



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 2024

No. 67

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 17, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY K. WEBER, Sr. 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.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISCOVERY OF NEW YORK BAY BY GIOVANNI DA VERRAZZANO

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 recognize the anniversary of the discovery of New York Bay by Giovanni da Verrazzano, which occurred 500 years ago today.

Giovanni da Verrazzano of Florence, Italy, was the first to lead an expedi-

tion to find a western passage from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific. On April 17, 1524, Verrazzano entered New York Bay, becoming the first to chart the East Coast of the United States.

His discovery expanded maritime knowledge and sparked inspiration for other explorations, including Henry Hudson's voyage to New York Bay that established New Amsterdam 85 years later.

Since then, New York City has become a global economic hub for trade and commerce and has the highest economic impact of any city in the United States.

To commemorate the significant impact of Verrazzano's discovery, in 1960, Governor Rockefeller named the bridge in our district connecting the boroughs of Staten Island and Brooklyn the Verrazzano Narrows Bridge.

Since 1885, the Statue of Liberty has proudly sat in New York Bay, where she welcomed over 12 million immigrants who legally passed through Ellis Island between 1892 and 1954. Today, New York City is home to 8.8 million people, 800,000 of whom are of Italian descent, with the largest population of Italian-Americans residing in my district.

New York City takes great pride in Giovanni da Verrazzano's discovery, and I join our community in celebrating his historic achievements today.

THE BORDER IS NOT SECURE

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a New York City Representative in a post-9/11 world to talk about how concerned I am that our border is not secure.

Since Joe Biden took office, CBP has encountered at least 340 individuals on the terrorist watch list along the southern border or in our interior.

For example, an Afghan migrant on the terrorist watch list spent nearly 1 year inside the United States after he was apprehended and released by CBP

agents in March of 2023. He was processed at the border.

CBP released him without alerting ICE officials about potential terrorism ties, and he was free to fly domestically in the United States. He was arrested in February 2024, then released by an immigration judge in March, who was not told that he was a national security risk.

Last month, an illegal immigrant from Lebanon caught at the border admitted to CBP that he was a member of Hezbollah and was headed to New York to try to make a bomb.

In February of 2024, ICE apprehended another terrorist who was allowed to roam in the U.S. for nearly 1 year after crossing the border illegally, and the terrorist was a member of Al-Shabaab, who was only arrested after ICE became aware of his threat to national security.

Additionally, in February, a Colombian man on the terrorist watch list was caught crossing into the Eagle Pass area.

In August of last year, it was discovered that a smuggler with ISIS ties helped more than a dozen Uzbek migrants into the United States over the southern border.

In April of 2021, CBP announced that they had arrested two Yemeni men on the terrorist watch list in separate incidents as they attempted to illegally cross the southern border in California, and they were both on no-fly lists.

Again, we have caught at least 340 individuals, either at the border or in the interior. However, the more concerning number is who did we not catch? We know that nearly 2 million people, estimated by CBP, have entered this country without any encounter by government or law enforcement. We don't know who they are, where they are, or what their intentions are. That comes down to about 800 individuals a day.

We need to secure our border, particularly with growing threats from

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.

H2447

Iran—who said they want to commit an attack on our own soil—and Russia and China. If we are going to send our allies money, which we should support our allies, we need to ensure that our own homeland is secure against these threats, as well.

Even the FBI Director is confirming that joint terrorism task forces in all 56 of FBI's field offices are occupied with threats coming across our border.

It is unconscionable to me that the President refuses to reverse any of his more than 60 border policies that he changed via executive order. It is also unconscionable to me that Senator SCHUMER refuses to work with us to force the President to reverse these policies, because the President has discretion and put these policies in place to begin with and can reverse them.

I believe our Speaker needs to go back to Joe Biden and CHUCK SCHUMER and say: If we are going to pass foreign aid, we must have at least a few commonsense border protection measures in there. I don't think it is that hard to ask from Republicans or Democrats to say at least let's prohibit individuals who are gang members, terrorists, or criminals from entering into this country.

AN EMBATTLED ISRAEL AND A BELEAGUERED UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMICK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the previous speaker of the bipartisan bill from the Senate, which does, in fact, deal with the critical issue she raised. The leadership of the Republican Party has refused to take up that bill.

However, there is a more important issue that confronts this House that we should have acted on days, weeks, months ago. That is the security of the global community, the sanctity of international law, and the saving of the sovereignty of Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of an embattled Israel and a beleaguered Ukraine and apprehensive allies around the world.

A month ago, Speaker JOHNSON said: "No one wants Vladimir Putin to prevail. I am of the opinion that he wouldn't stop in Ukraine. If he was allowed, he'd go through all the way through Europe."

The Speaker said: "There is a right and wrong there—a good versus evil, in my view. And Ukraine is the victim here. They were invaded. We stand with good."

The Speaker went on to say: "I understand the timetable and I understand the necessity of the urgency of the funding."

Yet, we twiddle our thumbs without any paper on this floor as to how we are going to affect the urgent end of which the Speaker spoke.

Speaker JOHNSON then said on April 16: "We need steady leadership. We

need steady hands on the wheel. Look, I regard myself as a wartime Speaker."

If the Speaker regards himself as that, Speaker JOHNSON must act now. There is no time for delay. There is no time for political chaos to impede our aid to Ukraine.

Clearly, we are not acting urgently. If we did, we would have allowed us to pass the Senate national security bill a long time ago. Putin has to be happy with the failure to bring the Senate bill to the floor. It must look like "Gulliver's Travels" with the little people in America, the Lilliputians who are in our midst tying down America's ability to respond.

We have seen the consequences of House inaction. Over the weekend, Iran made an unprecedented attack on Israel, launching roughly 350 drones and missiles at targets across the country. They see an unresolved United States, although Israel shot down nearly all of them with the support of America.

God bless President Biden and our allies. The audacity and breadth of Iran's attack ought to concern us all as Americans and as global citizens.

In Ukraine, we have allowed our allies to run so low on ammunition that their air defenses cannot fend off similar air attacks. Shame on America. Shame on this House.

Indeed, Iran supplies Putin with the same drones and missiles to strike Ukrainian cities. Meanwhile, Ukraine's soldiers are so starved for ammunition that they wade into swamps in search of abandoned Russian artillery shells they can reuse. That is how committed they are to winning this war, and that is how desperate they are for our aid. This Congress has failed to provide it for them for 473 days.

The world watches us and wonders: Does America remain the defender of freedom, democracy, and its allies, or has the wellspring of democracy run dry? The free world expects more from the great arsenal of democracy, and so should we.

Most Members of this House agree. Over 300 Members of this House have voted for the proposition contained in the Senate bill. On seven occasions in the past year, over 300 Democrats and Republicans voted to aid Ukraine. Even more of us voted to aid Israel.

We are not a silent majority, but a silenced majority, silenced by a Speaker who refused to give us a vote. It will pass. He could put the Senate supplemental on the floor at any moment. It would pass with a large bipartisan majority.

Freedom is waiting upon us today. International law is waiting for us to redress the grievance that has occurred by Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, let us act now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HOYER. Ukraine's time has expired.

IN RECOGNITION OF DAVID PLANNING

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest hockey coaches of all time, Herb Brooks, once said: "Let me start with issuing you a challenge: Be better than you are. Set a goal that seems unattainable, and when you reach that goal, set another one even higher."

I can think of few people who have consistently risen to that challenge better than our floor director, David Planning.

As the head of our whip operation for the last 1½ years, David has played an integral part in making sure our House Republican majority delivers on our agenda for the American people, and with the slimmest majority in history, who only controls barely one-half of one-third of the government, making sure we get our priorities across the finish line is no easy feat.

However, in large part, thanks to David's grit, professionalism, and insatiable desire to win, House Republicans have been able to pass signature pieces of legislation that much larger majorities could not.

Nevertheless, it is not just David's fierce competitiveness that makes him great. It is the intentional relationships he has created with people across every sector of our Conference. It is the steadiness he exudes no matter how high the stakes, and it is his positivity that not only makes him a winner, but makes him an incredible teammate.

