Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)
Pascarell	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)
Payne	Schiff	Titus
Pelosi	Schneider	Tlaib
Peltola	Scholten	Tokuda
Perez	Schrirer	Tonko
Perry	Scott (VA)	Torres (CA)
Peters	Scott, David	Torres (NY)
Petterson	Sewell	Trahan
Pingree	Sherman	Trone
Pocan	Sherrill	Underwood
Porter	Slotkin	Vargas
Pressley	Smith (WA)	Vasquez
Quigley	Sorensen	Veasey
Ramirez	Soto	Velázquez
Raskin	Spanberger	Wasserman
Rosendale	Stansbury	Schultz
Ross	Stanton	Watson Coleman
Roy	Stevens	Wild
Ruiz	Strickland	Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—14

Blunt Rochester	Miller-Meeks	Scanlon
Boebert	Nunn (IA)	Waters
Carter (LA)	Pappas	Wexton
Kim (NJ)	Phillips	Wilson (FL)
Meeks	Scalise	

□ 1433

Mr. MOORE of Utah changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in order to attend the funeral of a student who was a victim in the Perry school shooting in my District and due to inclement weather, I was unable to be present for floor votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 2, Ordering the Previous Question and “yea” on rollcall No. 3, Rule.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBERNOLTE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Moore of Utah moves to reconsider the vote on adoption of House Resolution 947.

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

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

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 954

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Edwards

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

TAIWAN NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2023

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 540) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to pursue more equitable treatment of Taiwan at the international financial institutions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 540

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Taiwan Non-Discrimination Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) As enshrined in its Articles of Agreement, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) is devoted to promoting international monetary cooperation, facilitating the expansion and balanced growth of international trade, encouraging exchange stability, and avoiding competitive exchange depreciation.

(2) Taiwan is the 21st largest economy in the world and the 10th largest goods trading partner of the United States.

(3) Although Taiwan is not an IMF member, it is a member of the World Trade Organization, the Asian Development Bank, and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum.

(4) According to the January 2020 Report on Macroeconomic and Foreign Exchange Policies of Major Trading Partners of the United States, published by the Department of the Treasury, Taiwan held \$471,900,000,000 in foreign exchange reserves, more than major economies such as India, South Korea, and Brazil.

(5) According to section 4(d) of the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96-8), enacted on April 10, 1979, “Nothing in this Act may be construed as a basis for supporting the exclusion or expulsion of Taiwan from continued membership in any international financial institution or any other international organization.”

(6) Taiwan held membership in the IMF for 9 years following the recognition of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) by the United Nations, and 16 Taiwan staff members at the Fund were allowed to continue their employment after the PRC was seated at the IMF in 1980. As James M. Boughton has noted in his *Silent Revolution: The International Monetary Fund 1979–1989*,

even as the PRC was seated, the United States Executive Director to the IMF, Sam Y. Cross, expressed support on behalf of the United States Government for “some kind of association between Taiwan and the Fund”.

(7) On September 27, 1994, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations regarding the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review, then-Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs Winston Lord stated: “Recognizing Taiwan’s important role in transnational issues, we will support its membership in organizations where statehood is not a prerequisite, and we will support opportunities for Taiwan’s voice to be heard in organizations where its membership is not possible.”

(8) The Congress has repeatedly reaffirmed support for this policy, including in Public Laws 107-10, 107-158, 108-28, 108-235, 113-17, and 114-139, and the unanimous House and Senate passage of the *Taiwan Allies International Protection and Enhancement Initiative (TAIPEI) Act of 2019*.

(9) In its fact sheet, entitled “U.S. Relations with Taiwan”, published on August 31, 2018, the Department of State asserts: “The United States supports Taiwan’s membership in international organizations that do not require statehood as a condition of membership and encourages Taiwan’s meaningful participation in international organizations where its membership is not possible.”

(10) According to the Articles of Agreement of the IMF, “membership shall be open to other countries”, subject to conditions prescribed by the Board of Governors of the IMF.

(11) In the IMF publication “Membership and Nonmembership in the International Monetary Fund: A Study in International Law and Organization”, Joseph Gold, the then-General Counsel and Director of the Legal Department of the IMF, elaborated on the differences between the terms “countries” and “states”, noting that “the word ‘country’ may have been adopted because of the absence of agreement on the definition of a ‘state’” and, with respect to the use of “countries” and applications for IMF membership, “the absence of any adjective in the Articles emphasizes the breadth of the discretion that the Fund may exercise in admitting countries to membership”. According to Mr. Gold, “the desire to give the Fund flexibility in dealing with applications may explain not only the absence of any adjective that qualifies ‘countries’ but also the choice of that word itself”.

(12) In his IMF study, Mr. Gold further observes, “in the practice of the Fund the concepts of independence and sovereignty have been avoided on the whole as a mode of expressing a criterion for membership in the Fund”. He continues, “Although the Fund usually takes into account the recognition or nonrecognition of an entity as a state, there are no rules or even informal understandings on the extent to which an applicant must have been recognized by members or other international organizations before the Fund will regard it as eligible for membership.” In fact, when considering an application for membership where the status of an applicant may not be resolved, Mr. Gold writes “there have been occasions on which the Fund has made a finding before decisions had been taken by the United Nations or by most members or by members with a majority of the total voting power.” Mr. Gold concludes, “the Fund makes its own findings on whether an applicant is a ‘country’, and makes them solely for its own purposes.”

(13) Although not a member state of the United Nations, the Republic of Kosovo is a member of both the IMF and the World Bank, having joined both organizations on June 29, 2009.

(14) On October 26, 2021, Secretary of State Antony Blinken issued a statement in support of Taiwan’s “robust, meaningful participation” in the United Nations system, which includes the IMF, the World Bank, and other specialized

United Nations agencies. Secretary of State Blinken noted, “As the international community faces an unprecedented number of complex and global issues, it is critical for all stakeholders to help address these problems. This includes the 24 million people who live in Taiwan. Taiwan’s meaningful participation in the UN system is not a political issue, but a pragmatic one.” He continued, “Taiwan’s exclusion undermines the important work of the UN and its related bodies, all of which stand to benefit greatly from its contributions.”

SEC. 3. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the size, significance, and connectedness of the Taiwanese economy highlight the importance of greater participation by Taiwan in the International Monetary Fund, given the purposes of the Fund articulated in its Articles of Agreement; and

(2) the experience of Taiwan in developing a vibrant and advanced economy under democratic governance and the rule of law should inform the work of the international financial institutions, including through increased participation by Taiwan in the institutions.

SEC. 4. SUPPORT FOR TAIWAN ADMISSION TO THE IMF.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund (in this section referred to as the “Fund”) shall use the voice and vote of the United States to vigorously support—

(1) the admission of Taiwan as a member of the Fund, to the extent that admission is sought by Taiwan;

(2) participation by Taiwan in regular surveillance activities of the Fund with respect to the economic and financial policies of Taiwan, consistent with Article IV consultation procedures of the Fund;

(3) employment opportunities for Taiwan nationals, without regard to any consideration that, in the determination of the United States Governor, does not generally restrict the employment of nationals of member countries of the Fund; and

(4) the ability of Taiwan to receive appropriate technical assistance and training by the Fund.

(b) *UNITED STATES POLICY.*—It is the policy of the United States not to discourage or otherwise deter Taiwan from seeking admission as a member of the Fund.

(c) *WAIVER.*—The Secretary of the Treasury may waive any requirement of subsection (a) for up to 1 year at a time on reporting to Congress that providing the waiver will substantially promote the objective of securing the meaningful participation of Taiwan at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act).

(d) *SUNSET.*—This section shall have no force or effect on the earlier of—

(1) the date of approval by the Board of Governors of the Fund for the admission of Taiwan as a member of the Fund; or

(2) the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. TESTIMONY REQUIREMENT.

In each of the next 7 years in which the Secretary of the Treasury is required by section 1705(b) of the International Financial Institutions Act to present testimony, the Secretary shall include in the testimony a description of the efforts of the United States to support the greatest participation practicable by Taiwan at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2) of such Act).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 540, the bipartisan Taiwan Non-Discrimination Act, sponsored by Congresswoman KIM of California and Congressman GREEN of Texas.

This bill would require the United States to advocate for Taiwan’s membership and meaningful participation at the International Monetary Fund, or IMF, to the extent that admission is sought by Taiwan.

IMF membership provides several nonprofit benefits to participants, such as access to information on members’ economic policies; access to technical assistance related to banking, fiscal affairs, and exchange issues; financial support in times of payment distress; and opportunities for trade and investment.

If IMF admission is sought by Taiwan, this bill would further require the United States to press the IMF to monitor and evaluate the health of Taiwan’s economy; provide technical support to Taiwanese officials regarding microeconomic, monetary, and budget policies; and support employment opportunities at the IMF for Taiwan nationals.

□ 1445

To date, Taiwan has not formally requested membership at the IMF. I also understand that Taiwan does not intend to request membership this Congress and is, instead, focusing on other organizations such as the World Health Organization and the International Criminal Police Organization, INTERPOL. We respect that and appreciate the structure of this bill that positions the United States to act should Taiwan request membership.

I also believe it is critical that the United States continue to signal unequivocal opposition to the prospect of China using force in an effort to take control of Taiwan, especially as China is watching Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. Democrats have been sounding the alarm, and I will repeat this warning here today: We must provide additional funding for Ukraine or we risk emboldening China’s aggression against Taiwan.

While I support this bill and all efforts to prevent conflict in the Taiwan Strait, I am concerned that if Congress cannot come together to provide additional funding for Ukraine, our efforts here today will be in vain.

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

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. McHENRY for yielding and supporting my legislation. I also thank Representative GREEN of Texas for co-leading this bill, H.R. 540, and making it a bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 540, the Taiwan Non-Discrimination Act.

Longstanding U.S. policy towards Taiwan has supported its membership

institutions.

The IMF has no fewer than 190 countries, nearly the totality of the world.

An economy as vital as Taiwan should have a seat at this important table.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our Democratic colleagues for their support in keeping this a bipartisan issue, and I thank the bill’s sponsor, Mrs. KIM, for her important leadership, as well.

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

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

in international organizations where statehood is not a prerequisite.

The U.S. also advocates for Taiwan's voice to be heard where membership is not possible. This principle has lasted decades across Republican and Democratic administrations, and it has repeatedly been reaffirmed in bills passed by Congress.

My bill is straightforward. It requires the Treasury Department to implement our Taiwan policy at the International Monetary Fund, or IMF.

Taiwan is not required to be a member state of the United Nations in order to gain membership in the IMF. For example, Kosovo, also not a U.N. member, has belonged to the IMF for over a decade.

If Taiwan seeks admission to the IMF, then the Treasury Department should carry out our longstanding U.S. policy and support its application. While Taiwan awaits its admission to the IMF, H.R. 540 encourages the U.S. Governor of the IMF to support integrating Taiwan into the IMF's regular economic monitoring activities and Taiwanese nationals with equal employment opportunities at the IMF.

The IMF is devoted to monetary cooperation, exchange rate stability, and the growth of international trade. Taiwan is one of our top 10 trading partners, and it has the fifth largest cash reserves of any foreign country; greater than Brazil, South Korea, Mexico, or any European country except Switzerland.

At a time when China has been threatening the work of the IMF through its nontransparent lending abroad and its lack of cooperation with other creditors, we must focus the IMF on effective international cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, advocating for Taiwan's membership in the IMF would also unlock additional opportunities for the country in other international financial institutions, as was mentioned, one of which is the World Bank which requires countries to first be members of the IMF before becoming a member of World Bank.

With Taiwan's election taking place this week, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 540 and send the Taiwanese people a strong message of solidarity and support for their democracy.

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

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chair of the National Security, Illicit Finance, and International Financial Institutions Subcommittee.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and thank him for managing the floor today. I was supposed to do that, and I got stuck in a snowstorm and slid all the way here, but I am here and glad to be here.

Before us today are a number of bills that originated in the National Security, Illicit Finance, and International

Financial Institutions Subcommittee which I chair. I commend the sponsors for their diligent commitment to crafting meaningful policy.

Congressman MEUSER's China Exchange Rate Transparency Act of 2023 will provide much-needed transparency to China's use of tools to impact the exchange rate, and their actions to threaten the core mission of the IMF.

Ensuring China plays by the same rules of the road as everyone else has been and will continue to be a focus of my National Security, Illicit Finance, and International Financial Institutions Subcommittee.

H.R. 803, the PROTECT Taiwan Act, has been a project dutifully undertaken by Congressman LUCAS. This legislation will send an unwavering message that if the Xi Jinping regime is seeking to provoke a war in Taiwan, China will face a new reality, exclusion from the international community. I thank Congressman LUCAS for this strong bipartisan solution to China's aggression.

Finally, as we heard from Vice Chair Congresswoman KIM, H.R. 540, the Taiwan Non-Discrimination Act of 2023, will ensure that Taiwan's voice is properly heard at the IMF. Ultimately, the decision to apply for membership into the IMF, and subsequently the World Bank and other international financial institutions, belongs to Taiwan. However, if they so choose to apply, the United States should be unequivocally supportive.

I thank the gentlewoman for her unwavering support to defend Taiwan and ensuring that the international financial institutions which my subcommittee oversees prioritize Taiwan policy at the IMF. I also thank Chairman McHENRY for his work on the full committee.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from North Carolina has no further speakers, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

This legislation from Congresswoman KIM and Congressman GREEN directs the United States to support Taiwan should the island pursue participation in the IMF.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support this bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would just reiterate that Mrs. KIM's bill is critical to strengthening both our national security and the global economy. I think it is important that we state clearly as the United States Congress our support for Taiwan.

Taiwan has one of the world's most advanced and innovative economies and should be included under the IMF's activities.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and thank my Democratic colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee for working with committee Republicans on supporting this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 540, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PRESSURE REGULATORY ORGANIZATIONS TO END CHINESE THREATS TO TAIWAN ACT

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 803) to direct certain financial regulators to exclude representatives of the People's Republic of China from certain banking organizations upon notice of certain threats or danger, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 803

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pressure Regulatory Organizations To End Chinese Threats to Taiwan Act" or the "PROTECT Taiwan Act".

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY REGARDING THE EXCLUSION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA FROM CERTAIN BANKING ORGANIZATIONS UPON NOTICE OF CERTAIN THREATS OR DANGER.