Competitor, winner, teammate—those are the words that come to mind when I think about David Planning. Although we are quite sad for him to leave us as he moves on to another career opportunity at the end of the month, I have no doubt that those characteristics will continue to carry him far.

David, thank you for your service, not just to our office, but for our entire House Republican Conference. Thank you for your steadfast commitment to our commonsense conservative agenda. Thank you for giving up so many nights, weekends, and holidays to make sure that our Conference is successful in our mission to counteract Joe Biden and the Democrats' failed agenda.

Mr. Speaker, most importantly, I thank him for his friendship and the incredible memories that we are going to have from the last 15 months. May he never stop setting and reaching his goals. We cannot wait to see how he excels outside the Halls of Congress, and we wish him nothing but the best in his next chapter.

□ 1015

CALLING FOR CEASE-FIRE AND DE-ESCALATION IN MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the massacre of the Palestinian people and the urgent need to de-escalate the Middle East.

For months now, after the brutal attack on October 7, the world has watched in horror as the crisis in Gaza has worsened daily. Today, less than 200 days later, nearly 34,000 Palestinians have been killed by Israeli forces.

Every day that goes by without a cease-fire is another day that Palestinians are subjected to violence, starvation, death, and destruction.

Every day that we do not de-escalate the region, more lives are put at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn the Iranian military's attack on Israel, and I condemn the Israeli military's attack on the Iranian consulate in Syria.

These escalations are dangerous, and we now find ourselves at a critical inflection point. We can either leverage diplomacy to de-escalate tensions and push for peace, or we can stand idly by as this spirals into a broader regional conflict that will result in more loss of life—Palestinian, Israeli, and American.

We must de-escalate, and facilitating a lasting cease-fire in the region is the only path forward.

Some of my colleagues seem all too willing to rush into an endless war with Iran and continue providing a blank check to the Israeli military.

Right now, Palestinians in Gaza are being starved, bombed, tortured, and executed. Generations of Palestinian families have been wiped out. Over 2 million are displaced from homes that have been razed to the ground. Make no mistake: History will remember this moment as a genocide.

We cannot bomb our way to peace, and the U.S. must stop using our tax dollars to arm the Israeli military with more bombs and bullets. These are the same bombs and bullets that have been used to kill over 14,000 children in Gaza. It is shameful.

It is why we see momentum across the globe in support of a cease-fire. Millions are marching peacefully in the streets. A cease-fire is the mandate, a cease-fire to surge humanitarian aid, a cease-fire to bring all the hostages home, a cease-fire to save lives.

We will never be silent in the face of injustice. We need a cease-fire now.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LUKE BAILEY SANTOS

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Luke Bailey Santos of Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Our community is devastated over the loss of Luke. He was a force for good and a bright light in politics and our world. Luke believed deeply in the power of community organizing and could build meaningful relationships with folks from any and every walk of life because he cared deeply.

He knew that our destinies were tied and our humanity connected. He had a

heart for storytelling, as well. He represented the best of us, a genuine person who loved his family, his friends, and the pursuit of justice.

Luke never had an agenda, only passion. He was ready to roll up his sleeves and play any role. Our team often described him as a wunderkind and the kid who would be President someday.

Mr. Speaker, I am devastated that Luke's time on this Earth was so short. His 20 years were filled with meaning and contribution and love. He made every day count, and every day, he made our world better. In his name, we will continue the work of building a more just world.

HONORING THE LIFE OF A TRUE COMMUNITY BUILDER, PAUL PARRAVANO

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the passing of a true community builder, the unofficial "Mayor of MIT," Mr. PAUL Parravano.

Paul was compelled to work "so tell me about yourself" into every single conversation he had, and he meant it, so let me tell you a little bit about him.

Paul Parravano joined MIT's Office of Government and Community Affairs in 1990. He touched countless students, faculty, community leaders, and elected officials in his 33 years of service. He was committed to the full inclusion of disabled people in every aspect of life. He served as a board member of the National Braille Press, just one of his many contributions to the empowerment and upliftment of the broader disability community.

A Braille champion, his advocacy improved access to financial information for the blind across the United States. His contributions earned him the Cambridge NAACP's Lifetime Achievement Award and the Cambridge Community Center's Reverend Nichols Founder's Award, and he was the inaugural recipient of the MIT Staff Award for Distinction in Service—all well deserved.

His legacy was really forged in the intimate moments he shared so freely with any and everyone he met and how generously he shared his hard-fought wisdom.

He showed us how to lead with compassion, and although he was blind, Paul saw people. He saw the infinite possibilities within people and in our world more than any person I have ever known.

Mr. Speaker, to his wife, Martha, and his daughters, Emily and Ellie, I thank them for sharing Paul's light and love with us. We are a better Commonwealth because of him.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORO VALLEY

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

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the town of Oro Valley's 50th anniversary.

On April 15, 1974, Oro Valley started as a small town with only 1,200 people.

Today, it has grown into a booming community with a population of over 48,000 Arizonans.

The town recently celebrated its 50th anniversary with community performances from local bands, fireworks, and parades. This celebration was a testament to the sense of community and strong neighborly values my family and I have been fortunate enough to experience ourselves over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mayor Winfield and Vice Mayor Barrett for their leadership of the community.

I am so proud to represent Oro Valley and so many other wonderful communities like this in our district.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF LEAD POLICE OFFICER ADAM R. BUCKNER

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Lead Police Officer Adam R. Buckner, one of Arizona's brave law enforcement officers who tragically passed away on Sunday, March 31, 2024.

At just 31 years old, Adam lost his life while serving our community so bravely in Tucson.

Officer Buckner started his law enforcement career with the New Orleans Police Department in 2017 and then joined the Tucson Police Department in November 2021.

Officer Buckner recently won the Midtown Division's Officer of the Month award for his dedication to the community. His commitment to community service shined bright during his time as a lead police officer at the Tucson Police Department.

Officer Buckner was committed to helping others in times of need and truly loved the Tucson community. He is remembered as a loyal, kind, and selfless friend and remains a true hero in the hearts of our Tucson community.

Officer Buckner is survived by his wife, mother, sister, and three brothers. We will never forget Officer Buckner's sacrifice or the ultimate sacrifice of any first responder. His death is a reminder that our police, fire, and medical personnel and all first responders risk their lives every time they put on the uniform. We extend our gratitude for his dedicated service and are eternally grateful for his contributions.

U.S.-ISRAEL FRIENDSHIP MORE CRUCIAL THAN EVER

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, this past week, Iran has launched a direct, aggressive, unprovoked attack on our ally, Israel.

I was on the ground in Israel less than 2 weeks ago with a group of 18 of my colleagues to hear from Israeli police, soldiers, and officials about the importance of the United States' partnership.

As Israel defends itself in their war against Hamas, Iran, and other proxy terrorists, the U.S.-Israel friendship is more crucial than ever. I met with families of hostages and visited sites of the October 7 attacks, one of the most impactful parts of my visit.

We have seen the names, numbers, and footage, but when you meet the families who lost loved ones or visit with them like we did this week, it is even more gut-wrenching.

We also met with several Israeli officials, including Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Herzog.

Mr. Speaker, 193 days is how long the Israeli hostages have been held by Hamas terrorists. In Israel, I spoke with the families of the hostages. For months, these families have agonized over not knowing the status of their loved ones. As a parent myself, it is an unimaginable pain. We must stand in solidarity with Israel and bring every hostage home now.

It was a somber but incredibly impactful visit and only reinforced my support for our friends in Israel.

Then, 6 days after I returned, Iran launched an attack on our ally, Israel. Over the weekend, Iran launched an attack on Israel that included the use of 185 drones, 110 surface-to-surface missiles, and 36 cruise missiles. Despite the scale, this attack was rendered unsuccessful due to Israel's multilayered air defense and its partnership with the United States.

I am now more than ever going to continue to protect the U.S.-Israel relationship. I am a proud cosponsor of the Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act.

This body must act now. We need to come together to support our ally. Time is of the essence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand united on this issue immediately.