(a) *IN GENERAL.—If the President, pursuant to section 3(c) of the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3302(c)), informs the Congress of any threat to the security or the social or economic system of the people on Taiwan and any danger to the interests of the United States arising therefrom resulting from actions of the People's Republic of China, it is the policy of the United States to seek to exclude representatives of the People's Republic of China, to the maximum extent practicable, from participation in meetings, proceedings, and other activities of the following organizations—*

- (1) *the Group of Twenty;*
- (2) *the Bank for International Settlements;*
- (3) *the Financial Stability Board;*
- (4) *the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision;*
- (5) *the International Association of Insurance Supervisors; and*
- (6) *the International Organization of Securities Commissions.*

(b) *POLICY ADVANCEMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, shall take all necessary steps to advance the policy set forth in subsection (a).*

(c) *WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of subsection (a) with respect to an*

organization upon submission of a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate—

(1) that such waiver is in the national interest of the United States; and

(2) that contains an explanation of the reasons therefor.

(d) SUNSET.—This Act and the requirements of this Act shall have no force or effect on the date that is the earlier of—

(1) 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress that the termination of this Act is in the national interest of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of H.R. 803, the PROTECT Taiwan Act, introduced by the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and senior member of the House Financial Services Committee, Mr. LUCAS.

In addition to its hostile rhetoric, China has sought to intimidate Taiwan by making large incursions into the island's airspace. In fact, according to the Global Taiwan Institute, there were 563 incursions in 2022. Between January and August 23, 2023, there were 461 median-line crossings and 560 southwest incursions. Those are a lot of incursions.

If the Xi Jinping regime seeks to provoke war in Taiwan, Congress must clearly signal the costs that will be imposed on the Chinese Communist Party if it acts against the island.

One of those costs should be China's exclusion from the international community, which is a bipartisan pressure point. Chinese leaders must understand that a threat to Taiwan is a threat to international order, and a threat to Taiwan is a threat to China's economic growth opportunities.

As a result, we think China should not be able to participate in multilateral organizations if they conduct this type of business.

We have already seen Russia's isolation on the international stage after its invasion of Ukraine. We must be clear that this is what awaits Beijing if they cross the line in Taiwan.

Mr. LUCAS' bill would make China a pariah in key organizations devoted to ensuring global economic stability. This includes the G20, the Financial Stability Board, and other gatherings

of international financial regulators. Participation in these groups should be reserved for countries that take international norms and values seriously.

A Chinese invasion of Taiwan would underscore that Beijing has surrendered its right to be included. I thank Mr. LUCAS for his hard work on the PROTECT Taiwan Act and Congressman VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas on the Democrat side for being an original cosponsor.

Now more than ever I think we must show that deterring Chinese aggression against Taiwan is a bipartisan issue for the United States Congress. I think this bill will send that right signal.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2023.

Hon. PATRICK McHENRY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN McHENRY: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 803, the PROTECT Taiwan Act.

I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be discharged from further action on this measure, subject to the understanding that this waiver does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. The Committee also reserves the right to seek an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this bill and would appreciate your support for any such request.

I ask that you place our exchange of letters into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation, and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,
MICHAEL T. MCCALL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2023.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCALL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN McCALL: Thank you for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 803, the PROTECT Taiwan Act, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. I agree that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 803 at this time, you do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that you will be appropriately consulted and involved on this or similar legislation as it moves forward.

As discussed, I will seek to place a copy of our exchange of letters on this bill in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,
PATRICK McHENRY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 803, the PROTECT Taiwan Act, sponsored by Congressman LUCAS of Oklahoma and Congressman VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.

This bill would impose financial consequences on China if it launched a

major act of aggression against Taiwan. Specifically, this bill would require Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the Securities and Exchange Commission to seek China's exclusion from the proceedings of the major financial institutions and international organizations. These include the G20, the Bank for International Settlements, the Financial Stability Board, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, the International Association of Insurance Supervisors, and the International Organization of Securities Commissions.

In short, this bill would deny China the economic, political, and diplomatic benefits of participation in the international organizations that ensure stability of financial markets and businesses if it were to engage in a major act of aggression against Taiwan.

This bill imposes a high threshold with regard to what kind of aggression would trigger this action. Specifically, it requires a Presidential notification to Congress under section 3(c) of the Taiwan Relations Act, which would only occur if there were a substantial threat to Taiwan. For reference, section 3(c) was not triggered during the tensions of the Third Taiwan Straits Crisis of the 1990s.

I also thank the bill's sponsor for working with Democrats to adopt changes to the bill that ensures it closely mirrors a similar law passed in the last Congress aimed at Russia following its unlawful invasion of Ukraine.

□ 1500

Accordingly, the United States is now actively seeking Russia's exclusion from these international bodies.

If China were to cross the line Russia crossed by invading Ukraine, we would similarly seek to exclude them from these international bodies.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the chair of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and a senior member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman McHENRY for yielding time to me on this bill.

First, before I address the topic at hand, I would like to take a moment to note that I have served with Chairman McHENRY for his tenure in the United States Congress.

I can proudly say this is a body that everyone comes in brand new and full of fire and vinegar, but it is a body where people develop into their skills, where their natural talents are honed and sharpened, and where many of our friends become great statesmen and stateswomen.

I note for just a moment that Chairman McHENRY, when he joined this

body, represented that fire and vinegar, that intensity.

In his time here, he has developed into a statesman, a chairman of great regard, and someone who ultimately, when he leaves this body at the end of the session, will be missed.

My colleague, and I would like to think I can call you my friend, but most assuredly I note my respect for your legislative skills.

The bill before us is a bipartisan piece of legislation, as my colleagues have noted, to send a clear message: If China intends to engage in conflict against Taiwan, then China should be prepared to withstand the consequences.

Under the Taiwan Relations Act, the President is required to notify Congress if China poses an immediate threat to Taiwan's security.

If this notification is triggered, my bill states it is U.S. policy to exclude Chinese representatives from key international organizations: The G20, the Financial Stability Board, and the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision.

A threat to Taiwan is a threat to the international order. Now, let me repeat that one more time: A threat to Taiwan is a threat to the international order.

We should make it clear that if China acts to throw the world into instability, China will be excluded from international bodies that work to uphold that very stability.

I thank my colleague from Texas, Congressman GONZALEZ, for working with me on this bill. I encourage my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

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

This legislation from Congressmen LUCAS and GONZALEZ is designed to send a message to China, discouraging escalation of its aggression toward Taiwan.

I again note that while I agree that sending a strong signal to China regarding the United States' support for the prevention of conflict in the Taiwan Strait is important, we must also send a strong signal to Russia by providing additional funding to our fellow democracy, Ukraine.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I reiterate that Chinese leaders must understand that a threat to Taiwan is a threat to international order, and it should be a threat to their standing in international institutions.

They will not be able to operate in major multilateral organizations as if it were business as usual.

We know the impact on Russia after its invasion of Ukraine. We have to let officials in Beijing know that that is what awaits them if they cross the line in Taiwan.

I urge adoption of this bill and support for the bill. I thank my colleague,

Mr. LUCAS, for his friendship and for his kind words, as well as his important leadership on this topic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 803, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

CHINA EXCHANGE RATE TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2023

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 839) to require the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to advocate for increased transparency with respect to exchange rate policies of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 839

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "China Exchange Rate Transparency Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Under Article IV of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the People's Republic of China has committed to orderly exchange rate arrangements, the avoidance of exchange rate manipulation, and cooperation with the IMF to ensure "firm surveillance" of the exchange rate policies of the People's Republic of China. Pursuant to Article VIII of the Articles of Agreement of the IMF, the IMF may require the People's Republic of China to furnish data on gold and foreign exchange holdings, including assets held by non-official agencies of the People's Republic of China.

(2) In its November 2022 report, entitled "Macroeconomic and Foreign Exchange Policies of Major Trading Partners of the United States", the Department of the Treasury concluded, "China provides very limited transparency regarding key features of its exchange rate mechanism, including the policy objectives of its exchange rate management regime and its activities in the offshore RMB market.". The Department continued: "China's lack of transparency and use of a wide array of tools complicate Treasury's ability to assess the degree to which official actions are designed to impact the exchange rate."

(3) In that report, the Department further noted that "China's failure to publish foreign

exchange intervention and broader lack of transparency around key features of its exchange rate mechanism make it an outlier among major economies and warrants Treasury's close monitoring."

SEC. 3. ADVOCACY FOR INCREASED EXCHANGE RATE TRANSPARENCY FROM CHINA.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund (in this Act referred to as the "IMF") to use the voice and vote of the United States to advocate for—

(1) increased transparency from the People's Republic of China, and enhanced multilateral and bilateral surveillance by the IMF, with respect to the exchange rate arrangements of the People's Republic of China, including any indirect foreign exchange market intervention through Chinese financial institutions or state-owned enterprises;

(2) in connection with consultations with the People's Republic of China under Article IV of the Articles of Agreement of the IMF, the inclusion of any significant divergences by the People's Republic of China from the exchange rate policies of other issuers of currencies used in determining the value of Special Drawing Rights; and

(3) during governance reviews of the IMF, stronger consideration by IMF members and management of the performance of China as a responsible stakeholder in the international monetary system when evaluating quota and voting shares at the IMF.

SEC. 4. SUNSET.

This Act shall have no force or effect on or after the date that is 30 days after the earlier of—

(1) the date that the United States Governor of the IMF reports to the Congress that the People's Republic of China—

(A) is in substantial compliance with obligations of the People's Republic of China under the Articles of Agreement of the IMF regarding orderly exchange rate arrangements; and

(B) has undertaken exchange rate policies and practices consistent with those of other issuers of currencies used in determining the value of Special Drawing Rights; and

(2) the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 839, the China Exchange Rate Transparency Act of 2023, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

The China Exchange Rate Transparency Act reflects a bipartisan objective to hold China accountable for its poor economic governance.

The International Monetary Fund's articles of agreement require member countries to "... collaborate with the Fund and other members to assure orderly exchange arrangements and to

promote a stable system of exchange rates.”

In other words, to remain a member of the IMF, a country should avoid manipulating exchange rates to gain an unfair competitive advantage over other member countries.

According to the Treasury Department’s November 2022 Foreign Exchange Report, “China’s lack of transparency and use of a wide array of tools complicate Treasury’s ability to assess the degree to which official actions are designed to impact the exchange rate.”

This is just another barrier created by China’s economic governance that prevents us from gaining basic insights into the world’s second largest economy.

This opacity threatens the core mission of the IMF, which was established to help monitor exchange rate agreements.

It is ironic that China is always the one who demands a greater voice at the IMF, even if its actions undermine the fund’s ability to be effective.

For too long, we have seen China dismiss international rules of the road. From debt restructuring in the developing world to massive Chinese export credits, China has refused to work with other economies to find global solutions.

Mr. MEUSER’s bill will help prevent China from undermining yet another key area of cooperation—the IMF’s monitoring of exchange rates.

It will require the Treasury Department to push for greater transparency in China’s exchange rate management during the IMF’s economic reviews of China.

The bill would also make future reviews of Chinese shareholding in the IMF contingent on Beijing becoming a more responsible player in the international monetary system.

We need Treasury to take a firm stand at the IMF and insist that China adhere to the exchange rate policies of other advanced economies, or at the very least, disclose what those policies are.

This is important for the global economy, and it is certainly important for the American economy and American workers.

I thank Mr. MEUSER for his leadership on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 839, the China Exchange Rate Transparency Act of 2023, sponsored by Congressman MEUSER.

This bill requires the United States executive director at the International Monetary Fund, or IMF, to use its voice and vote to advocate for increased transparency regarding China’s exchange rate policies.

This is important because China has a history of devaluing its currency, the

yuan, against the dollar, making its exports unfairly cheaper, and thereby harming small businesses in the United States.

This bill would further impose greater accountability on China by requiring the United States to press the IMF to report whether China’s exchange rate policies affect the value of SDRs and to consider China’s performance as a responsible partner in the international monetary system when evaluating China’s voting power at the IMF.

President Biden’s Treasury Department has already increased transparency of China’s practices, including by placing it on a watch list for its failure to publish foreign exchange intervention and key features of its exchange rate setting mechanism.

This bill would reinforce the Biden administration’s actions to further push for greater transparency and accountability in this regard.

These are sensible actions Congress can take to prevent China from using its currency as an economic weapon.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) to explain his bill.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MCHENRY very, very much. I appreciate his leadership on our committee and on this bill.

I do rise in support of my legislation, the China Exchange Rate Transparency Act, H.R. 839, a bipartisan initiative supported by Representatives DONALDS, LOUDERMILK, NICKEL, LAWLER, LEE of Nevada, and DE LA CRUZ.

This legislation confronts the People’s Republic of China’s often deceptive and autocratic exchange rate policies and regular disregard for financial transparency on the international stage.

With this legislation, we are directing and challenging China’s opaque and often manipulative practices in foreign exchange markets, including their policy of accumulating massive foreign currency reserves and depreciating their currency, which undercuts the competitiveness of U.S. exports. By mandating the U.S. executive director at the IMF to use the voice and vote of the United States to advocate for increased exchange rate transparency from China, we are not just advocating for fairness—we are fighting for the integrity of the global economy.

The Department of Treasury’s reports from November 2022 to 2023 lay it out clearly: China’s exchange rate practices are too often shrouded in secrecy, undermining not just the U.S. but the entire global trade system. It is time we confront China’s persistent gaming of international norms. They have been playing by their own rules for too long, and it is detrimental to global economic fairness and stability.

This legislation is not about only singling out China. It is about ensuring

that all IMF members, including China, adhere to the rules that they have agreed to. China has promised to maintain orderly exchange rate arrangements without manipulation. It is our job to hold them to that promise and to ensure they do not continue to exploit the system to their advantage.

We are taking a firm, no-nonsense approach to a complex issue, emphasizing our commitment to fair trade and a transparent global economic system.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the China Exchange Rate Transparency Act of 2023, H.R. 839. This legislation stands for accountability in international finance, fair trade practices, and the stability of our global economy.

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this legislation builds upon the Biden administration’s efforts to increase transparency and accountability of China on key features of how it sets its currency exchange rate.

It is critical to continue to apply pressure on China in this regard because weaponizing its exchange rate will directly harm the United States’ small businesses selling their products and services here in the United States.

For these reasons, I again urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1515

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

I reiterate that Mr. MEUSER’s bill will help prevent China from undermining yet another key area of cooperation; and that is the IMF’s monitoring of exchange rates.

Exchange rates affect the cost of goods and services in every district in America. Whether or not China is adhering to international norms affects our economy, it affects the global economy, and we need to address that.

We have legislation that enables us to address that. It enables us to speak in a bipartisan way that China’s currency manipulation we will not stand for as a statement of American policy.