RECOGNIZING BLACK MATERNAL HEALTH CRISIS

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congressional Mamas' Caucus, I am asking our Chamber to please take a moment to recognize that we are experiencing a Black maternal health crisis in our country.

In Michigan's 12th Congressional District, we are experiencing not only the Black maternal health crisis but also an infant mortality crisis.

We don't want another study. We want action.

Michigan has had one of the highest death rates among Black women in our country because our systems and institutions have failed to provide our Black neighbors with the comprehensive, high-quality care they deserve, a system free of systemic racism.

To address the Black maternal mortality crisis, we must understand and acknowledge our country's racist history and the ways in which it has manifested in our healthcare system. Black women are three times more likely to die from pregnancy-related causes than White women. This is unacceptable.

Black women have consistently been neglected and mistreated in our

healthcare system. They should feel safe and supported by their healthcare professionals, and they should be believed.

Black women in frontline communities like ours also live with the devastating effects of preexisting conditions from air and water pollution.

I founded the Congressional Mamas' Caucus with Mothering Justice because we were tired. We were tired of policies created about mothers but not with mothers.

I am also incredibly proud to have been a supporter and cosponsor of the Black Maternal Health Momnibus Act, a comprehensive bill that would address every dimension of the maternal health crisis in America.

This legislative package will extend WIC eligibility, fund community-based organizations, prioritize Black maternal mental health, support incarcerated mothers, and invest in Federal programs to address the Black maternal health crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I will not stop until Black women receive the equitable, nondiscriminatory, comprehensive care they deserve.

GET THE LEAD OUT

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, water contaminated by lead service lines can be found in every single congressional district in our country. From rural areas to densely populated cities, lead service lines are widespread and pose serious health risks to all of us, but particularly our children.

I founded the Get the Lead Out Caucus with the goal of eliminating lead from our drinking water once and for all.

Experts have estimated that we need \$60 billion to replace every single lead pipe in America in the next 10 years. We continue to wake up to stories about children being poisoned and cities having to hand out bottled water because they have failed to invest in our water infrastructure.

We are now seeing our own food supply being impacted by toxic water being used to wash produce that ends up in our refrigerators and on our dining room tables.

People across our country are being forced to drink, bathe, cook, and wash dishes with water that is literally poisoning our bodies.

This is a public health crisis, Mr. Speaker, and it affects all of us in the United States.

I am proud that I am leading, in partnership with Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL and LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, an appropriations request to provide \$1.5 billion in additional funding for lead service line replacement in Michigan and throughout the country in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in this initiative. I know that many of our municipalities have talked to all of us about struggling to find the resources to meet the urgent need for lead pipe detection and replacement, so this \$1.5 billion would

keep us on track for our goal of total nationwide lead pipe replacement in the next decade.

Tribal nations across the Great Lakes remind us that water is life. There is no more precious resource than water. We must continue to demand that clean, affordable water is a human right in our country.

□ 1030

CONGRATULATING LAILA NASHER

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to congratulate Laila Nasher, a resident from our district and a dedicated leader in our community, for becoming the first Yemeni-American woman to earn the prestigious Truman Scholarship award.

Born in Aden, Yemen, Laila is a proud immigrant and was raised by her mother in Detroit. In 2021, I had the honor and privilege of Laila interning in our office, and since then I have watched from afar her incredible commitment to public service, and it continues to just grow.

Laila is committed to advancing equity in our public education and supporting underserved communities and first-generation college students like herself. As a student at Harvard, she is now studying social anthropology and history and inspiring young Yemeni-American women in our community and across our country to pursue their dreams.

I am so proud of Laila in receiving the Truman Scholarship award and cannot wait to see all that she is going to be able to accomplish in the years to come. Please join me in congratulating Laila for her outstanding achievements and deep commitment to our community.

GOVERNMENT OVERREACH DURING PANDEMIC

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, we witnessed the egregious overreach of government during the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in the infringement of Americans' rights and devastating consequences for our economy and unprecedented government spending.

From the outset of the pandemic, we witnessed unprecedented government actions that trampled upon our basic freedoms and liberties: social shutdowns, mandated mask wearing, and vaccine mandates were imposed with little regard for individual autonomy, constitutional rights, or people's personal health issues.

These heavy-handed measures not only eroded the fabric of our society but also inflicted severe economic harm on businesses and families across the Nation.

Those of us with an ounce of common sense suspected from the beginning that COVID was little more than the

flu and that the government's actions bordered on martial law.

We were told it would take 2 weeks to flatten the curve. Well, were we played or how did that really turn out when it became 3-plus years?

Instead of allowing citizens medical freedom, they forced the jab onto all of us, encouraging employers to threaten employees with termination if they didn't comply and keeping kids out of college. In order to return to their classes, they had to take the jab.

One of the common controversies came from ivermectin, which we now know, and many knew at the time, works as a very effective early treatment for COVID-19. How many people were harmed because they weren't allowed this early treatment because it was politicized?

Indeed, recently, the FDA finally had to walk back an early-on smart-aleck tweet they made trying to compare real ivermectin that is prescribed for people and formulated for people to something that would be comparable for livestock. After having suffered that embarrassment, they had to walk it back.

In the meantime, how many lives were lost because this early treatment was not available? Instead, they were forced into other types of treatment or flat out being ignored when doctors and hospitals said: Well, come back to us when it is really bad, then we will check you in.

Americans should have the right to make their own informed decisions with doctors they trust, including the choice to use alternatives such as ivermectin, especially in early treatment.

It is very troubling that the government actively suppressed information about treatments for COVID-19, including ivermectin, hydroxychloroquine, and other materials that were available, while promoting instead a one-size-fits all approach centered around vaccines. Safe and effective, we were told.

In fact, the FDA's censorship of information about ivermectin has had real-world consequences for medical professionals who dared to speak out. Again, what you see is that the FDA had to walk back their lies and their deception about this. They also were browbeating hospitals and doctors into selling the same thing. We see that even in my own local area where people were asking legitimate questions about ivermectin and were made fun of: Oh, this is just horse paste. You don't want to do that.

Medical experts were contradicting themselves time and time again since the beginning of the pandemic. We were told to lock down for 2 weeks, right? Then it was masks, and then it was double masks. Then it was something called social distancing. For a while, they thought ventilators were going to be the issue for that, so they hurried manufacturers into making ventilators, and then they found out maybe those were harmful.

Before Trump left office, we had top officials saying: Oh, I will never take it if it is Trump's medicine. Then immediately after they were forcing it on people when Biden took over. Interesting how that works.

Commonplace therapeutics with decades of human usage and proven success—including ivermectin, which won a Nobel Prize in 2015 for its lifesaving qualities—again, as I mentioned, were branded as unsafe horse medication.

Treatment methods should be a topic of debate or discussion and, indeed, the experts should be allowed to bring this forward that have all people's best interests in mind. If a treatment works, then it should be distributed as widely as possible or at least allowed, whether it is a vaccine, a dosage of ivermectin, or an infusion of monoclonal antibodies.

The politicization of differing treatments hurt Americans by restricting their ability to receive lifesaving medications, especially early treatment, when it probably could have saved thousands of lives.

As we stand today, there are multiple options that have been proven effective in treating the virus, but we hear the same old saw about the latest iteration of vaccine being forced upon people and making billions for pharmaceutical companies.

We should be able to choose what we want. If you want to take therapeutics, you should have the ability to take them. In a lawsuit filed in Texas, three doctors claimed that the FDA's actions interfered with their medical practices and harmed their reputations. Pharmacists have refused to fill ivermectin prescriptions for patients, and doctors have faced professional repercussions for simply advocating for the use of ivermectin.

There is much more, but when these people ask for forgiveness for lying to us like that, no way. There needs to be prosecution.

COMMEMORATING ARMENIAN GENOCIDE REMEMBRANCE DAY

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, as the only Member of Congress of Armenian-Assyrian descent, I rise to commemorate Armenian Genocide Remembrance Day, which will be observed next week by the Armenian community in the United States and around the world.

On this solemn occasion, we remember the 1.5 million Armenians and hundreds of thousands of Assyrians, Greeks, Chaldeans, Syriacs, Arameans, and Maronites who were systematically slaughtered by the Ottoman Empire between 1915 and 1923. What all the victims had in common is that they were Christians, and among them members of my own family.

To honor my ancestors and all who perished, I worked with so many other Members for nearly three decades to

pass a resolution recognizing the Armenian genocide. For many years, the conventional wisdom in Washington was that a misguided policy of genocide denial served U.S. geopolitical interests.

However, thanks to the determined advocacy of the Armenian-American community, we overcame this entrenched opposition, and in October 2019, the resolution passed the House by a bipartisan vote of 405–11, ending over 100 years of official U.S. silence. As the vote total was announced, I thought my parents, grandparents, and extended family were applauding from Heaven.

Now nearly 5 years later, it is important to acknowledge that the fears of the resolution's detractors never materialized.

Rather than diminishing America's standing in the world, our recognition of the Armenian genocide has done the opposite: strengthening American global leadership by affirming our commitment to human rights. I am proud of the progress we have made, but we have more work to do to combat the lasting effects of genocide denial, which has left many Americans unaware of this dark chapter of history.

My legislation, the Armenian Genocide Education Act, addresses this issue by establishing a program within the Library of Congress to develop educational resources on the Armenian genocide to be used in American schools.

With nearly 90 cosponsors, this legislation is the most cosponsored bipartisan bill pending before the House Administration Committee. I urge Chairman STEIL and Ranking Member MORELLE to report this bill out of committee as soon as possible. I am confident that it would pass with a large bipartisan vote when it comes to the floor of the House. This bill is critical because it is so often said that those who forget history are doomed to repeat it.

Alarmingly, it felt as if history were repeating itself last September when Azerbaijan perpetuated an ethnic cleansing campaign against the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh that bore a disturbing resemblance to the mass displacements committed by Ottoman forces a century ago. This atrocity was preceded by a grueling blockade that deprived civilians of food, medicine, and other essentials for over 9 months, bringing them to their knees.

We must not wait another century to hold Azerbaijan accountable for the crimes it has committed against the Armenian people. That is why I once again call on the State Department to end U.S. military aid to Azerbaijan, sanction Azerbaijani officials for human rights abuses, and provide desperately needed aid for the 120,000 Armenians who were forced from their homes at gunpoint last year.

The best way to honor the legacies of those who perished in the Armenian genocide is by using our voices to prevent atrocities today.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
JAMES WRIGHT

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and celebrate a selfless civil servant who has served the Second District of Nebraska for well over 20 years in Federal, State, and local government. James Wright currently serves as our district director and has made a lasting impact for our constituents.

In 2001, James started a decade-long position with my friend and former congressman, Lee Terry, as a constituent liaison and special projects coordinator, a role in which he handled constituent casework and developed outreach projects that addressed the needs of local governments, private civic organizations, and other constituents.

One of his most impactful achievements was leading the district's transition assistance program after the FCC directed the conversion of all TV and radio systems from analog to digital. His model comprehensive program included information, education, and engagement to many who needed assistance to make a smooth and seamless transition.

After a decade with Congressman Terry, former Governor David Heineman, also my friend, asked James to head up the Office of Violence Prevention, where he was responsible for developing, fostering, promoting, and assessing violence prevention programs throughout the State of Nebraska.

James served there for a year before returning to Federal service and working with U.S. Senator Mike Johanns, a man I respect very much. He served as a special projects coordinator and constituent services representative, where he continued his passion for helping constituents by finding resources and solutions to resolve their cases.

Following his time in the U.S. Senate, James once again took a detour from his Federal service and worked for the city of Omaha under another one of my friends, Mayor Jean Stothert, as the director of community outreach. In that role, he assisted neighborhood groups and alliances through the development of community outreach programs.

After working in city government, James served under my friend and predecessor, Congressman Brad Ashford, as director of constituent services, where he provided direct assistance to constituents, delivering guidance and assistance to the constituent services team. He also worked with the senior staff to develop and maintain strategic relationships with relevant stakeholders in State and local government related to issues of importance to the congressional district.

During this time, his leadership was key to the authorization of the first-ever public-private partnership that

constructed a modern veteran healthcare center that has become the standard across the Nation in how to deliver better, faster, and more effective VA care.

James joined our team in January of 2017. As our district director, James oversees the management and operation of the office, supervises and mentors our staff, and leads engagement with a multitude of local organizations, constituents, and elected officials across a wide variety of issue areas.

□ 1045

James also supervises all of our constituent services, delivering the best constituent services in Congress as recognized by the Congressional Management Foundation in 2021.

James' service to the community goes way beyond his 20 years of Federal civil service. He is a semi-professional actor. James has served as a board member of the Omaha Community Playhouse since 2019 and has starred in several of their productions, including roles in "Fences," "Sweat," and "Parade."

He also is a board member for Lutheran Outdoor Ministries focusing on the promotion of Carol Joy Holling Camp, which provides Christian education, spiritual, psychological, social, personal, and professional development in an environment that is free of any discrimination based on race, religion, color, creed, disability, national origin, age, or ancestry.

Most importantly, James is a loving husband to his wife, Angie, and father of 7-year-old son, Lincoln. He offers much of the credit for his success to his mother, Sherry, a commissioned officer in the United States Air Force, who taught him to stand up for himself and that through hard work and determination he could accomplish anything he set his mind to.

I want to add on a personal note, James is a great supervisor. He cares for people, he is strategic, and he has been a blessing as our district director running our Omaha office.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate James on his 20-plus years of service to his community and the Second Congressional District of Nebraska.

IN SUPPORT OF UKRAINE

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on National Security, I rise in strong support of aid for a free and independent Ukraine. I also stand in solidarity with the more than 37 million Ukrainian people who have never relented in their fight for freedom in the face of more than 2 years of state-sponsored terrorism launched by Russian President Vladimir Putin.

This past weekend, the Commander in Chief of the Ukrainian Armed Forces

reported that with U.S. assistance depleted, Ukrainian army positions along the country's 600-mile eastern border have "worsened significantly in recent days."

With Ukrainian soldiers facing a critical munitions shortage, Russian troops are currently firing 10 artillery rounds for every Ukrainian round. Until the prolonged impasse on Ukraine funding here in Congress, the United States was the primary ammunition supplier for the Ukrainian army. Now, the top American military commander in Europe describes the situation succinctly when he says: "If one side can shoot and the other side can't shoot back, the side that can't shoot back loses." It is as simple as that.

Ukraine's air and missile defense systems are also similarly depleted. In reference to a recent Russia air strike targeting a key power plant in the Kyiv region, Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy indicated that Ukraine simply ran out of the missiles necessary to defend its critical energy infrastructure.

Russia, in fact, has taken full tactical advantage of escalating lapses in the Ukrainian air defenses, launching aerial offenses against almost every power plant in the country.

Not surprisingly, Russian troops are continuing to advance in the Donetsk region in eastern Ukraine, a primary goal of Vladimir Putin. Russia has brutally bombarded the city of Myronohrad, also known as the City of Peace, and is now well-positioned to capture the strategic town of Chasiv Yar, whose high ground will enable Russian forces to launch direct offensives against the last Ukrainian strongholds in the east.

Meanwhile, over 40 percent of Ukraine's civilian population—or nearly 15 million people—are in need of urgent humanitarian assistance. The United Nations Human Rights Monitoring Mission in Ukraine reports that the country endured a 20 percent increase in civilian casualties and injuries last month over February of 2024, with double the number of children killed or injured.

Moreover, large-scale coordinated attacks on Ukraine's civilian energy infrastructure destroyed or damaged 20 energy facilities across the country, leaving millions without electricity and running water.

According to the Global Rights Compliance, an international human rights organization that is assisting the Ukrainian Government investigating and prosecuting Russia war crimes, "The stark reality is that more and more Ukrainians are dying by the day as the Ukraine aid package remains stalled in Congress."