This bill will require the Department of the Treasury to push for greater transparency in China’s exchange rate management during the IMF’s economic reviews of China. That is the way we are going to do it.

We have sound policy. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I thank my Democratic colleagues and Republican colleagues on committee for working together on this bill, as well as Mr. MEUSER of Pennsylvania for his leadership on this important issue.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. VAN DUYNE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 839, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam 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 motion will be postponed.

OFAC LICENSURE FOR INVESTIGATORS ACT

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6370) to require the Office of Foreign Assets Control to develop a program under which private sector firms may receive a license to conduct nominal financial transactions in furtherance of the firms' investigations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6370

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "OFAC Licensure for Investigators Act".

SEC. 2. SENDING AND RECEIVING OF NOMINAL AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, establish a pilot program under which a private sector firm may receive a license to conduct nominal financial transactions in furtherance of the firm's investigations.

(b) COORDINATION.—When establishing and carrying out the pilot program required under subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall coordinate with the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network for the purposes of supporting activities of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network Exchange, as described in section 310(d) of title 31 of the United States Code.

(c) REPORTING ON ACTIVITIES.—Each private sector firm that receives a license described under subsection (a) shall submit a detailed monthly report to the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control on the activities of the firm conducted under such license.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 1 year after the date on which the pilot program is established under this section, and annually thereafter until the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date the pilot program is terminated, the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall submit a report to the Committees on Financial Services and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Foreign Relations of the Senate containing—

(A) the number of licenses requested under the pilot program;

(B) the number of licenses granted under the pilot program; and

(C) a broad discussion of the utility of the pilot program.

(2) CLASSIFIED BRIEFING.—After submission of each report required under paragraph (1), the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control shall provide the Committees on Fi-

nancial Services and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Foreign Relations of the Senate with a classified briefing containing—

(A) additional detail on the applicants for a license under the pilot program;

(B) identification of the firms granted a license;

(C) information on the operation of the pilot program, including how long each license lasted and the personnel needed to manage the pilot program;

(D) information gleaned by the Office of Foreign Assets Control from running the pilot program;

(E) the utility of that information;

(F) any obstacles to the operation or utility of the pilot program; and

(G) any recommendations for improving or extending the pilot program.

(e) TERMINATION.—The pilot program established by the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date on which the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control establishes such program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6370, the OFAC Licensure for Investigators Act, introduced by my friend, the ranking member of the National Security, Illicit Finance, and International Financial Institutions Subcommittee, Mrs. BEATTY.

The gentlewoman from Ohio has been an adept legislator in committee and great as an ally and fearsome as a foe. It has been good to work with her on solid policy.

I think this is an important matter for us. Illicit finance internationally and domestically is something we want to tackle, and we want to tackle this through solid policy that can be passed in a bipartisan way.

Since Hamas' October 7 terrorist attack on Israel, we have witnessed the ramifications of bad actors using the financial system to further their acts of terrorism.

This bill would enhance the tools in Treasury's arsenal to go after sanctioned individuals and entities while also holding them accountable in their financial activities.

There is already a well-established practice in traditional financial investigations where a law enforcement agency can request that financial institutions keep open criminal accounts in

order to help track the illicit flows of money.

This bill mirrors that practice.

The bill requires the Secretary of the Treasury to develop a pilot program administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control to allow private sector firms under a temporary and specific license to conduct nominal financial transactions to and through sanctioned entities to further their investigations.

OFAC, the Office of Foreign Assets Control, is a very important tool, one of our most powerful tools of protecting free people around the world and the flow of funds and tracking those flow of funds.

OFAC's licenses are authorized to OFAC to engage in transactions that would otherwise be prohibited. Mrs. BEATTY's bill would allow, for example, blockchain analytics firms to work with OFAC to trace wallets controlled by bad actors. The power of blockchain lies within its immutable ledger that cannot be altered and allows analysis firms to see the movement of value every step along the way.

Mrs. BEATTY's bill is a crucial step in the right direction. The Treasury Department will be required to keep Congress informed of OFAC's activities and findings under the license. With strict oversight and Treasury's ability to continue to follow the money and follow the value, the United States will be better positioned to go after terrorists and other bad actors and entities.

I thank Mrs. BEATTY for her legislation and for her important work on this topic, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 5, 2024.

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCHENRY: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 6370, the OFAC Licensure for Investigators Act. Based on your commitment to incorporate agreed edits into the suspension text, I agree that Foreign Affairs may be discharged from further consideration of the bill, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

This agreement is made with the understanding that it does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or prejudice our jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future.

Thank you for agreeing to place our exchange of letters into the Record during Floor consideration. I look forward to continuing to work together as this bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL McCaul,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2024.

Hon. MICHAEL McCaul,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN McCaul: Thank you for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6370, the OFAC Licensure

for Investigators Act, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. I agree that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 6370 at this time, you do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that you will be appropriately consulted and involved on this or similar legislation as it moves forward.

As discussed, I will seek to place a copy of our exchange of letters on this bill in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MCHENRY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services.

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

I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 6370, the OFAC Licensure for Investigators Act, which is cosponsored by Mr. NUNN of Iowa. I also thank the chairman and my friend for his support.

The global regime to counter money laundering and terrorist financing is becoming increasingly effective at detecting and deterring the abuse of our financial markets. However, we must stay ahead of the bad actors, who in many cases are moving into darker corners of the financial system and using technologies and methods that are harder to trace.

Private investigative firms, some with unique technologies and analytic methods, should be enlisted to help banks and governments, among others, identify the criminals and the terrorists, their bank accounts, and their typologies.

Today, these private firms are limited in how far they can see into a bad actor's operations. One of those limitations is due to sanctions, which appropriately prevent parties from engaging with sanctioned targets. However, as a result, whether in analytic firms or large bank intelligence units, the good guys have to stop their investigations upon finding evidence that suggest that a wallet or account or address may be associated with a sanctioned individual or entity.

There is a workaround today, but it is far too limited. Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control, or OFAC, provides licenses to individual parties and transactions which allow for narrow exceptions to its sanctions program. My bill requires OFAC to design a pilot licensing program that would allow investigators to apply to OFAC for permission to get a step further and engage with sanctioned persons under certain conditions to gain more visibility into opaque networks and practices.

The investigators could only use nominal amounts but would be able to trace where the money goes. Ensuring that there is robust oversight in this process, the bill mandates that recipients of these specific licenses must report to OFAC monthly on their findings.

This program would be similar to when government officials ask financial institutions to keep open suspicious accounts so the government

could then go and watch the transactions, and while they are doing that, they are able to follow the money.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this innovative and bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage in a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Madam Speaker, I have heard concerns from Members about the definition of "nominal transactions" in the bill. As we saw in OFAC's August 22 designation of Tornado Cash, U.S. persons may have received unsolicited nominal amounts of virtual currency from Tornado Cash. These nominal amounts could be as small as a fraction of a penny. The term "nominal amounts" is a term of art within OFAC, but, understandably, Members are worried that this license could allow for the financing of terror activities.

Prior to today's floor proceedings, OFAC and my staff discussed capping licenses at \$10. A fraction of a penny spread across \$10 could provide an immense amount of data on illicit actors and their funding mechanisms.

I think it is important to reiterate on the record for Members that this bill is not intended to allow a license for greater than \$10. Is that something that the gentlewoman would agree with?

Mrs. BEATTY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCHENRY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I say to the gentleman that I would. I think that is a very fair question to ask. Let me just assure you that it is also my intent, as the sponsor of this bill, that the term "nominal" in this context should not be interpreted to be more than the \$10 as you referenced, and I certainly understand why that concern came up. As you know, this bill is intended to enhance our efforts to stop terrorist financing. The kind of investigation that this bill is trying to allow for doesn't need more than a few dollars—or nominal, not to exceed \$10—to be effective. We have seen this before, so I am very comfortable assuring you that we would define it as \$10 or less.

I thank the gentleman for clarifying this. I, too, want to put on the record that it would be defined as the \$10 mark, and I certainly thank the gentleman for his support on this legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the bill's sponsor for this and for her addressing an important matter, which is money laundering internationally and at home is a severe problem. It is a severe problem with regulated financial institutions, and we have longstanding laws and rules and folks that are engaged in Justice and at Treasury that are highly adept at this.

We have new technologies that emerge each day and new approaches

to launder value or money. The movement of digital money is complex. With blockchain technology it makes it much easier because then you basically can follow what is on the blockchain, and it is there for the public to see and for our experts in government to follow very well.

We want to make sure that they are given the full tools to track that illicit finance wherever it may be using the best techniques and technology available to anyone in the world. We want to make sure that we stay on top of this and curb illicit finance the best that we possibly can.

We have the best laws, the best rules, and the best people working to protect our people here and abroad.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mrs. BEATTY for her leadership here on this important issue.

Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

My colleague, Mr. NUNN, and I have devised a smart pilot program that would allow for private-sector investigators to engage in small-dollar transactions with sanctioned persons in order to gain valuable information about how networks and activities of those bad actors work.

I am pleased to say that we have agreed on the nominal amount of \$10, and by creating a licensing program for such a person, both business and government will benefit from the information gained, improving visibility into criminal and terrorist financing networks. That is what this bill is all about.

Madam Speaker, for those reasons, I again urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I would just reiterate that Mrs. BEATTY's bill is a crucial step in the right direction, and the Treasury Department will be required to keep Congress informed of OFAC's activities and findings under the license.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6370, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1530

BORDER CRISIS IS KILLING OUR COUNTRY

(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, for the new year, I have done a survey with my constituents and asked what the issues are that they want to be focused on in 2024. The top answer they submitted in my northern California district was the border crisis, a Biden and Democratic Party-created crisis.

Republicans and Democrats agree there is a crisis at our border, and it is President Joe Biden's fault. During his first 100 days in office, he took 94 executive actions on immigration, including halting the construction of the border fence.

Under his administration, there have been 8 million illegal border crossings nationwide and over 6.7 million encounters at our southern border. The Biden administration's continuous open border policies are to blame for this historic crisis.

We need action now. We need it yesterday. We must pass, over in the Senate, H.R. 2, the strongest border security bill in congressional history, immediately. We must complete the wall, change the asylum rules to not be such a joke and prevent millions of illegals from being attracted here by a magnet, streamline deportations, and end parole in the United States.

We cannot continue to allow this to stand any longer. It is killing our country and our economy.

POLICY SOLUTIONS TO THE BORDER CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAN of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, before I yield time to my colleague from Utah, I want to quickly highlight and reiterate the importance of what we are doing here as the House GOP.

House Republicans, during the holiday break, took the time, over 60 of us,

to go down to the border to be able to share what is truly going on. We get to hear, hopefully, today a little bit more about this.

At no point in our Nation's history has the situation on the southern border reached the levels of policy failure, humanitarian disaster, and security threat that it has under the Biden administration.

Many of my House Republican colleagues witnessed firsthand the tragedy at our border last week. It is out of control, and the Biden administration has completely dropped the ball on this issue and threatened the safety of every American community in the process. The issue is, it is more simple than this.

To President Biden, the gig is up. You took office and thought: Let's just reverse everything that the Trump administration had been doing. Let's not necessarily evaluate whether it was successful, whether it was the right policy. Let's just kind of use our executive pen to reverse everything.

It is very simple to consider Migrant Protection Protocols, the remain in Mexico policy, catch and release. These are simple policy changes that would have an immediate positive impact.

Many of my colleagues were able to see this, to witness this, again, firsthand this past week, and I look forward to hearing from Representative BURGESS OWENS from the great State of Utah for more on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I recently joined Speaker JOHNSON and more than 60 colleagues to visit the southern border at Eagle Pass, Texas, one of the busiest Border Patrol entry points. What I witnessed was nothing short of an invasion, an invasion facilitated by the purposeful policies of the Biden administration.

It was my second trip to the border since the spring of 2021, and regrettably, the situation has only gotten worse.

Two years ago, I encountered a heart-wrenching tragedy of an unaccompanied autistic 7-year-old child, a little girl who was trafficked by the Mexican cartel. My guess is the Biden administration is clueless as to the status of this vulnerable young lady. My guess also is that she is now 1 of the over 100,000 unaccompanied children who have been trafficked through the Biden administration's open border and now lost. The 100,000 innocent children lost to our system highlight the heartless administration that does not care about the innocents.

The crisis doesn't end here. Over 100,000 Americans, primarily aged between 19 and 48, have fallen victim to fentanyl, a deadly weapon shipped from China to Mexico, processed, and then smuggled across our borders. More Americans have lost their lives in a single year than the two 20-year wars in Vietnam and Afghanistan combined.

As these Americans are being poisoned across our country—by the

way, this is across party lines. It doesn't matter what our race, creed, or color might be. Take one, and we have lost another child.

As we are losing Americans, over 100,000, at this one port of entry, Eagle Pass, they are making over \$34 million per week through this trafficking of fentanyl.

President Biden did not inherit this crisis at our southern border. He purposely created it by rolling back the successful Trump policies and then refusing to enforce U.S. immigration laws. In his first 100 days, he took 94 executive actions on immigration, resulting in 1.8 million illegal crossings since January 2021.

That is why I joined my House Republican colleagues to pass the Secure the Border Act of 2023 7 months ago, which offers commonsense solutions to the Biden border crisis. This legislation demands the completion of the border wall, an end to catch and release, an increase in Border Patrol agents, a halt to the flow of deadly fentanyl, and protection of our innocent children from human traffickers. It places the safety of the American people first, a sentiment shared by citizens throughout our country who are tired of Washington's inaction. However, the Senate Democrats refuse to bring it to the floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to immediately pass H.R. 2, send it to the President's desk, and stand up for the safety, security, and sacred laws of our great Nation.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative OWENS for his firsthand look.

I spent time at the border—I believe it was in the late spring—and the same situation continues on. The solutions are right in front of us, and we just need the Biden administration to recognize that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time to be able to weigh in on these issues in a little more relaxed manner here and spend some time.

I want to talk a little bit about legislation we are working on here known as S.J. Res. 38. In this case, it would ensure our taxpayer dollars are used to buy American-made products, something that has had bipartisan support, nonpartisan support, in the past around here.

Certainly, when we are talking about having something domestically produced or buying it from a foreign competitor or ally, one thing we shouldn't be doing is buying more and more things from China.

What is the sense of exporting so many of our dollars over to somebody who is such an adversary in so many things on the world front, with the funding of countries that are helping to sponsor terrorism and the unrest they are helping fund in the Middle East? There are constant threats to Taiwan and the other islands in the South

China Sea that are possessions of Japan and others, constant aggression on that. They sink many other smaller countries into huge debt by dangling out loans they know they can't repay, and pretty soon, they can take over the resources of that country.