After several months of refusing to even consider aid for Ukraine, Speaker JOHNSON is now indicating that he plans to bring up a foreign package as soon as this week. Unfortunately, the House Republican majority is still playing politics with a matter of grave

importance to the Ukrainian people and democracy globally, going to great lengths to craft legislation designed to appease an extreme faction of the Republican Conference.

This political gamesmanship continues even though the United States Senate passed a bipartisan foreign aid package more than 2 months ago that I believe would easily pass this House with the necessary support from Members on both sides of the aisle.

We have reached a new low in this Congress. It is totally unthinkable throughout our history that a Republican Member of this House would attack a democratic ally and support a gangster and a war criminal like Vladimir Putin, but that is where we are today.

Ukrainian President Zelenskyy recently stated that the United States Congress needs to think twice about pushing these political matters with regard to supporting Ukraine and vote to support all of the countries whose lives depend upon it. I strongly agree. I urge the House Republican leadership to take up the Senate bill and ensure that Ukraine and our other international allies like Israel will receive the support they urgently need.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION GUAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor and recognize the Guam Chamber of Commerce who this year are celebrating their 100th anniversary.

The Guam Chamber of Commerce has and continues to be the voice of economic growth in Guam. An advocate for enhancement of small businesses, an organization which promotes opportunities for employers and employees alike, an association of like-minded business entities focused on improving industries and a leadership which expands on professionalism, the Guam Chamber of Commerce is an icon of commerce within the Marianas and Pacific region in general.

On behalf of the House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate president, Catherine Castro; chairman of the board, Ernie Galito; and board of directors of the Guam Chamber of Commerce, along with hundreds of businesses and organizations who comprise of their membership on the celebration of their 100th anniversary.

We thank them for fostering commerce activity in Guam over the past 10 decades and look forward to decades more of their dedication toward our island's economic growth.

RECOGNIZING MELISSA SAVARES

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Mayor Melissa Savares as she serves her final term as mayor of Dededo, Guam.

For close to two decades, Melissa has dedicated herself to the betterment of

families, youth, and “the elderly,” “manamko,” residing across Guam’s largest village.

Savares’ history of service includes her time as president of the Mayors’ Council of Guam, a board member of the Guam Community Health Centers, a commissioner on the Serve Guam Commission-AmeriCorps program, and a member of the Civilian-Military Task Force, among other things.

Mayor Savares is a powerhouse in her community and is widely known across the island for her heart, for public service, and her efforts in preventing crime in the village.

Under her leadership, the Dededo Municipal Planning Council has sponsored youth sports teams and initiatives such as Youth Drug-Free Summer Basketball League, Student Robotics, and Real World Design Challenge, to name a few.

I would like to thank Mayor Savares for her commitment to the village of Dededo and wish her the very best in retirement. Her departure from the office would undoubtedly be felt, but I am certain she has laid a solid foundation for continued growth and development in Dededo to come.

RECOGNIZING ORLANDO

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the place I get to call home and serve—the 407, known as the City Beautiful.

From its charming mom-and-pop shops to world-class attractions, the success of our city is a testament to the incredible and unwavering spirit of our community.

Orlando is a place like no other.

At the heart of our city is a thriving small business community whose passion and dedication are felt by everyone they serve, especially when it comes to Orlando’s amazing and diverse food scene.

As we celebrate the spirit of community, pride, and support that defines the 407, let us reaffirm our commitment to its continued success by uplifting our local businesses.

In supporting them, we ensure that Orlando remains not just a place full of potential but a city that can truly thrive.

RECOGNIZING EXTRAORDINARY BLACK LUMINARIES

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize extraordinary Black luminaries from around central Florida and their achievements and contributions to our city.

Their dedication shapes our everyday history, reminding us to uphold Black voices in government, community, business, and all spaces of power.

I recognize: Carolyn Fennell, Shanta Barton-Stubbs, Ms. Mary Maxwell, Reginald B. McGill, Tanisha Nunn Gary, Joseph Caesar, Reverend James T. Morris, Ronald O. Rogers, and Thomas Chatmon.

I am reading their names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today because nobody can erase their contributions to building a better central Florida.

HONORING BOB GRAHAM

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because yesterday the State of Florida and our entire Nation lost a dedicated servant, Senator, Governor, respectable statesman, husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, Bob Graham.

Bob Graham dedicated his life to public service. He dedicated his life to the people, and he was a champion for all of us.

From his work on protecting the Everglades and fighting for our environment to fighting for education and opportunity for all students to even teaching citizenship before he was elected at Miami-Dade County High School, Bob Graham’s legacy can be seen everywhere across the State of Florida and in all of us. He truly represented a time in Florida politics that we could all be proud of.

RECOGNIZING FOUR EXTRAORDINARY WOMEN FOR WOMEN’S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor four extraordinary women for their impact on central Florida and beyond.

Their tireless efforts, unwavering determination, and profound achievements have shaped our local history and continue to inspire generations to come.

We honor them for their strength of character, unwavering spirit, and profound influence that they have on our community.

These women are: Graciela Noriega Jacoby, chief operating officer of Heart of Florida United Way; Dr. Marie Jose Francois, founder of the Center for Multicultural Wellness and Prevention; Pastor Sharon Y. Rule, founder and pastor of Agape Perfecting Praise and Worship Center; and Oncanthono Am, associate general counsel at the University of Central Florida.

I want to celebrate these women and all that they have done for our community.

HONORING SHEILA DICCIO

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Winter Park’s new mayor, Sheila DeCiccio.

Winter Park is a historic and unique community in my district filled with charm and beauty that attracts new visitors but has fostered a deep sense of community for many of central Florida’s residents.

Mayor DeCiccio is a longtime Winter Park resident and has always put her community first by volunteering, sitting on the city’s board of commissioners, and now will be serving as the city of Winter Park’s first woman to be mayor.

Winter Park faces unique challenges—responsible growth, affordable housing, and infrastructure improvements. But Mayor DeCiccio’s deep roots in the community and her passion to tackle these challenges with

her community's best interests at heart will ensure that she and the city of Winter Park are successful.

I extend my heartfelt congratulations to Mayor DeCiccio, and I am eager to work alongside her to work for and with the people of Winter Park.

□ 1100

RECOGNIZING DONNA CAMACHO'S SERVICE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Donna Camacho's service and leadership at the Alzheimer's Association Georgia Chapter.

Donna, a Savannah resident, has contributed over 19 years of volunteer leadership at the Alzheimer's Association. During her time, she has been actively involved in various roles, including serving as co-chair on the board of directors and as Georgia's congressional ambassador of the organization.

Donna's involvement in health-related fields extends beyond her time at the Alzheimer's Association. For over 30 years, she served as the Chatham County Health Department's program manager.

As a pharmacist, I understand just how vital it is to continue to push for advancements in our healthcare system, especially for Alzheimer's disease, detection, diagnosis, and prevention.

Donna has diligently worked to increase awareness for Alzheimer's patients, and I wish her the best in her future endeavors. She is a friend to all, and if you get to know her, she might even bake you one of her most famous chocolate cakes.

COMMEMORATING HISTORIC HARRINGTON SCHOOL'S CENTENNIAL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Historic Harrington School on St. Simons Island.

Originally called the Harrington Graded School, the one-room schoolhouse was built by African-American tradesmen in 1924. The school was the main educational structure for three African-American communities on St. Simons Island.

In the 1960s, many students left the school to attend St. Simons Elementary. The building was briefly used as a daycare center until being abandoned in 1970. Restoration efforts were led by the St. Simons African American Heritage Coalition and the St. Simons Land Trust in 2024.

The restored Harrington School is now a community gathering space for holidays, celebrations, meetings, and other events.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Harrington School on its 100th anniversary.

Keep up the good work.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF HOWARD COHEN

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the

life of Howard Cohen, a member of the Savannah community who inspired and influenced so many.

After graduating from the Benedictine Military School at Armstrong College, Cohen served in the Nation's Air Force Division during the Korean war.

In 1952, Cohen established Savannah's first weightlifting gym, drawing nationwide attention from those interested and involved in the sport.

Cohen's athletic ambitions were taken up by his son, Michael, who went on to make the U.S. Olympic weightlifting team in 1980 under his father's guidance.

For himself, Cohen's love, passion, and dedication to weightlifting set him on the path to achieving many notable titles. In fact, he was a 10-time Pan American champion who achieved 32 national championships.

His legacy will live on, and he will continue to serve as a role model for generations to come.

CELEBRATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF SHARP MEMORIAL METHODIST CHURCH

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 75th anniversary of Sharp Memorial Methodist Church in Young Harris, Georgia.

Built in 1948 and opened in 1949, Sharp Memorial Methodist Church has been a cornerstone of the Young Harris community. The church was named after Dr. Joseph Astor Sharp, born in 1864.

After graduating from Emory at Oxford, Dr. Sharp served as president of Young Harris College for 35 years. Dr. Sharp dedicated his life to the service of others and deeply inspired his congregation, the community, and generations of students.

Standing at the entrance of Young Harris College, Sharp Memorial Methodist Church continues to honor his legacy and serve the community.

Mr. Speaker, 75 years later, Young Harris trustees, the local community, and alumni are coming together for a week of celebration, reflection, and looking ahead.

The legacy of Dr. Sharp and the ongoing work of Sharp Memorial Methodist Church will undoubtedly strengthen and enrich the community for generations to come.

HOUSE MUST PASS NATIONAL SECURITY PACKAGE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Foreign Relations Committee, I rise to address the House on the challenges we face in Ukraine, in the Middle East with Israel and Iran, and in Taiwan and Asia.

The world is watching and looking for American leadership. Iran has launched a telegraphed attack on Israel, sending over 350 drones and missiles last weekend. Seeing these missiles being intercepted above the Tem-

ple Mount emphasizes Iran's disregard for Muslim, Jewish, and Christian holy sites and its desire to take innocent lives.

Iran's actions continue to disrupt opportunities for peace in the Middle East. I was in Israel 2 weeks ago, one of over a dozen trips I have made to the Middle East in the last 30 years.

Before the attack on October 7, Saudi Arabia was on the brink of signing a peace agreement and joining the Abraham Accords. Formalizing Saudi-Israeli relations for both countries would achieve strategic and military goals, ranging from defense to food security and innovation, thus bringing hope for more peaceful opportunities with moderate Arab nations.

When the Ayatollah saw this, I believe he pulled the strings on proxy forces to stop these negotiations that resulted in Hamas' horrific attack on innocent Israeli citizens on October 7 that took over 1,200 lives and 200 hostages.

Iran is the number one state sponsor of terrorism in the world. For years, the Iranian regime has been funding Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Houthis to spread international chaos. Iran has directly or through its proxies killed hundreds of Americans who have been in the region.

China is also threatening Taiwan and watching how the United States responds to other conflicts around the world. They are watching.

The new axis of evil—Iran, Russia, China, North Korea—presents an ever-growing threat to the United States and our allies. This is a seminal moment in American and world history, I believe. Therefore, we cannot abandon our allies in their darkest time of need. Ukraine needs our support.

For months, the Senate-passed supplemental aid package has been held hostage by many of my Republican colleagues, some of whom appear to be on the side of Russia. I don't get it. President Reagan and Senator McCain must be turning over in their graves.

It has been over 6 months since the attack on October 7, and what has the House done? Nothing, wasting time on baseless impeachments, threatening a motion to vacate, and close to shutting down government.

Yet again, House Democrats have stepped in to save the day. We have always been clear since day one. We are here to govern, putting people before politics. We have extended the hand of bipartisanship to work on behalf of the American people and the security of our country. We have demonstrated our words with actions: passing and extending the debt ceiling, avoiding government shutdowns three times, and, finally, passing our budget 6 months late.

Mr. Speaker, 193 Democrats have signed the discharge petition to bring the Senate-passed supplemental package to a vote.

The House must pass the national security package this week. It will provide additional equipment for Ukraine,

Israel, and Taiwan, with critical security and military needs to defend their freedom and, therefore, our freedom. It will provide humanitarian aid for the Palestinians, who have been horrifically punished and suffered in Gaza, and Armenians refugees removed from their historical home in Nagorno-Karabakh, along with investments in border security to help alleviate the challenges we have here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, would you stand with freedom-loving democracies and help bring this bill to the floor and support Ukraine, Israel, and Taiwan, or will you stand with Putin and embolden his mafia of dictators to further attack our allies? That is the question.

Your actions will show not only the American people but history where you stand in protecting the future of democracies. The world is watching.

This is our Churchill-Chamberlain moment. Will we be like Churchill and continue to be the beacon of light for freedom around the world, or will we try to appease, as Chamberlain did with the Nazi dictator Hitler that resulted in the cause of over 100 million deaths during World War II? That is the question. This is the moment.

We must stand for freedom. We must pass this security package this week for Ukraine, Israel, Taiwan, and freedom-loving people around the world.

Mr. Speaker, that is the challenge we face this week. I hope we are successful.

RECOGNIZING MOUNT SIDNEY, NEW HOPE, AND WEYERS CAVE RURITAN CLUBS' 85TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Ruritan Clubs in Mount Sidney, New Hope, and Weyers Cave for their 85-year commitment to serving their local communities.

As a fellow Ruritan, I know how well these clubs embody the spirit of service and community that is the backbone of rural America.

Through volunteer work and donations, these Ruritan clubs keep our district beautifully maintained and bolster communal ties. They also hold annual events, like barbecues, to raise the funds they need to positively impact our local communities.

On April 13, a special celebration was held at the Weyer Cave Community Center to honor the past, present, and future generations of Ruritans who have made and continue to make significant contributions to their communities.

This event was not just a recognition of these long-lived charters. It is a testament to the enduring spirit of community service and unity.

Therefore, it is with immense pride and gratitude that I stand here today to congratulate Mount Sidney, New

Hope, and Weyers Cave Ruritan Clubs on their 85th anniversary. Their ongoing work to instill a commitment to public service reflects the best of what it means to be a part of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank these Ruritan clubs for their 85 years of service. Here is to many more years of success and community support.

HONORING THE VIRGINIAN REVIEW

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Virginian Review newspaper.

For 110 years, The Virginian Review has been a guiding light for past generations, the present generation, and those yet to come.

The Virginian Review was born out of the consolidation of two local newspapers in Alleghany County/Covington region, the Covington Virginian, founded in 1914, and the Daily Review, founded 9 years before.

After 74 years, the newspapers talked of merging, and on January 3, 1989, the newly created The Virginian Review published its very first edition.

Today, The Virginian Review, under the direction of Scot Refsland, continues to uphold its impressive reputation as an incredible source to keep our communities informed by their essential news coverage and thoughtful, incisive reporting.

Since its beginning, The Virginian Review has been a consistent and reliable news source, delivering local, State, and national updates to folks across Virginia's Sixth District.

It is a privilege to celebrate The Virginian Review, and I wish the entire team all the best as they celebrate 110 years of outstanding journalism.

CONGRATULATING CHRISTENDOM COLLEGE'S WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Christendom College women's basketball team on winning the United States Collegiate Athletic Association Division II National Championship in Petersburg, Virginia.

The Christendom Crusaders won the trophy by a score of 76-65 in the championship game against Johnson and Wales Charlotte, bringing home the first women's basketball national title in school history.

Their victory was an entire team effort led by junior Miranda Keller, who led the Crusaders with 22 points; junior Catherine Thomas, who had 19 points; and freshman Mary Pennefather, who also had 19 points.

Miranda Keller was also named Player of the Game for the National Championship for her efforts, and Catherine Thomas was named Tournament MVP for her outstanding play.

Led by Head Coach Mary Minick and Assistant Coach Annie Heisler, this victory is a testament to the hard work and perseverance of everyone on Christendom's women's basketball team.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate these athletes, parents, coaches, and staff on an incredible season and a well-deserved victory.