As the United States of America, we can produce anything we want here. We can produce it well, usually of the best quality, using the best practices, by far, yet what are we doing? We are hamstringing our own ability to strengthen our own economy with the energy we need to produce in order to do that, with environmental policies that 50 years ago were well intentioned but have been completely weaponized against industries and farming, mining, and timber. The West burns each year massively. In California and Utah, it is endless.

A lot of this currently comes from Biden administration policies, and I jump back 3 years to 8 years to the Obama-era policies that have put us in this spot.

Currently, President Biden wants to shoot down the waiver to eliminate the buy in America requirements for, in this case, electric vehicle chargers. That is what this bill, S.J. Res. 38, is about, which would be purchased under the Infrastructure and Jobs Act, another boondoggle itself.

If the money is going to be forced to be spent, and we have to buy these electric chargers for electric cars, at least can we have them be American produced, American made.

Don't get me mixed up with the electric car crowd. I don't think we should be forcing that on anybody. At the same time, they are tearing down the California power grid with the dams they are removing on the Klamath River up in the north part of my district and one across the border, and then threatening the Snake River farther up and one down in Mendocino County.

It is just one thing after another, getting rid of hydroelectric power and also the ability to store water and for the water to be retained during flood control season and for some recreation—yes, even water available to let out for fish when they need to. When they tear these dams out, we lose that green, renewable, clean, CO₂-free power by these policies.

An addendum to that, CO₂ is not a problem. It is only 0.04 percent of our atmosphere. The left wants to keep playing these games like we are talking about here. They want to export jobs to China to build these electric car chargers. They want to tear down the dams that produce CO₂-free, green, renewable power and try and build even more batteries and more windmills that chop up the birds and only run when there is a little bit of wind and the solar plants that only run during the daytime when it is not a cloudy or rainy or snow-covered day. It is amazing how dumb these ideas are.

In 2021, the Democrats included \$7.5 billion of taxpayer money for electric

vehicle charging stations in their pie-in-the-sky idea that we are going to electrify everything in the next few years. This is the Infrastructure and Jobs Act.

I don't support the forced purchase and proliferation of electric vehicles, but doggone it, if we are going to do this, we need to buy American.

Why do we have to steamroll our own laws? Why is the administration backstabbing our American manufacturers and sending billions over to China and other Asian markets?

In the process, it also destroys our immigration laws and fosters more chaos at the border when we have this continued policy by the Biden administration of basically ignoring the border.

As mentioned earlier, 64 of my colleagues went to the border. I have paid a couple of visits myself in Arizona and California and such. It is indeed chaos. They are just walking right past you when you go visit the border. Some of these are nice folks from Central America, families and such. We keep putting out the magnet, the green light to come across.

We have talked many times about the numbers coming across the border, like 10,000 per day just in the month of December, 300,000 for a month.

The burden is being borne even by our Democrat-run cities, even they are starting to cry uncle. We have the Governor of New Jersey saying we need to check with these bus companies and see where they are all coming from. No, you need to check over here at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. That is where the policy is coming from. It isn't bus companies from Texas or Florida or something. That is who you need to be talking to because that is where the problem is.

Indeed, the administration is shifting from pushing our jobs overseas to then having our jobs here filled by people who are coming here illegally. It is the chaos they have had at the border coupled with these other policies and fentanyl coming across the border.

Who knows what kind of terror cells are being built by people coming across the border illegally and the gunrunning and everything else that can happen? It has even resulted in the housing of illegal immigrants in our National Park System, including a national park right there in New York City, so people can't use it.

Now, you have seen the stories more and more recently that they are going to be housing them in schools. Kids are getting kicked out of schools in New York right now because they have a supposedly temporary problem where they have to house them in the gym. The kids can go online, back to Zoom learning, like during the height of COVID, which was manipulated in my own home State of California, which took an extra year to allow kids back into school.

□ 1545

What a mess. Why are these people entrusted with power?

When you talk to the American public, this is all preventable. We don't have to live like this, when we are talking energy, when we are talking domestic production. No, we would rather export it, I guess, and have kids in Africa mine the products in order to have your electric car and electric gadgetry.

The National Park Police have testified that these encampments on our National Park lands endanger the people that would normally enjoy and use them. Also, in the wintertime, these areas can end up being a floodplain, like the one in New York City, endangering the illegal immigrants that are being attracted—until recently, when it seems maybe the light is starting to turn around for the Governor of New York and the mayor of New York City and such.

I don't know. I don't know.

Mr. Speaker, we have a porous border. We have a massive problem with the encounters that we have at the border here that are overwhelming our demoralized Border Patrol folks. How are they supposed to do their job?

On my visit down to Arizona, they actually had, and still have today, government-provided vans go over and just pick people up at the gaps in the border and get them to the processing center sooner. We know that 85 percent of them are not going to be heard at their asylum trial any time soon.

One thing after another is wrecking our economy, wrecking people's confidence in government, and the ability just to conduct their own lives. There is no reason we need to have such costly ways of doing business with energy, with procuring food; everything else that is happening under this Biden administration.

Mr. Speaker, just 3 years ago, things were looking pretty good on the cost of fuel, cost of groceries, and employment until they used COVID as a weapon to attack our economy at that time and tried to make it look bad in order to win the 2020 election.

We have a lot of complex issues, but the solutions really aren't that tough when you get down to it: enforce the border laws that we have.

We don't need comprehensive immigration reform. We already know what we are supposed to do about the border. We just need to enforce the laws that we have and have common sense applied to asylum.

At the same time, let's not exploit American jobs that we could be doing if we have to produce these electric vehicle charging stations. At least let Americans produce them instead of sending them to China.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for speaking very plainly and very simply. These solutions are right in front of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the CMS' proposed Medicare cut of 3.37 percent.

Just to put this in perspective, when a physician sees a Medicare patient, they do it because they care about patients. They do not do it for money, because it doesn't make financial sense.

Let me give an example here.

You own a hardware store and you want to sell hammers. It costs you \$1 for each hammer. Say, the hammer is on Medicare, or you have to buy the Medicare, and you have to sell it for 60 cents.

How long do you stay in business? It doesn't make sense.

So as we move time and time again, the number of physicians who are able to take Medicare patients, out of the goodness of their heart, is falling and falling. You actually lose money on Medicare or Medicare patients that has to be taken up through cost shifting for regular insurance.

When I ran a private practice, I stayed up many, many nights, Saturday nights, searching for paper clips, making sure that I knew where every penny went. I just had to make sure that my staff and the bills got paid before I ever got paid.

My practice was heavily Medicare, so I did not take a salary many, many times because the numbers did not work. In fact, adjusted for overinflation for the last 20 years, Medicare physician fee schedules have dropped 20 percent, and this is in light of the massive inflation we have had over the last 2 years; even worse.

Mr. Speaker, what other profession expects to get a pay cut every year?

This has to stop.

These are the people who are actually up in the middle of the night taking care of your grandmother who has appendicitis, taking care of your daughter, taking care of your child with a broken arm. They are the ones doing this, and here we are rewarding them because they basically have to take government pay patients by cutting and cutting and cutting.

One of ObamaCare's directives was to starve private practices to force physicians to work in hospitals or big conglomerations.

How did they do this? They cut their pay every year while hospitals, although not as much so, got raises every year.

So what does this do? It pushes physicians out of private practice because they can't pay the bills.

Mr. Speaker, I left my private practice when my partner said: We can't do this anymore. We are going to be acquired by a hospital.

Mr. MURPHY: We can't provide the care to the patients that they need.

Why is it a bad model? Private-practice physicians are different birds than employed physicians. It is just very simple. It is a well-known fact in medicine. Those employed physicians tend to be less efficient, cost more, and tend to work more on the clock.

Those who are in private practice put a taproot down in a community. They have stayed there, and they are some-

one's doctor for 20, 30 years or more. This is not happening now. They have made transitory medicine the rule, not the exception.

The cuts that are going to the Medicare fee schedule absolutely need to stop. This is why I introduced H.R. 6683, the Preserving Seniors' Access to Physicians Act.

This legislation will stop this year's cuts while we work on a permanent solution. This is not something that needs to happen year after year after year where we are cutting and cutting the people who actually take care of patients.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress to help work with my colleagues to help fix Medicare. We are facing an absolute calamity with the shortage of doctors, especially surgeons, in the next 3 to 5 years. Those who are reaching retirement age, instead of working like most physicians do, are finally throwing up their hands and saying, we are done.

Sadly enough, the ones coming out of medical school now—because of some of the processes now were not working hard enough—are not nearly coming out in the numbers and the efficiency to take the place of those retiring.

Every day, we now add 10,000 new patients to the Medicare rolls. You are expecting doctors to continue to take more and more Medicare, earning less and less and less. They are going to go out of business or have to go into employment, which we all know is a worse way of taking care of patients.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 6683 and help us try to keep medicine back on track.

Thank you.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Murphy and I sit on the same committee, Health in the Ways and Means Committee, and if his remarks seem personal, it is because they are. He has had such a close experience with this, and no one makes the point better that all of our providers' costs continue to go up because of bad the monetary policy that we have seen, particularly in the last few years. When we constantly tell these providers, You are going to have to do more with less, they have to make decisions, and this is ultimately the worst possible thing for our patients.

The crowding-out effect that we have going on in our economy right now, particularly with things related to government funding, there is no situation where it is worse than this. The inability for us to get after our true debt and deficit drivers will continue to crowd out, so these types of cuts are forced on providers, and we have to be willing and adult enough to be able to figure that out.

So thank you for that, Dr. Murphy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am rising today to advocate for America's patients and their physicians.

Over the past 3 years, doctors across the Nation have more than stepped up to the challenges that they have encountered, COVID, often risking their own health and safety to protect our communities. That not only includes the physicians; that includes the nurses, the technicians, and everyone in America's hospitals. However, when Congress left town in December, we once again let down America's doctors by allowing a 3.37 percent Medicare payment cut to hit January 1.

As a cardiothoracic surgeon for 15 years, I have seen firsthand the consequences of cuts like these. What are the consequences? Access to quality healthcare for rural America that I represent, underserved urban America, the American people.

The payment cut to physicians will impede patients' access to care while increasing the gap between physician expenses and reimbursement rates.

I want to associate myself with Dr. Murphy's comments. Costs are dramatically going up, and, if that continues, more and more of America's physicians will not take Medicare. I didn't say Medicaid. I said Medicare.

Given the existing shortage of physicians in the United States, the combination of declining reimbursement and rapidly rising costs threatens to drive more doctors out of the profession, particularly, as I mentioned, in rural and underserved urban America.

It has led to a lot of consolidation, as Dr. Murphy mentioned—physicians being consolidated into a large medical practice or employed by large hospital systems.

Fortunately, we have a window of opportunity to right this wrong and support the thousands of hardworking men and women serving millions of Medicare beneficiaries. We must stop the bleeding and eliminate the full 3.37 cut by January 19.

Congress must also implement a permanent solution that will halt the downward spiral of physician reimbursement and provide much-needed and deserved stability for America's doctors. Again, if we want access for America's seniors to the Medicare program, we have to act. We have to act soon.

Again, it is not just physicians out there not taking Medicaid. They are not taking Medicare. I have elderly in-laws and an elderly mother. They have experienced this.

In fact, we had a hearing in the Committee on Energy and Commerce a couple of weeks ago. There was an economist there. He couched it in a way that was positive. He said, Well, 60 percent of America's seniors are not having trouble finding a primary care physician.

When it came around time for my questioning, I said, Well, I want to rephrase that. Forty percent of America's seniors are struggling to find a primary care doctor. That is a big number, folks. Forty percent of America's seniors are struggling. Their physician retires. Their physician moves.

Trying to find a new primary care doctor is a big challenge. We cannot let this continue—again, urban America and underserved areas, rural America that I represent.

In 2023, for a more permanent solution, I introduced the bipartisan Strengthening Medicare for Patients and Providers Act, which would tie the annual physician fee schedule updates to inflationary measurements, the Medicare Economic Index, or MEI. That is both fair and efficient. It has been promoted. Almost every medical society in America thinks this is a good idea.

I don't have the graph in front of me but let me just tell you what it shows. Outpatient and inpatient hospital care gets an update based on inflation every year. Providers do not. As Dr. MURPHY outlined, it has been at least a 20 percent cut just based on that in the most recent history, and even more if you factor in the massive inflation—which thankfully is down—that we had last year and the year before.

The current path toward further consolidation, physician burnout, closure of medical practices must be corrected. If we don't correct this, the problems I outlined are going to continue.

I urge congressional leadership to address this critical issue, and I will continue to advance patient-centered solutions that empower patients and support innovation to ensure that all Americans have access to quality, affordable healthcare.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Dr. BUCSHON, for another incredible perspective on this looming issue that seems to just be year over year over year, and we cannot continue to put our medical providers in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah, Vice Chairman MOORE, for yielding and for claiming this time this afternoon to discuss these important issues facing our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as the music note dropped in Nashville and Americans rang in the new year on January 1, we woke up in the morning to horrifying news. 302,000 illegal immigrant encounters had occurred at our southern border, the most in any single month ever, in December 2023. To put this number into perspective, that is more than the entire population of Knoxville, Tennessee, which is the third largest city in my home State of Tennessee.

□ 1600

Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that out of the 302,000 illegal immigrants encountered at the southern border, none of these includes the illegal immigrants who successfully evaded our Customs and Border Patrol agents.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it is actually much worse. In fact, in fiscal year 2023 which ended on September 30, so it doesn't include the record-breaking

month of December, Customs and Border Protection reported 2.48 million illegal immigrant encounters, and there were over 1.1 million known got-aways. That includes 169 people who were stopped trying to cross the border in fiscal year 2023 whose names appear on the terrorist watch list, which is more than in fiscal years '17, '18, '19, '20, '21, and '22 combined. Or to put it another way, the entire Trump Presidency plus Biden's first 2 years.

Additionally, border officials seized 27,293 pounds of fentanyl in fiscal year 2023. That is a whopping 464 percent increase from 2020 and, obviously, points out the failure of the White House and the Department of Homeland Security to enforce our Nation's laws.

Their desire for open border policies is wreaking havoc on an entire generation of young people in my home State and across our country who are dying from fentanyl overdose at an alarming rate.

From halting border wall construction to ending the successful remain in Mexico program implemented during the Trump administration to ending title 42 powers that kept illegals out of the country, the White House continues to send a message to the world that our borders are wide open.

Thankfully, there is a solution that would make for a great new year's resolution. The House Republicans passed H.R. 2, the Secure the Border Act of 2023. It would end the catch-and-release policy, pay more for Border Patrol agents, restart important border wall construction, and strengthen and streamline the asylum process.

The bottom line is we must enforce the laws already on the books and pass new ones that put an end to the skyrocketing illegal immigration disrupting every corner of America, including my home State of Tennessee. Unfortunately, until then, every town in President Biden's America will be a border town.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I echo the gentleman's sentiments, and I will continue to speak on it today. The solutions at the border are simple. We have got actual data that can just be reimplemented and we can get rid of the politics involved and just do something right by our Nation. We look forward to an opportunity to leverage this moment to get this border policy through. The things in H.R. 2 make absolute sense.

I am looking forward now to the remarks of my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the vice chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I joined the largest congressional delegation in history to visit our southern border. What we saw is absolutely alarming. It is alarming to me personally and will be alarming to every American. We saw a Border Patrol station that has been

under constant siege for months. We saw a community in Eagle Pass dealing with the strain of over 300,000 migrants crossing the border in the past 30 days. We saw an emboldened cartel that continues to smuggle drugs and human trafficking into every community in America.

Speaking to Border Patrol agents and local sheriffs, it is clear that President Biden's open border policies have led to this national security crisis.

In the past 3 years, we have seen the number of attempted entries by individuals on the terrorist watch list skyrocket to over 100 a year with 1.5 million got-aways reported by the Border Patrol. That number is surely larger. We have seen an increase in drug smuggling with substances like fentanyl, methamphetamine, and heroin entering our Nation at record levels.

Moreover, we have seen reports of public schools being used as holding facilities for migrants instead of being used for American students who are already suffering from historic learning losses after the COVID pandemic.

All of this amounts to a pattern of failure brought on by the Biden administration's refusal to address the border crisis head-on.

Half measures will not keep Americans safe. It is time for the Senate to pass H.R. 2, the Secure the Border Act, and begin working in good faith to protect our communities.

For far too long, my constituents have been poisoned by fentanyl analogs that are created in China, made into pills in Mexico, and brought into the United States through an open southern border.

It is time to enforce our laws. It is time to reinstate the remain in Mexico policy. It is time to give Border Patrol agents the tools and the resources that they need to protect our border and to protect the sovereignty of our country. It is time to secure our Nation.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. JOYCE for coming down over the holiday break.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for hosting this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss CMS' Medicare physician fee schedule which threatens seniors' access to healthcare, exacerbates vertical consolidation within the market, and will further drive patients toward higher cost sites of service.

Physician costs are growing, but their reimbursements are shrinking yet again.

In America, we all want the same thing when it comes to healthcare. Whether you are a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or whatever, you want accessible, affordable, and quality healthcare. Everyone wants that.

This is causing all three to suffer. Accessibility is decreasing. More physicians and more physicians are no

longer accepting Medicaid and are no longer accepting Medicare.

The issues are accessibility, affordability, driving patients to higher cost sites, and, of course, quality.

Quality goes down when we lose quality physicians, and we are losing them. They are getting out of the practices because they can't afford to stay in the practices. In fact, Medicare doctor payments have been cut by almost 10 percent over the last 4 years. This is simply unsustainable.

Fortunately, we have a window of opportunity to right this wrong and support the thousands of hardworking men and women serving millions of Medicare beneficiaries. Over the holidays, I spoke with doctors in my district who are preparing to make painful decisions including service reductions and hiring freezes.

For patients, this means an inability to get even basic healthcare services close to their homes or longer wait times as overwhelmed staff race to keep up.

That is why I am working closely with my bipartisan colleagues on a permanent solution, but we need to stop the full 3.37 percent cut and ensure that physicians have the financial support necessary to care for our seniors.

This is the United States of America. We have the greatest healthcare system in the world, and we are ruining it.

Again, I don't care if you are a Republican, Democrat, Independent, red, blue, or green. I don't care. We all want the same thing. We want accessible, affordable, quality healthcare. This is ruining it. We have got to compensate our physicians.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his remarks emphasizing the need for good healthcare.

I hear this from several of my friends, family, and constituents back home. I think one of the most alarming things that we are seeing right now in the healthcare provider world is that—when I grew up, a lot of my friends' parents were physicians. They would always encourage their child to go into medical school and pursue a career that they loved so much. This may just be an anecdote, but I am literally seeing that next generation of current providers saying: Try something different.

Again, that may just be my experience. I don't think it is because I have heard a lot of it from other colleagues of mine. We can't look back at this time and say we didn't address this issue of not doing right by our providers, by our rural healthcare and making sure that they have what they need to be able to navigate the costs that are continually increasing and being able to provide for their patients.

As Dr. Murphy also talked about, we have to have private practices being able to stay nimble and focused on their specific community and not just build big conglomerates. Small business is the backbone of our Nation, and

that needs to exist also in our healthcare market.

As I close here, let me just turn to the other topic that we talked heavily about today which is the border. I spent some time at home the last few weeks, and as I met with and had different forums back home with constituents, I explained to them that one of the biggest problems is the way that policy works in Washington, D.C.

It is in a very partisan and difficult circumstance back here. I don't think anybody on either side of the aisle would disagree with me that it becomes very difficult. When we factor in the Senate that requires a 60-vote threshold—every bill needs to be bipartisan in the Senate—that requirement isn't here in the majoritarian rule House, but that is what we live with. Particularly when there is split government, then we have difficult decisions and difficult things to navigate.

The point that I made to them was that with my Democratic colleagues, we often can find the first three or four provisions of a particular issue that we agree with, but then that is when it becomes difficult because if Democrats want the fifth, the sixth, and the seventh item, then they will say, no, we are not going to vote on any of the things we agree on until we get some of these things we want, even though we agree on the baseline.

We do it too. We have certain things that we want to make sure we get so we are going to leverage that so we don't get the basics done.

I can't think of a scenario where this applies more than our border crisis right now. I don't want to make this political. I remember a little while ago when there were 34-odd migrants that suffocated in the back of a truck. It was like a blip on the news feed. It was so quick. It came out as a news cycle. That is the danger of what is going on right now. We have empowered the cartel networks that we should be united against. We have empowered the cartel networks to own the border.

I heard a staggering statistic—I don't have the number in front of me—on what we have calculated on how much money those cartels are making on a weekly to monthly basis. It is terrifying because that number is going directly into the drug trade.

The fentanyl crisis is one of the biggest impacts this has on our community. I held this huge roundtable back in Utah with the caretakers, law enforcement, and advocacy groups. It was a very nonpartisan conversation, and it was so, so concerning on what was going on.

This is what I want to tell the American people: We actually agree that we should do a lot of the elements in H.R. 2. We should shore up that protection and border security. However, then we need to make sure we streamline the visa process, and we need to make sure we get a stronger workforce here.

I am here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we actually largely will agree on that

aspect of a comprehensive immigration reform.

□ 1615

My biggest criticism of President Biden and his administration has been that he immediately removed or reversed the Migrant Protection Protocols, the remain in Mexico policy that the Trump-Pence administration had done. "Well, we are a new administration. We have to reverse all those things."

A lot of the energy things were done by executive order. It was also this border policy. I think we are seeing now it is okay to have made a mistake if you are willing to be the adult and say: "Look, we actually should reimplement some of this stuff."

It is what the American people need. It is what the polling will tell us. It is what we largely agree, that there are some basic things that we can get done.

I think not telling the cartels: "Hey, if you just get folks to the border and get them across, they are going to get lost in the system. You are going to be in there, and you are going to be fine." That is what they are telling them. The immigrants who are coming here, it is not the experience they are having because they get lost in the system and then are forced to go into the drug trade or forced to be part of the workforce of the Sinaloa cartel once they rush the product through the borders however they get it, whether it is a port or nonport. I don't care how it comes through.

Once that product gets here, then these individuals get leveraged to do that because they have no other options because they were lied to by the cartels.

If we can agree on some basic stuff, let's implement it. If we shore up and get back to times that we saw in previous Presidencies, we can then go and actually work on some of the other immigration policies that also need reform.

I am committed to doing that, and I hope that we can address that. If we leave the border with this type of policy that we have seen create a beacon for these cartels, then we will not be able to accomplish anything.

If it has to be done all in one bill, that is unrealistic because it is just a bigger beacon. It is just more opportunity for the cartels to try to get more people through, and it is nonsensical.

I hope for every opportunity to tell the Biden administration that this is actually better for you politically. I hate to say it, but this is what the American people need.

That is what my colleagues are trying to emphasize. That is why over 64 of my colleagues last week spent time down there. The same things that I saw months ago when I visited Eagle Pass are continuing. They are not getting better. There has to be policy change.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues for attending today's Special

Order and sharing their thoughts on these very important issues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PROTECT AND ENHANCE SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, we are here this afternoon to discuss America's number one anti-poverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty program for children. It is Social Security.

I commend my colleague from the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MOORE, for his work on the committee, but here is the issue, Mr. Speaker: This Congress that we are all a part of has not enhanced Social Security now going on 53 years. 1971 was the last time the United States Congress, which has the responsibility, enhanced Social Security for any of its recipients. Mr. Speaker, 10,000 baby boomers a day become eligible for Social Security, and since 1971, Congress has not taken any action.

I am joined by my colleagues today as we come to this floor and beseech our fellow colleagues to do one simple thing: Vote. That is our responsibility.

We have a very specific plan that we have put forward. There is also this other plan that is out there, some sort of debt commission that is going to go behind closed doors and decide what they will cut with respect to Social Security.

The American public overwhelmingly—Democrat, Republican, and Independents—all say we do not need cuts to the very essential programs that we rely on as a country. For more than 40 percent, Mr. Speaker, of all Americans, Social Security is the only pension that they have, and Congress hasn't acted in more than 53 years.

We need to enhance the program. We need to enhance it in a way that makes sure that everyone gets an across-the-board increase, especially for 5 million of our fellow Americans, mostly women, who get below-poverty-level checks from the government of the wealthiest nation in the world because Congress has not taken the time or the effort.

Who are these people? They are your brothers, your sisters, your aunts, your uncles, your neighbors, the people you go to church with.

Where does this money go? Right back into every single Member's district.

Mr. MOORE of Utah has 110,000 Social Security recipients in his district. Every single Member of Congress is getting a card that tells them how many recipients they have in their district, what they receive, whether they are dependents, spouses, or disabled.

That is what we are focused on. We want a vote, Mr. Speaker, because the

American people demand it. That is why I am joined here for this Special Order hour on this floor by so many of our colleagues. There are so many of us that we hope everyone will recognize their time and have consideration for their colleagues, but I will also point out the more than 350 groups across the Nation that support the Social Security 2100 Act, including the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, Social Security Works, the NAACP, the AFL-CIO, Paralyzed Veterans of America, the National Education Association, and I could go on. Instead, I am going to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a leader on the Subcommittee on Social Security.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my brothers and sisters on behalf of more than 124,000 of my constituents in north Jersey in the Ninth District who rely on Social Security each and every month. They rely on it.

To some, as in the entire country, that is their only means of income, of survival. That is how Social Security was established in the 1930s and implemented a few years later.

Social Security is one of America's greatest success stories. I remember the first time I ran for Congress in 1996. I walked into a room prepared to deal with housing codes and public housing, but the only questions folks asked me: "Where do you stand on Social Security?" "Do you want to privatize Social Security?"

Social Security is a success story. After nearly 90 years, it still stands as a monument to decency and dignity and the birthright of hardworking Americans, yet throughout its storied history, Mr. LARSON, it has been under attack. Even in 1935, it was the subject of attacks and lies from day one.

The Republican Study Committee, which represents three-quarters of House Republicans, proposed slashing Social Security benefits by \$718 billion. The GOP leadership wants to create a so-called fiscal commission in our government funding bill. That is a wolf in sheep's clothing.

I am proud to join my friend and colleague, Congressman JOHN LARSON, in a letter opposing this cynical ploy to slash Social Security and Medicare.

Without aggressive action, Social Security lurches toward insolvency. Congress has a sacred responsibility to fight for its future. The same question asked 26 years ago is asked of me today. That is why I am standing with Mr. LARSON on his Social Security 2100 Act, to ensure the long-term strength and solvency of Social Security.

The Social Security 2100 Act provides paid-for benefit enhancements while not raising taxes on middle-class families. It is a no-brainer.

Our bill ends the painful 5-month disability waiting period. Who can justify that in this day and age?

It would ensure Americans suffering with permanent disorders like Huntington's disease get the help they need without red tape or delay.

The bill eliminates the windfall elimination provisions so that firefighters, police officers, teachers, and others get the full benefits that they have earned.

With the Social Security 2100 Act, we are fighting for our seniors who have worked their entire lives and rely on Social Security to make ends meet. We are fighting for working families so that no one who pays into the system over a lifetime ever retires in poverty.

We must get this done for the American people, Mr. Speaker. There are no excuses.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, there is no person on the committee who has fought harder for the repeal of WEP and GPO and who understands the significance and impact that Social Security has on so many of her constituents and constituents all across this country than Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman JOHN LARSON for being the chief advocate for reforming our Social Security system. It is high time that Congress acted to preserve those benefits for people who have earned those benefits by paying into the system over their working lives.

I want to touch on another issue that concerns me with respect to Social Security, and that is that we see an increasing number of people who rely on those benefits. Since 2010, the number of individuals who rely on Social Security has increased over 21 percent. Over that same period of time, Social Security's administrative funding for basic operations has fallen by 17 percent after you account for inflation.

Those shortages—that is, more people needing services but the budget being cut—have caused a significant delay across Social Security for our most vulnerable populations, including those who are awaiting disability benefits.

I have a constituent from my district who has been working with my casework team in my district office for more than a year and a half. This individual had a stroke and applied for disability benefits with Social Security in August 2022 after becoming paralyzed. He was denied those benefits in June 2023.

□ 1630

He appealed his decision that same month and didn't receive a response from Social Security until November of 2023, stating that his application needed additional review. After 17 months without any form of income, his case was finally approved just this week. Americans should not have to wait this long to see these necessary earned benefits.

Instead of working with Democrats to ensure that Social Security has a better capability to serve constituents like that one, my Republican colleagues proposed devastating cuts to Social Security. Additional cuts to an

agency that is already struggling with a significant backlog would be catastrophic for seniors and individuals with disabilities. After they do these budget cuts, then my Republican colleagues want to turn around and blame the staff at the Social Security Administration for not being able to handle the backlog.