CONGRATULATING BLUE RIDGE CHRISTIAN'S GIRLS' BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Blue Ridge Christian girls' basketball team on winning the Virginia Association of Christian Athletics, VACA, State championship.

After being down 21-7 at one point in the game, the Bears fought their way back into contention, winning their second VACA title in 3 years.

The team had a tremendous performance throughout the season, finishing 18-2 and going on to win the championship. Despite the countless challenges of working through illnesses and other obstacles, the perseverance and commitment to success demonstrated throughout the year led their team to victory.

Winning the State championship title is a testament to the unwavering dedication and hard work that the coaches and players display each and every day throughout the season.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my sincerest congratulations to the entire Bears coaching staff and team for their incredible season. It is my honor to recognize their well-deserved victory, and I wish them nothing but the best for seasons to come.

STANDING WITH ISRAEL

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my unwavering support for Israel, our foremost ally in the Middle East and the beacon of democracy in that region.

Over the weekend, Iran launched a direct attack on Israel from Iranian soil, firing over 300 missiles and drones at the nation. This is the first time Iran has ever directly attacked the Nation of Israel.

These direct attacks also follow the brutal war launched by Iran-backed Hamas terrorists on October 7 of this last year. This vicious attack claimed the lives of over 1,200 innocent Israeli citizens and took more than 240 hostage, some of whom were Americans.

While some on the other side of the aisle and in the media attempt to draw a moral parallel between Hamas and Israel, there is simply no comparison to be made.

As Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu once said: "You cannot equate a democracy that values life with a terror organization that glorifies death."

Israel has an absolute right to defend itself, and while they continue to fight for their country's survival, Hamas continues to intentionally target population centers, seeking death and destruction.

Let me be clear: Hamas has no interest in peace or a solution. Their only objective is to eliminate the Jewish State. I cannot fathom why people choose to back Hamas despite its atrocious human rights record.

We must stand with Israel, and I remain steadfast in my support of America's closest ally.

□ 1115

CELEBRATING EARTH DAY

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

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Earth Day, which will be on Monday, a day to honor and celebrate our remarkable planet.

Earth Day is an important opportunity to renew our commitment to combating climate change, transitioning to a clean-energy future, promoting conservation and sustainability, and advancing environmental justice.

We face serious environmental challenges across the globe, from preventing sea level rise on the coasts to combating the destruction of natural habitats in the Arctic and everything in between.

Under the leadership of the Biden-Harris administration, Congressional Democrats made historic climate progress over the past few years, including the largest investment in climate action and clean energy in our Nation's history.

The Inflation Reduction Act is creating hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs of the future, and as we continue to transition to cleaner, more sustainable technologies, we are working to ensure that everyone can benefit from these investments and that no one is left behind.

The Biden-Harris administration is complementing our efforts with transformative executive actions that include finalizing strong standards that cut greenhouse gas emissions and safeguard our communities.

Thanks to the administration, we have taken historic action to reduce methane emissions; strengthen standards for soot; limit emissions from cars, trucks, and buses; and curb PFAS, or forever chemical, contamination.

In the coming weeks, we look forward to a strong final rule for Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for power plants. Last year, I led over 50 Members of Congress in urging the administration to finalize strong standards that will protect the health and well-being of the American people, and we eagerly await that final rule.

I commend the administration for their commitment to ensuring that 40 percent of the overall benefits of Federal investments in climate, clean energy, affordable and sustainable housing, and other key areas flow to historically disadvantaged communities that have been disproportionately impacted by climate change and pollution.

For too long, low-income communities, communities of color, our Tribal and indigenous communities, have borne the brunt of environmental degradation and our worsening climate. The climate crisis exacerbates long-standing inequities and contributes to

worse public health outcomes for vulnerable populations.

My predecessor, the late Donald McEachin, was a true environmental justice champion who always stood up for these vulnerable populations. Each year, he would lead a resolution to recognize Earth Day and call for action to protect our planet. This week, I look forward to building on his legacy and helping to reintroduce that resolution to honor Earth Day.

As a mother to two young children, I am fighting to ensure a healthy, more sustainable future for my children and yours. Earth Day is a reminder that we have no planet B. We must continue fighting to protect our Earth and protect our next generation.

RECOGNIZING COACH KEVIN KIERNAN

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the career of Mater Dei High School Coach Kevin Kiernan. After 17 years at Mater Dei coaching the girls basketball team, this will be his last season coaching the Monarchs.

Coach Kiernan recently celebrated his 900th win after a decisive victory in the southern California regional playoffs. It was a bittersweet moment for the coach as he and his players reflected on the legacy that he is leaving behind. He wraps up his coaching career with 12 CIF Southern Section titles, six State crowns, and two national championships. That is a record.

Coach Kiernan is an Orange County native, and Mater Dei High School will keep him as athletic director.

We wish him the best. I am glad he is staying around. Let's keep the good work going.

HONORING RICHARD "DICK" HIGGINS

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the heroic life and legacy of Richard "Dick" Higgins.

Dick was a husband, longtime Orange County resident, and a national hero. He served in the Navy during World War II after surviving the horrific attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

His service to our community continued after he left the Navy, visiting schools and doing interviews and making sure that history stayed alive with young people and others in Orange County.

Dick lived to be 102 years old, and he is survived by two children, two grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren. In his words, he now goes to be with his beloved Winnie Ruth, his wife of 60 years.

I thank Dick for his service to our country and thank him for his sacrifice.

HONORING ORANGE COUNTY SCHOOL COUNSELORS OF THE YEAR

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor this year's Orange County School Counselors of the Year.

I am so proud that two of these counselors are from my hometown. Mr. Gernux is from Santa Ana Unified School District, and Ms. Rodriguez is from Anaheim Union School District, both of whom represent the best in our local public schools.

Like myself, Ms. Rodriguez and Mr. Gernux were grown in our local hometowns. They are products of Orange County public schools, and now they are giving back to the public school system that gave them so much.

Ms. Rodriguez, Mr. Gernux, and the rest of these fine educators will continue to shape the future leaders of tomorrow. All of us in Orange County and in Congress appreciate their commitment to our community, our youth, and our future.

RECOGNIZING BLACK MATERNAL HEALTH WEEK

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, for women looking to start or grow their families, motherhood should be one of the greatest, most joyful times in their lives. For far too many Black women in Ohio's 13th Congressional District and across this country, this experience is often overshadowed by trauma, heartache, and loss.

It is no secret that Ohio, my home State, has one of the highest Black maternal death rates in the entire Nation, with Black women two to three times more likely than White women to die from pregnancy or birth-related causes.

We rightfully talk about the social determinants of health that Black women face in accessing quality, affordable prenatal and postnatal healthcare in our communities, which contributes to these completely unacceptable maternal mortality rates.

Today, I would like to focus our attention on another contributing factor to Black maternal mortality that is often overlooked: intimate partner violence. Homicide is the leading cause of death among pregnant women in the United States. It is higher than the three leading health causes of maternal mortality, those being hypertension, hemorrhaging, and sepsis.

Addressing the violence that plagues women during pregnancy and shortly thereafter is why I introduced the Safer Homes and Families Act. This comprehensive legislative package would provide vital support to keep moms and families safe, including prohibiting the use of electronic devices for stalking, providing training for healthcare providers to better identify and treat individuals experiencing abuse, and allowing survivors to break a lease without adverse costs.

Statistics have indicated that nearly 20 percent of women experience violence during their pregnancies, and for one in six women, abuse first begins during their pregnancy. This violence substantially increases the likelihood

for pregnancy-related complications that not only endanger the life of the woman but also that of her unborn baby.

While members of the Congressional Black Maternal Health Caucus are working tirelessly to highlight and address the ongoing epidemic of Black maternal health, it is clear there is more work that needs to be done. Even to this day, we are still trying to convince colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers how important it is that we care for women and care for mothers.

This is not a partisan issue. It is a human issue. Our Black mothers and babies in every district across the country deserve to live long, healthy, and happy lives.

I am confident that regardless of our political party, we can work together to improve health outcomes and deliver on the promise of better health, healthier lives, and brighter futures for all of us.