Unfortunately, the story that I told about my constituent is not unique. There are countless Americans who suffer from disabilities and are unable to get their benefits in a timely manner. These Americans deserve better.

I again thank my colleague, Mr. LARSON, for leading the charge on reforming the system, on holding up our end of the bargain to people who have paid into the system over their entire working lives.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I again want to point out that both Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Ms. MOORE, who will be speaking next, understand completely that Social Security is an earned benefit. It is often referred to on the other side as an entitlement. It is hardly an entitlement. Every American knows when they look at their paycheck that it says FICA. That stands for Federal Insurance Contributions Act. Whose? Yours.

GWEN MOORE understands that, and that is why she has been fighting on this committee to make sure that we not only extend the solvency, but we enhance the benefits.

Imagine this, Richard Nixon was President of the United States the last time Congress enhanced any benefits to Social Security. Do you think things have changed a little bit over those years?

Every single member of the public ought to be outraged by this. It is not anything the President can do with executive order. It is not anything that is going to happen through the judiciary. It is only through the United States Congress.

What are we asking of the Congress? We are asking them to vote.

That is what GWEN MOORE does every week on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman LARSON for holding this Special Order on the importance of enhancing Social Security.

Mr. LARSON talked about how things have not changed for the last 80 years since Social Security has been in existence. I will tell you one thing; Social Security has not changed its emphasis and focus on allowing our workers to retire and age in dignity and not in poverty. We should and can enhance the program so that it will be solvent and useful for current and future beneficiaries.

Take, for example, some provisions that I have included in the Social Security 2100 Act. That is to provide beneficiaries receiving payments for 20 years or more an enhancement. As our population lives longer, more and more

people may end up living out their savings, especially women. As our students continue to face the daunting cost of pursuing higher education, it is critical that we reinstate the student benefits of retired, deceased, or disabled workers. These reforms would be particularly meaningful for students of color and low-income families.

Before closing, I add my voice in supporting how important it is that Social Security 2100 recognizes that caregiving is, in fact, uncompensated work. In the United States, 43.5 million people, mostly women, work as unpaid caregivers to their children, aging parents, or to an adult family member with a disability, and they don't receive a single dime. The value of that unpaid caregiving is estimated at over half a trillion dollars annually.

This bill provides caregiver credits to ensure that people, mostly women, are not penalized when it comes time to claim their Social Security benefits for taking time out of the workforce to care for children or other dependents.

I thank Mr. LARSON for his continued commitment to preserve and enhance Social Security.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MOORE.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has done just an incredible job on the Ways and Means Committee, again advocating on a regular basis, especially for the more than 5 million fellow Americans who get below-poverty-level checks from Social Security. We are not here just to extend the solvency of Social Security. We have a plan that the President of the United States supports, that is fully paid for. It is paid for by having people—are you ready for this?—who are making over \$400,000—that is about six-tenths of 1 percent of the American people. Raise your hand in the gallery if you are making more than \$400,000.

By doing just that, we will both extend the solvency and enhance the program that is fully paid for and make sure the trust fund stays intact. That is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania fights for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LARSON for hosting this Special Order hour so we can discuss the importance of this country's most effective anti-poverty program.

Social Security is an earned benefit. It is the insurance people pay for with every paycheck, and it is the bedrock of retirement security, with benefits guaranteed to nearly all seniors.

In my district in the City of Brotherly Love, Philadelphia, there are about 120,000 Social Security recipients who receive \$194 million in monthly benefits. That includes many of our Nation's most vulnerable, including retirees, folks with disabilities, and children.

Social Security's guaranteed benefits keep many recipients from all demo-

graphic groups out of poverty, but these protections are especially vital to Black and Brown Americans. Without Social Security, 21.7 million more adults and children would be below the poverty line. That is why Democrats are consistently fighting to stop Republicans' attempts to dismantle this vital program.

Time and time again, Republicans have put forth plan after plan to cut Social Security benefits and raise the minimum retirement age. In the current Congress, they proposed a fiscal commission to address the national debt, which we all know is just a backdoor way to cut essential programs like Social Security and Medicare.

However, in contrast to Republicans, Democrats are offering a proposal that would protect and expand the Social Security program. That is why I am proud to support Congressman LARSON's Social Security 2100 Act. This transformative legislation would permanently increase benefits by 2 percent across the board on average for all Social Security beneficiaries for the first time in 52 years. We would pay for this bill by ensuring millionaires and billionaires finally pay their fair share into Social Security.

The American public is on our side when it comes down to protecting and expanding Social Security. Poll after poll finds that the vast majority of Americans believe Social Security benefits should not be reduced in any way and support a proposal to increase benefits. That is why I remain steadfast in opposing any and all cuts to Social Security, and I will continue to work with my Democratic colleagues to protect, expand, and deliver Social Security benefits to all those who have earned them.

Again, I thank Congressman LARSON for hosting this Special Order hour and thank him for his consistent leadership.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I, again, thank the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, Social Security Works, the Alliance for Retired Americans, the NAACP, the AFL-CIO, and AARP, which came out most recently condemning the so-called commission that is coming down the pike.

Every American should be aware of this. When they are talking about a debt commission, what they are talking about is cutting Social Security, a commission that goes behind closed doors and without public hearings decides what is going to be the future of Social Security.

Americans—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—support Social Security and enhancing it. Nobody knows that better than STEVE HORSFORD, who represents more than 150,000 Social Security recipients in his home State of Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut

(Mr. LARSON) for bringing us together for this important Special Order and to thank him for his tremendous leadership on Social Security as the ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security and for introducing the Social Security 2100 Act, which I am proud to be an original cosponsor of.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the urgent need for us to take action to protect and to improve one of the most important programs in our Nation, Social Security. It is shameful that it has been more than 50 years since Social Security benefits have been improved.

Social Security is vital to making sure our senior citizens, the disabled, and many children in Nevada and all across the country are able to keep a roof over their heads and to keep food on the table.

Mr. Speaker, there are 149,700 Social Security recipients in Nevada's Fourth Congressional District, which I am honored to represent. This includes 113,832 retirees, 8,380 children, 11,279 widows and spouses, and 16,209 disabled workers. Collectively, they receive \$248 million in monthly benefits in our district alone.

When beneficiaries receive their Social Security checks, what do they do? They turn around and spend that money in our communities, helping to churn the local economic engine.

I know some of my colleagues on the other side will say we can't afford it. Well, the truth is, we can't not afford it. By simply ensuring millionaires and billionaires pay just their fair share of FICA that everyone else who works every day does, we can absolutely afford it. With these funds, we can increase benefits for all recipients by 2 percent, which would be the first general increase in Social Security in over 52 years. You tell my constituents we can't afford it, and meanwhile they are struggling to afford their rent and their food.

Something else that I hear a lot about from my constituents is the fact that this bill, as proposed by Congressman LARSON, repeals the Windfall Elimination Provision, the WEP, and the Government Pension Offset that currently penalizes many workers who have worked in the public sector, including teachers in Nevada.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, I have one of the most diverse districts in the country, and I also have a significant military presence and many veterans who live in my district.

Social Security's progressive benefit formula is particularly important for groups that tend to earn lower wages during their working lives, which include African Americans and Latino families. For example, in 2020, average earnings were about \$41,000 for African Americans and \$38,000 for Hispanics.

The progressive formula means benefits replace a higher share of preretirement earnings for low-wage workers.

People of color are less likely to work for employers who offer pensions and less likely to receive pension benefits in retirement, which weakens their security.

In 2014, 30 percent of African American seniors, 19 percent of Latino seniors, and 25 percent of Asian American seniors received income from pensions or retirement benefits other than Social Security. This compares to 47 percent of White seniors.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Latino and Black seniors in my district and all across the country rely on Social Security for all or nearly all of their income.

After decades of hard work, they deserve the benefits that they have earned, and they deserve a program that keeps their benefits in line with inflation and the cost of living.

By preserving and expanding benefits, Social Security 2100 would increase retirement security for people of color who have worked hard and who depend upon Social Security in their retirement.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, nearly one in five adult Social Security beneficiaries are veterans. Military servicemembers pay FICA, earning future retirement, survivor, and disability benefits. Seriously injured veterans may be eligible for Social Security disability benefits.

Over 8 million veterans received Social Security benefits in 2022. This is more than 5.41 million veterans who received disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Social Security 2100 Act will extend the Social Security trust fund until 2066 and increase benefits for every recipient.

Only we, the Congress, can make the necessary changes to protect and enhance Social Security, and we must take that action.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this side of the aisle to put people over politics and to protect Social Security.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nevada. When he spoke, I was reminded of John Lewis, our fellow colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, who said that, in fact, Social Security is the civil rights movement.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN), someone who understands, with the birthday of Martin Luther King coming up this Monday, our celebration of that, and one of our leaders who truly understands the fierce urgency of now and what it means to have to pass Social Security for the constituents that we represent who need it the most.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of Americans—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents alike—are clear in their support for Social Security. In fact, nearly 9 in every 10 Americans oppose cutting Social Security.

That is because for the last 88 years, Social Security has helped millions of

Americans retire from a lifetime of work with the dignity that they deserve.

Despite the undeniable success and popularity of the program, House Republicans have remained relentless in their fight to dismantle and defund it.

What is worse, Mr. Speaker, is Republicans turning their backs on a fundamental promise to the American people—a sacred trust—where contributing to Social Security means the same safety net that supported our grandparents will be there to support us in retirement.

House Democrats still believe in that sacred trust. We want to uphold our end of the promise. That is why I am proud to support and join Congressman LARSON and members of the House Democratic Caucus in supporting Social Security 2100 to increase seniors' benefits, protect against inflation, and strengthen the program for generations to come.

I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his relentless, tireless leadership on this vital issue.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY). Together, we have gone across the State of Connecticut as we have talked about Social Security and its importance and significance.

Nobody understands it better, especially its impact on teachers and firefighters and police officers and municipal workers who have long been prevented through WEP and GPO. Under this bill, that all changes because of his efforts.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I begin by thanking my colleague, Congressman JOHN LARSON, for his thoughtful, courageous leadership on this issue, crafting Social Security 2100, which is the only comprehensive, paid-for measure which enhances Social Security and averts the 2034 cliff that this country is going to encounter if Congress does not act.

As Mr. LARSON stated, when the social insurance program was created in 1935, signed into law by Franklin Roosevelt, it was created as an insurance program.

Congress, over time and on numerous occasions, has reformed the bill to protect the basic promise, which was made by the Congress and by President Roosevelt, to make sure that people who are retired, children who have lost a parent, and in recent times, people with disability are protected from the vagaries of life.

Again, we have stepped forward and taken care of challenges, fiscal challenges, that the law has encountered.

What JOHN's bill would do, in essence, is extend the solvency of Social Security to 2066. We would avoid the cliff that we are going to hit in 2035. It would not gouge or cut any benefits.

The Republican Study Committee is talking about raising the retirement

age. That is a Social Security cut for people who have paid into this program out of payroll year in and year out.

It increases the benefits by 2 percent on average for all beneficiaries. It rebases the program so that people will not receive Social Security and be below the poverty line.

It is exactly, in other words, what this country is looking for, a program that affects every single American, every single family member.

Everybody cares about Social Security. It is our job, just like prior Congresses when they have been approaching these fiscal challenges, to act.

What we need is for JOHN's bill to be taken up and voted on. We don't need commissions that are going to take this bill behind closed doors with no transparency, which again is exactly the opposite of what the people of this country want.

They want to see what we are doing because this affects them and all those years of insurance payments that they have put into this program.

We need to take up JOHN LARSON's bill, Social Security 2100. Again, I implore the leadership of this Congress to move and to act and to not go down the path of a nontransparent commission, which is going to shut out the American people. That is not how we fix Social Security.

I thank Mr. LARSON for his leadership. Let's move forward on Social Security 2100.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the female dean of the United States Congress, who has more than 143,000 Social Security recipients in her district and has been a tireless fighter for Social Security before I even came to the United States Congress. We applaud her efforts.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member LARSON for yielding time and for his noble, tireless work safeguarding Social Security for the benefit of all Americans.

For nearly a century, America has made a sacred promise—those who work hard throughout their lives will benefit from the fruits of their labor upon retirement.

Social Security promises a safe and secure retirement for tens of millions of Americans during their golden years. Without action, that promise is at risk.

I hear from thousands of retirees across Northwestern Ohio who want to see a responsible solution to refinance Social Security going forward. One in five Social Security beneficiaries are veterans.

Let me observe that the billionaire class must join the vast majority of Americans in paying their fair share into the system itself.

By making that happen, the Social Security 2100 Act, championed by Congressman LARSON and all of us, will increase benefits for current and new

beneficiaries, protect retirees against inflation, and repeal the Windfall Elimination Provision.

We must push for a vote on the House floor as soon as possible. The Social Security 2100 Act is one of the most important bills before this Congress.

There are 182 House cosponsors of this bill. I ask Speaker JOHNSON to please move this bill to the floor for a vote.

Social Security is an earned benefit, and America made a promise to workers, and Democrats are committed to making good on that promise.

I am the granddaughter of immigrants. They worked at the lowest wages and the worst jobs—first fired, last hired. They simply could not have existed if it were not for Social Security. The same is true for my parents.

You see, Social Security is not just a program. It is a trust, a sacred insurance trust, and that trust is intergenerational. I thank Congressman JOHN LARSON for his dogged, persistent efforts to move this issue forward.

I may be the only Member here in this Chamber tonight who was present in the 98th Congress in April of 1983 after I was first elected to Congress and soon after became a deciding vote in April of that year for the refinancing of Social Security for the next generation.

What an unforgettable moment that was. I sat right in that seat right there, and I stood and I cheered because we had fought so hard for that in the prior election.

That close, eventful vote, so extremely important to refinancing Social Security for the first time in a generation, passed. Now, Congress must meet its responsibility for the succeeding generation.

The Speaker of the House back then was Tip O'Neill of Massachusetts. We had a Republican President, Ronald Reagan.

There had been a commission to preserve Social Security and Medicare before I became a Member of Congress.

In the same way Congressman LARSON has led this effort, this House had a member from Florida, Claude Pepper, who chaired the Aging Committee.

They called him Red Pepper, and like Congressman LARSON, he was a heart-and-soul Democrat from the inside and out and just a great guy.

We were able to move passage of the refinancing of Social Security for the next generation, and I knew that I had helped do that as a younger Member.

At that time, the country was also in a deep recession, and we knew that Social Security as an earned benefit was paid through hard work, and it deserved to be lifted again.

It also insures children whose parents or guardians have died. Two-thirds of families in my district rely on Social Security or Medicare benefits, and they are truly lifelines for millions of people.

Medicare has worked too, and we need to do what is possible to make all

healthcare more affordable for the American people.

We know the Social Security insurance program is something America can renew for all our families. We know it works, it is proven, and it lifts all boats.

From an economic standpoint, to pull the rug out from under Social Security would cause not only harm to individuals but economic harm in every Congressional district in this country.

People use Social Security to buy food, to pay their utility bills, to pay copays on their medical services, and for the basics of life.

These aren't families that squander money, but they have earned retirement security, and they watch every penny.

We in Ohio want to express a special thanks to Congressman LARSON for including in the bill the Windfall Elimination Provision, which harms our working families so very much. This issue does not impact every single State, but believe me, it really impacts Ohioans.

Again, I thank my colleagues for being here tonight with us who championed protecting this earned benefit and social safety net, and I and all of us here stand with America's working people and retirees to protect and improve Social Security.

Though each of us represents different communities, we, all together, represent America. We know that with the unwavering leadership of Congressman JOHN LARSON, he will lead us to a day where Social Security 2100 is the law of the land.

I thank Congressman JOHN LARSON for his perseverance and for helping to move our Nation forward to protect the hard-earned benefits for generations to come.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, we have 20 minutes remaining, and we have about 12 people who are sitting here, so I hope our colleagues are mindful of that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who has more than 98,000 Social Security recipients in her district who receive more than \$143 million monthly in that district, as we indicated just how vitally important Social Security is as an economic development plan as well.

□ 1700

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut for yielding. He is long serving and longstanding, and I have been together with Mr. LARSON on this issue it has to be two decades, and I can only thank him for realizing that people will simply die—I am going to

say that—without the lifeline of Social Security. He has recognized that, and that is why we are in the fight.

That is why we have to continue the fight. That is why we have to come back in the next Congress and get this done because if it is not done in this Congress—we must get it done. We must get it done.

Let me give you breaking news. Let me tell you why we are all on the floor, why there are 12 Members on the floor and there were others on the floor previously. This is a national crisis. The House Republican Study Committee, a caucus of 176 House Republican Members, has proposed multiple harsh cuts to Social Security in the fiscal year 2024 budget. Although the budget is vague on details, they will be holding—and may have held—a press conference, and reporting has come out that they intend to cut your Social Security. They intend to violate the very special sacred trust—yes, do violence to the sacred trust that from the days of President Roosevelt every American—except those, of course, that were in some of the professions of people of color that we had to fix—every American felt that they could live, that they could survive because of Social Security.

I want to thank JOHN LARSON for championing together on the Social Security 2100 Act to be able to bring about an increase of benefits of 2 percent across the board on the average for all Social Security beneficiaries for the first time in 52 years; improve the cost-of-living adjustment so it reflects inflation; increase benefits to boost lower income seniors; improve benefits for middle-income widows and widowers; restore student benefits up to age 26; increase access to benefits for children living with grandparents and other relatives; and celebrate—celebrate repealing the windfall elimination provision, which means in the government pension offset that currently penalizes public servants.

I can walk the streets of the 18th Congressional District, and when all of these hardworking public servants are saying: Have you helped me? I can say yes. We will end the 5-month waiting period.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to join Mr. LARSON in vigorous support of the Social Security 2100 Act and to be able to say that we are here because there is a crisis because there is purposeful intent to snatch Social Security from the hands of beneficiaries, including children. I want to stand with you in the passage of H.R. 2100 because I want the lifeline to continue. I want the story of President Roosevelt to continue in the hands of Americans, people of color, those who have started in life in a low income and those who may end life in a low income but have as their lifeline Social Security.

I am standing with you.

Mr. Speaker, since 1935, the Federal Government has provided Social Security coverage to the American people and kept the

promise that a lifetime of work will be rewarded with the peace of mind, certainty, and a sense of stable retirement.

Social Security has transformed what it means to grow old in this country. This system allows our citizens to retire gracefully and with honor.

Social Security is the United States' most effective anti-poverty line.

Social Security keeps 22.5 million Americans, including children above the poverty line.

There are 98,576 Social Security recipients in Texas who receive \$143 million in monthly benefits. 8,118 of those are children who rely on our support to go to school every day and live safe and secure lives.

In the 18th Congressional district, Social Security recipients inject more than \$97 million into the local economy annually; nationwide, this figure is \$775 billion.

It is Congress' responsibility to keep that promise and to fund Social Security for all Americans. Congress must also ensure the benefits keep up with Americans' expenses—today, tomorrow, and forever.

Social Security is a lifeline for many. Social Security has been a stable and secure source of income for millions of seniors and families, many of whom desperately need it.

As our population ages and increases in size, we must protect the benefits that we have become accustomed to for current Social Security recipients and all future recipients.

We must work together to strengthen and protect Social Security, which is why I am a strong supporter of H.R. 4583, the Social Security 2100 Act.

Far too often, it is overlooked the seismic impact that Social Security has had in shaping our national economy and the structure of life chances for hundreds of millions of Americans through the years.

According to the 2022 Social Security Trustees report, if Congress does not act to correct Social Security funding issues, retirees will start receiving reduced benefits starting in 2034.

Reduced benefits would force millions of Americans into poverty.

For about half of senior beneficiaries, Social Security provides a majority of their income.

These seniors have worked extensively and paid into the Social Security system like they were asked to.

They held up their end of the bargain.

Congress must ensure that we are able to hold up our end of the bargain.

H.R. 4583 would increase social security benefits, improve the Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA), ensure no one retires into poverty, and repeals provisions that currently penalize many public servants.

We must continue to support our seniors, veterans, and children who all benefit from Social Security.

I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentlewoman for her continued input and support over the last several decades.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT), who has been key as an original co-sponsor of the Social Security 2100 Act and also for his passion about the people in his district who are in such need

of Social Security to make sure that it is there today, tomorrow, and in the future.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of Mr. LARSON, if he would yield for a quick question.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Sure.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. It is my recollection, I could be wrong, but I think it was in the year 2014 that you first came out with the Social Security 2100 Act. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. That is correct.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. So here we are 10 years on, and I want you to know I was an original cosponsor of that in 2014, and I was proud to do it, and I thank you for dreaming this whole idea up because it is so important.

We know that it is the retirement of the baby boomer generation, this glut of population going into retirement that is the problem. We know that 2035 is the current doomsday year when we are not able to pay 100 cents on the dollar on claims. It is not a surprise that this has been coming because we knew about the baby boomer generation, and that is why you came up with this 10 years ago because it is not a surprise, and we have to prepare for it.

Mr. Speaker, I speak here not of behalf of myself but on behalf of 176,000 beneficiaries of Social Security in my Congressional District in northeastern Pennsylvania, the vast majority of which are seniors, and the answer is we can't do nothing. We know what happens if we do nothing and we just get closer and closer to the 2035 cliff or whatever year it is going to be.

I am sorry to say that if we do nothing, we end up with the Republican answer, and the Republican answer again and again and again is cut benefits and raise the retirement age. That is what happens if we do nothing.

Cut benefits? Cut benefits? This is a program that is one of the most successful government programs—it is not even a government program; it is an insurance program. It is one of the most successful things that the government has done for American citizens in the history of our republic.

We have kept millions of people from dying in poverty as seniors in this country. We know that right now in excess of 30 percent of seniors receiving Social Security benefits have no other viable source of support. If you take it away from them, they will die in poverty.

We know that probably the most outrageous thing of all is it breaks a promise if you cut benefits. The promise was that you work your whole life, you pay in the premiums and your FICA, you pay in your whole work life, and you will be protected from poverty in your senior years. This would break the promise to cut the benefits.

Raising the retirement age? It has already been described as a cut. It is a cut. It is a change. All of a sudden you have to work longer and longer and longer. To those of us who sit behind a

desk for a living it is not that big of a problem, but there are people who have to lift and carry and climb and dig. And to make them do these things into their senior years just because we refused to do anything about this impending fiscal cliff, it is not right, it is not ethical, and it is not American.

Every time you hear the words “fiscal commission,” oh, we should have a fiscal commission, ladies and gentlemen, put your hands on your wallets when you hear those words “fiscal commission” because that is all they ever have proposed with fiscal commissions, cutting benefits and raising the retirement age.

The right answer is the Social Security 2100 Act. We have to adjust the cap so it makes sense so that it is egalitarian so that all Americans are included so that we can raise the benefits by 2 percent for the first time in over 50 years. We have to adjust this cap. We have to pass this bill. We have to put people over politics and protect Social Security.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LIEU).

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LARSON for his terrific leadership on Social Security. Many people here have been hearing about Social Security 2,100.

I just want to talk a little bit about what is actually in this amazing bill. It increases a number of benefits, including increases benefits 2 percent across the board. It improves the cost-of-living adjustment. It increases benefits to boost lower income seniors. It improves benefits for widows and widowers. It restores student benefits up to age 26. It increases access to benefits for children. It repeals the windfall elimination provision. It ends the 5-month waiting period. It increases benefits by an additional 5 percent for the most elderly. It provides caregiver credits and ends the disability benefit cliff.

How does it do that? It does it by ensuring millionaires and billionaires pay their fair share, and it closes a loophole of avoiding FICA taxes, and it puts an investment income tax only for people making over \$400,000.

This is an amazing bill. It is time we pass Representative JOHN LARSON’s Social Security 2100 Act to preserve Social Security for this generation and generations to come.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LARSON for being the voice of Social Security and the voice of the future.

I rise today for almost 150,000 recipients in my district in southern New Jersey, the First District, for those American families who have worked hard, played by the rules, and paid their taxes, as we all do.

For so many Americans, Social Security is all they have at the end of their

career. Since 1935, Social Security has provided stability, security, and protection for America’s seniors. That protection and stability is needed as we stare down that looming retirement security crisis in 2035, literally 100 years since Social Security started.

One in three Americans have less than \$5,000 saved. Fewer workers have access to a pension. Stagnant wages make it harder for people to save. Rarely do I say there is a good side or a bad side because it is usually in the middle. Well, there is no gray here. Social Security is clear. We need to protect it and expand the system that saves seniors or soon-to-be seniors.

Americans expect a future, and they earned a future where they can retire with dignity, and we need to work hard for them. The GOP once again is threatening to cut Social Security for people who don’t have anywhere else to go. The fear that our seniors are going through when you hear about that fiscal commission is nothing short of cruelty. That is why I am proud to be a sponsor of John’s Social Security 2100 Act. I will always fight for those seniors.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, for 40 percent of all Americans on Social Security the only benefit that they receive is Social Security, and that is why the gentleman’s point is so well taken.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. LARSON, the ranking member of the Social Security Subcommittee for his leadership on this issue and for organizing this important Special Order to talk about the work that Democrats are doing to protect and expand Social Security and thank him for doing a telephone town hall with me for the people in District One so that they could ask questions about what is happening and how this measure would help.

In my district there are 113,000 Nevadans—that is District One in Las Vegas in Henderson—who rely on Social Security just to make ends meet. It represents the U.S. Government at its very best. In fact, it is one of the most successful programs in our history, and it is vital that we protect it for future generations.

Now, while we are here talking about what the Democrats want to do to protect and expand it, the Republicans, even as we speak, are continuing to threaten Social Security.

Now, Mr. JOHNSON is new at his job of Speaker, but he is not new to this issue. As the former chair of the Republican Study Committee, he repeatedly called for Social Security benefits to be reduced.

In fact, this year’s Republican Study Committee budget would cut benefits by 13 percent and at the same time raise the retirement age to 69, providing seniors with fewer benefits for more work. Raising the retirement age would disproportionately harm low-

and middle-income seniors who rely most heavily on Social Security, forcing them to delay their well-earned retirement often from backbreaking jobs.

Furthermore, the Republicans’ terrible Labor-HHS appropriations bill would cut Social Security funding by 30 percent, closing 240 offices around the country and extending wait times for service.

□ 1715

We cannot let Republicans do this and play games with Social Security. That is why I am very proud to be an original cosponsor of Mr. LARSON’s bill. You have heard the ways that it protects and expands Social Security. We need to bring it up, we need to pass it, and I stand strongly in support of that.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LARSON for bringing us together.

Extremist Republicans are once again pushing to end Social Security as we know it, a critical program that supports 67 million people nationwide, 93,000 of them in my district.

Make no mistake, cutting Social Security will not help the average American, but instead, it will line the pockets of wealthy corporations while seniors and children suffer.

Americans work and pay their entire lives to access Social Security. It is their lifeline. Every single day, Mr. Speaker, I hear from Inland Empire residents asking to protect and expand Social Security.

Just in 2022, when we gave an 8.7 percent COLA increase—which was, by the way, the largest increase since the Reagan era—my constituents were delighted to have this increase.

This is what we must focus on, increasing benefits for the poor citizens that have paid into this program. They are not asking for a handout. They are asking for a program to be reaffirmed, and that is why I support the Social Security 2100 Act.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that during this Special Order hour on Social Security, it is only Democratic Members of Congress who have volunteered to speak. Heck, this GOP-controlled Congress isn’t getting anything else done, so why don’t we take up Social Security 2100.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of Social Security 2100 and that I have been every single term that I have been here, because I believe that Social Security is a promise. You spend a lifetime working hard and paying into the system so that you can retire with some dignity and security. It is not just something that seniors depend on, it is something that they have earned.

They aren’t getting rich on it. For most, it gives our seniors a bare-bones economic existence, but it is vital to

them. That is why I have made it my mission to protect and strengthen this critical program.

Protecting and strengthening Social Security means standing up to extremist proposals from the GOP, ones that have laid out cuts or privatization proposals that call for sunsetting the programs every 5 years and statements that suggest that we “pull Social Security up by the roots and get rid of it.” Outrageous.

The GOP is hell-bent on destroying the only economic security that is available to most of our retirees. That is why we need Social Security 2100. This bill would increase benefits across the board for Social Security beneficiaries and would improve the cost-of-living adjustment formula for keeping up with inflation.

Social Security 2100 would provide a tax cut for working- and middle-class beneficiaries; it would end the waiting period for receiving disability benefits; and it would provide caregiver credits for all of those who have had to take time out of their careers to care for a loved one, and so much more.

It is essential for millions of Americans. In my district, more than 166,800 people depend on Social Security, so I am never going to stop working to protect and strengthen this program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman’s time has expired.

Members are reminded to refrain from referencing occupants and guests in the gallery.

Does the gentleman from Connecticut have a motion to adjourn?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, first I would appeal to your great instincts and patience and thank you for this hour, but we actually have colleagues, at least four, that are here. Over 30 showed up.

Would it be possible to yield them a minute apiece?

I would make a motion to extend the time period to provide our colleagues a minute apiece.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 1 minute each?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot accept a motion to extend time, but Members may ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move for a 1-minute speech from the remaining four Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be recognized for 1 minute speeches?

SOCIAL SECURITY IS NOT MERELY A GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

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

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LARSON for his inspired and indefatigable leadership on this critical issue.

As someone who represents nearly 100,000 Social Security beneficiaries in

the Massachusetts 7th and as a co-chair for the Task Force on Aging and Families, I am so proud to be an original cosponsor of your Social Security 2100 Act.

This is a deeply consequential issue that stands to impact individuals from every walk of life—women, children, people of color, veterans, and our seniors—who have the right, who have earned the right, to age in dignity.

Too often they tell me that doing so is becoming more and more difficult. They share their anxieties of living on a fixed income. They are skeptical of the long-term stability of a system they have paid into, paycheck after paycheck, their entire working lives; people like Mrs. Palmer who lives in Boston and wrote my office saying that Social Security is a promise.

I agree. It is not merely a government program. Social Security is a promise to workers, to our elders, to the disabled, a promise to all people who seek to age with dignity. We will keep fighting to keep that promise.

IN SUPPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Social Security 2100 bill, and I thank Representative LARSON for introducing it.

Social Security is a promise. It is a promise that if you work hard and do the right thing and pay into the system during your career, you will be able to retire with dignity in this country.

Unfortunately, too many of my colleagues are obsessed with trying to cut and undermine this vital program. They say there is not enough money in the trust fund, while many of them voted for \$10 trillion of tax cuts that went primarily to the wealthy and to the biggest corporations just a few years ago. They could find \$10 trillion for tax cuts for the people at the top, but then they claim they can’t find any money to shore up the Social Security system.

Here is the truth: We can increase cost-of-living adjustments, increase benefits of Social Security, and extend the life of the trust fund indefinitely by just asking the people at the very top to pay their fair share. That is what this bill does. It asks the Elon Musks and Jeff Bezoses of the world to pay a fair share into the trust fund so that working people can retire in dignity.

IN SUPPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a proud cosponsor of the Social Security 2100 Act, a bill that will enhance Social Security benefits for the first time in 50 years and ensure this program’s solvency for years to come.

In my district, more than 157,000 retirees and families rely on Social Security as their primary source of income. Social Security doesn’t just help retirees. Almost 10,000 children and more than 20,000 disabled workers in my district depend on Social Security to meet their basic expenses.

Social Security was there when my mother-in-law, a stay-at-home mom, was suddenly widowed at 28 years old and left with four young children to raise on her own. Social Security was there to help her get through the tragic loss of her husband and to figure out how to support her young family.

I stand in support of Social Security. I will stand up to any politician who wants to take away or reduce those earned benefits.

A SECRET FISCAL COMMISSION

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing us this opportunity.

Is it really true, Mr. Speaker? Perhaps Mr. LARSON has told me that the Republicans intend to put together some sort of a fiscal commission specifically designed to go after Social Security, to cut the benefits, and to really jeopardize the well-being of seniors now and future seniors? Could that possibly be correct?

Apparently it is. A secret fiscal commission. There is another way of doing it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. LARSON has put together a proposal that would guarantee Social Security solvency for years to come. It would require that the super wealthy have to pay their fair share.

What is wrong with that? Nothing that I can think of.

We can also actually increase the annual COLA by going to the fair COLA bill which was introduced by—wow, my bill. Mr. LARSON, you have that in your bill. Good for you. Good for the seniors. Good for the future of America.

We can do this correctly, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. LARSON’s bill, Social Security 2100, would actually become law.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o’clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 11, 2024, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

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 Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. TORRES of

California, Mr. LAWLER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. MOLINARO):

H.R. 6929. A bill to appropriate funds for the Affordable Connectivity Program of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CROW (for himself, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. SARBAKES, and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 6930. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require political committees to file separate reports for contributions of \$1,000 or more which are received fewer than 20 days before the date of any election in which the committee makes a contribution to, or an expenditure or electioneering communication on behalf of or in opposition to, a candidate or political party in the election, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDWARDS (for himself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 6931. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to improve that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. EDWARDS (for himself and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 6932. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to require the inclusion of low-head dams in the national dam inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. KIM of California, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 6933. A bill to provide the National Credit Union Administration Board flexibility to increase Federal credit union loan maturities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. DONALDS, Ms. MACE, and Mr. GOODEN of Texas):

H.R. 6934. A bill to protect the right of parents to direct the upbringing of their children as a fundamental right; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ (for herself, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. LIEU, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 6935. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts, to award grants for arts and creative workforce programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LIEU (for himself, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. MOLINARO):

H.R. 6936. A bill to require Federal agencies to use the Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology with respect to the use of artificial intelligence; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself and Mr. MOLINARO):

H.R. 6937. A bill to provide for the improved collection of data for organic dairy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Mr. McGOVERN):

H.R. 6938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the deduction

for personal casualty losses as in effect prior to the enactment of Public Law 115-97 (commonly referred to as the "Tax Cuts and Jobs Act"); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENDALE (for himself, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRY, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. OGLES, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. COLLINS):

H.R. 6939. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to continue to implement the Migrant Protection Protocols, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENDALE (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 6940. A bill to effect a moratorium on immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENDALE (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MCCUAUL, Mr. FRY, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. OGLES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. COLLINS):

H.R. 6941. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit fleeing law enforcement officers enforcing immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENDALE (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 6942. A bill to prevent congressional reapportionment distortions by requiring that, in the questionnaires used in the taking of any decennial census of population, a checkbox or other similar option be included for respondents to indicate citizenship status or lawful presence in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 6943. A bill to provide for individual property rights in likeness and voice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. BROWNLEY):

H.R. 6944. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a catastrophic property loss reinsurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 6945. A bill to require enforcement against misbranded egg alternatives; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STRICKLAND (for herself and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 6946. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a compensation fund for military firefighters exposed to PFAS; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. LANDSMAN):

H.R. 6947. A bill to establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs a Veterans Affairs History Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 6948. A bill to authorize affordable housing construction as an eligible activity under the Community Development Block Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 6949. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YAKYM (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 6950. A bill to require agencies with working dog programs to implement the recommendations of the Government Accountability Office relating to the health and welfare of working dogs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah:

H. Res. 954. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee for the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BERA, Mr. BARR, Mr. MCCUAUL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. DOGETT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. OGLES, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. KIM of California, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. TRONE, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H. Res. 955. A resolution commending Taiwan for its history of democratic elections, and expressing support of Taiwan in the preservation of its democratic institutions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI:

H. Res. 956. A resolution expressing the great contributions to American society by Indian-American communities and the graduates of the Indian Institutes of Technology in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

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 Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 6929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is: Funding for the Affordable Connectivity Program

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 6930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require political committees to file separate reports for contributions of \$1,000 or more which are received fewer than 20 days before the date of any election in which the committee makes a contribution to, or an expenditure or electioneering communication on behalf of or in opposition to, a candidate or political party in the election.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 6931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7—"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of Appropriations made by Law;"

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—"Regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

The single subject of this legislation is:

Reauthorizes funding for the National Dam Safety Program through FY2028 and makes improvements to the National Dam Safety Act.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 6932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

"Regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amends the National Dam Safety Act to require the inclusion of low-head dams in the National Dam Inventory.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H.R. 6933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize the National Credit Union Administration Board to increase the federal credit union loan maturity cap from 15 to 20 years and allow loan maturities for 1-4 unit principal and non-principal residences to be extended to 30 years.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 6934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution. "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The single subject of this legislation is:

to protect the right of parents to direct the upbringing of their children as a fundamental right.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ:

H.R. 6935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Workforce Development

By Mr. LIEU:

H.R. 6936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

Artificial Intelligence

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 6937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

The single subject of this legislation is:

Data

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 6938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill reinstates the deduction for personal casualty losses as in effect prior to the enactment of Public Law 115-97

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 6939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Border security

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 6940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 6941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Law enforcement

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 6942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Decennial census

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 6943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Individual Rights

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 6944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Insurance

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 6945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require enforcement against misbranded egg alternatives.

By Ms. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 6946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To create a compensation fund for military

fire fighters exposed to PFAS

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 6947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs a Veterans Affairs History Office, and for other purposes.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 6948.

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:

Housing and Community Development

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 6949.

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:

Housing and Community Development

By Mr. YAKYM:

H.R. 6950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would require federal government agencies with working dog programs to implement the recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office in their October 2022 report.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. AMO.

H.R. 16: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 33: Ms. VELÁQUEZ.

H.R. 82: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. AMO.

H.R. 175: Mr. GUEST and Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 333: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 529: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 533: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 537: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 574: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 623: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 645: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 700: Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 709: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 726: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 751: Ms. LETLOW.

H.R. 766: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 793: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

H.R. 797: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 802: Mr. YAKYM and Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 807: Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. KUSTOFF, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 905: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 907: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 926: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 1087: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1088: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1097: Mr. ALFORD, Mr. BOST, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CAREY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. MILLS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BACON, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1116: Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 1117: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1118: Mr. McGARVEY.

H.R. 1139: Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 1179: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. McCaul.

H.R. 1191: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida and Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 1222: Mr. FROST, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1247: Ms. SCHOLTEN.

H.R. 1262: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 1273: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1277: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1278: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1369: Mrs. LUNA.

H.R. 1406: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 1413: Mrs. KIM of California and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1437: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 1491: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 1638: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 1716: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1721: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1737: Ms. NORTON and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1770: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1810: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.

H.R. 1812: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 1831: Mr. CLINE and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1833: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1840: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2367: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 2395: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2407: Mr. IVEY, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. FRY.

H.R. 2413: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 2440: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mrs. KIM of California.

H.R. 2441: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 2479: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 2501: Mr. LIEU, Mr. CASAR, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 2537: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 2552: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 2573: Ms. LEE of California and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 2706: Mr. DUNN of Florida.

H.R. 2726: Mr. THANEDAR.

H.R. 2728: Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 2748: Ms. HAGEMAN.

H.R. 2753: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 2831: Mr. MAGAZINER.

H.R. 2869: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2880: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.

H.R. 2889: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2923: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2955: Ms. SPANBERGER and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 2965: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 2967: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 2983: Mr. FRY.

H.R. 3009: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3018: Ms. BALINT, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 3036: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 3074: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3079: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3090: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3139: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 3238: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 3366: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 3380: Mr. McGOVERN.

H.R. 3408: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 3413: Mr. BANKS, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 3433: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, and Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H.R. 3474: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3475: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3481: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3541: Ms. BUDZINSKI.

H.R. 3605: Ms. ROSS and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3606: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 3638: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 3651: Ms. BROWNLEY and Mr. MANN.

H.R. 3676: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 3734: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.

H.R. 3824: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 3876: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3916: Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 3917: Ms. NORTON and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3925: Mrs. PELTOLA.

H.R. 3957: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 3970: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, and Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 4010: Ms. BROWN.

H.R. 4050: Mrs. RAMIREZ and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 4052: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4069: Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 4089: Mr. PAPPAS and Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 4123: Mr. BANKS and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 4170: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 4224: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 4263: Ms. PEREZ.

H.R. 4277: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 4316: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 4345: Mr. BANKS and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 4432: Ms. PEREZ, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. GALLEGUO, Ms. MANNING, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 4539: Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 4565: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 4569: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4602: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 4612: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 4663: Mr. TRONE, Mr. MAGAZINER, and Mr. IVEY.

H.R. 4708: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 4714: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 4721: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 4736: Mr. STAUBER and Ms. CROCKETT.

H.R. 4750: Mr. NEHLS and Mr. MOLINARO.

H.R. 4758: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4774: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 4856: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4864: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 4899: Mr. MOLINARO.

H.R. 4933: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 4993: Mr. DUNN of Florida.

H.R. 5003: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 5008: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 5012: Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEMERER, and Mrs. SYKES.

H.R. 5048: Ms. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 5064: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁQUEZ, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 5104: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 5244: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 5344: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 5399: Mr. VASQUEZ.

H.R. 5401: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 5408: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 5420: Mr. MOLINARO.

H.R. 5455: Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 5501: Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 5513: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 5530: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. DE LA CRUZ.

H.R. 5563: Mr. BOWMAN, Mrs. FOUSHÉE, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 5601: Mr. DELUZIO, Mrs. FOUSHÉE, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 5669: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 5683: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 5710: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 5754: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 5776: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 5799: Mr. BEAN of Florida.

H.R. 5840: Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 5854: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MC CORMICK.

H.R. 5867: Mr. DUNN of Florida.

H.R. 5909: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 5940: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 5976: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 6021: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 6030: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 6031: Ms. PEREZ.

H.R. 6046: Mr. STEUBE and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.

H.R. 6090: Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 6091: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6129: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEMERER.

H.R. 6140: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 6175: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.

H.R. 6284: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 6301: Mr. TRONE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 6318: Ms. BALINT.

H.R. 6319: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 6374: Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 6429: Mr. SELF and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 6485: Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 6492: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 6502: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 6504: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 6515: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. RAMIREZ, and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 6530: Mr. CAREY, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. MOYLAN.

H.R. 6538: Mr. VAN ORDEN.

H.R. 6553: Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, and Mr. SWALWELL.

H.R. 6578: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 6581: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 6608: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 6643: Ms. BALINT.

H.R. 6657: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. ALFORD.

H.R. 6687: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 6698: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 6706: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6744: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 6762: Mrs. FISCHBACH and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 6789: Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 6810: Mr. DUNN of Florida and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 6827: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York and Mr. TORRES of New York.

H.R. 6830: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 6831: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 6832: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 6862: Mr. MOYLAN.

H.R. 6885: Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 6906: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 6914: Mrs. HOUCHIN and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 6918: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. CRENshaw, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOORE of Utah, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 6922: Mr. LANGWORTHY.

H.R. 6926: Ms. TENNEY.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. KUSTER.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. TRONE.

H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. NORCROSS.

H. Res. 380: Mr. LAWLER.

H. Res. 419: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 540: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 542: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H. Res. 627: Mr. FEENSTRA and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 774: Mr. LAWLER and Ms. TENNEY.

H. Res. 806: Mr. VALADAO.

H. Res. 851: Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 881: Mr. COHEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 883: Ms. TENNEY.

H. Res. 901: Mr. LAWLER.

H. Res. 935: Mr. PETERS.

H. Res. 941: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. BICE, H. Res. 942: Mr. QUIGLEY.
and Mr. CLINE.

H. Res. 943: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. JOHNSON
of Georgia.