I call on my colleagues to join us in the fight to keep our moms and babies safe. Our mothers and babies simply cannot wait any longer.

Finally, I would like to recognize the many local organizations in Ohio's 13th Congressional District that are working each and every day to improve the health of Black moms and babies in our community. Organizations like Stark County THRIVE, Full Term First Birthday, Project Ujima, and the Minority Behavioral Health Group are all committed to improving maternal health outcomes and promoting equity in Ohio's 13th District.

Improving maternal health requires action and collaboration at every level, and I am extremely proud and grateful to these organizations for the work they are doing.

This Black Maternal Health Week and beyond, I am committed to improving healthcare access to all and giving women and families the tools they need to live healthy, happier lives in Ohio's 13th Congressional District and beyond.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 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. CARL) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Holy God, You call us to hold fast to faith, to trust You, the creator of the universe, to answer our personal needs, even while You attend to the multitude of demands in our communities, our country, and our world. How is it that You can hear us when the whole world cries for deliverance from warfare and famine and disease? May our faith be strong enough to believe that You in Your divine power will replenish us, as well as these deserts of disaster, with Your ocean of grace.

Our despair has names like Israel, Ukraine, Gaza, Sudan, and Taiwan. What answers are to be had which will address the injustices, the injuries, the inhumanity that overwhelm these regions? God, give us reason to hope in You, our redeemer, that we would be patient in tribulation and constant in prayer.

Transform our fears, our pains, our worries, and our concerns with Your love, a love greater than all that seeks to defeat or overtake us. For when all our efforts fail, when no solution is in sight, these three remain: faith, hope, and love. The greatest of these is the love we receive from You.

In the name of the one who loved us first, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania 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.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF U.S. ARMY CAPTAIN HARRY CRAMER

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and the legacy of Johnstown, Pennsylvania, native and U.S. Army Captain Harry Cramer.

In 1957, U.S. Army Captain Cramer was attached to the 14th Special Forces Operational Detachment when he was killed while training soldiers in Nha Trang.

In giving his life for his country, Captain Cramer became the first of 58,281 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who would be killed during the Vietnam war.

Throughout his time in the Army, Captain Cramer showed incredible bravery and was awarded a Silver Star and two Purple Hearts during his service in the Korean war. Last week, Captain Cramer was recognized in Cambria County when Highway 403, a road that was originally built by his family in the 1890s, was renamed in his honor.

America owes a debt of gratitude to Captain Cramer that can never be fully repaid. May God bless him and the entire Cramer family.

CONGRATULATING NORTH HOLLYWOOD HIGH'S SCIENCE BOWL TEAM

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a group of smart, dedicated, and science-loving students in my district from North Hollywood, California.

Last month, the Science Bowl team at North Hollywood High School won first place at the LADWP Science Bowl, the regional qualifying tournament for the Department of Energy's National Science Bowl Competition.

The team, made up of Boheng Cao, Daniel Hong, Phoebe Xu, Connor Zhao, and Suzoko Ohshima, rose to the challenge and topped other formidable science teams.

North Hollywood High School has won an astounding 25 of 27 regional competitions and are two-time National Science Bowl champions, having won most recently in 2021.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the team coaches, Altair Maine and Len Soloff, for fostering a culture of academic excellence and spreading the love of science to these remarkable students. I wish them all the best in the upcoming 2024 national competition.

CONGRATULATING THE SIRMON FAMILY

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

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Sirmon family of Baldwin County, Alabama, on their family farm being awarded the 2024 Alabama Farm of Distinction.

Sirmon Farms is owned by Joel and Patti Sirmon. Joel's mother, Shirley, who bakes great cookies, and her brother, James, also help run the fifth-generation family-owned farm.

At Sirmon Farms, they grow cotton, peanuts, corn, and sweet potatoes on

over 4,500 acres in the Belforest community. They will go on to represent Alabama during the Sunbelt Agriculture Expo in the Southeastern Farmers of the Year contest this fall.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Sirmon family and their family farm. I am thankful for the impact they have made on our State, and I am proud to be their Representative.

BLACK MATERNAL HEALTH WEEK

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, this Black Maternal Health Week, we confront the glaring reality that Black women in America are three times more likely to die from pregnancy-related complications across socio-economic criteria and education than similarly situated White women.

Research highlights a disturbing attribution, that Black women are also significantly more likely to encounter disrespectful treatment during childbirth, facing scolding, threats, and even outright hostility.

These disparities in treatment are not new. They are deeply embedded in the fabric, unfortunately, of our healthcare system and our society.

The fact that maternal death in the U.S. has more than doubled over two decades, with Black mothers suffering the highest rate, is a national tragedy. Moreover, the CDC's finding that over 80 percent of those deaths were preventable should be a call to action.

As a mother of five and a mother for a daughter, I find the current trajectory deeply troubling and wholly unacceptable. It poses a severe threat to the health and safety of Black women and all women across our Nation. It is paramount that we improve awareness of the urgent maternal warning signs and ensure the provision of timely, respectful, and quality care. We must save these lives.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF OFFICER ROSS BARTLETT

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Officer Ross Bartlett of Ceresco, Nebraska.

Officer Bartlett died in the line of duty last week on April 12 in Nebraska.

Bartlett served as a police officer for over 30 years. His three decades of service took him across Nebraska before arriving in the village of Ceresco.

He was not only a police officer. He was a husband, a dad, a grandpa, a friend, and so much more. He had a great sense of humor, and he loved to serve his community.

One way he did this was by volunteering at fire departments alongside

his wife, Tina. They had a passion for helping every community they lived in. I was fortunate to work with him as he served in Madison. I have great respect for him and his service in Madison County and beyond.

We have lost a great officer and an outstanding Nebraskan with a big heart for public service.

May God be with his family and friends during this difficult time.

HONORING VICTIMS OF COLUMBINE MASS SHOOTING

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the victims of the horrific mass shooting that occurred at Columbine High School on April 20, 1999, in Littleton, Colorado.

Twenty-five years ago, 12 teenagers and 1 teacher were killed just for going to school. Twenty-three were injured, and many still struggle with lifelong injuries.

Today, we remember those we lost: Cassie Bernall, Steve Curnow, Corey DePooter, Kelly Fleming, Matt Kechter, Daniel Mauser, Danny Rohrbough, Rachel Scott, Isaiah Shoels, John Tomlin, Lauren Townsend, Kyle Velasquez, and Dave Sanders.

We remember the families, the survivors, and the entire Columbine community.

Some became the country's first gun violence prevention advocates, like Tom Mauser, the father of Daniel Mauser. For 25 years, he has gone toe to toe with the gun lobby and the State and Federal governments to fight for change, all while wearing the shoes his son was wearing the day he was killed.

To honor their memories, we cannot allow another 25 years to pass before we say "never again" and finally mean it.

RECOGNIZING ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY DAY

(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 recognize Assistive Technology Day.

Assistive Technology, or AT, is any item, piece of equipment, or product system that is used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of individuals living with disabilities and older adults.

Having spent nearly three decades as a therapist, rehabilitation services manager, and licensed nursing home administrator before coming to Congress, I have a personal understanding of the challenges faced with those who require assistive technology. Whether it is a veteran dealing with service-connected injuries, children with au-

tism, an individual diagnosed with debilitating cancer, or adults with cerebral palsy, the bottom line is that these technologies make people's lives better.

Mr. Speaker, not only do I want to celebrate and recognize the critical role AT plays in the lives of those who need it, but I also want to recognize and thank all the AT specialists, programs, professional organizations, and researchers who are dedicated to facilitating the access to and acquisition of assistive technology.

HIGHLIGHTING EXCEPTIONAL ATHLETICISM OF ELLISON "TARZAN" BROWN

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

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, this week, nearly 30,000 runners from 118 countries and all 50 States came together to run the 128th Boston Marathon. That makes this a fitting week to recognize the legacy of Ellison "Tarzan" Brown, a Rhode Islander and member of the Narragansett Tribe.

Born in 1913, Brown's exceptional athleticism earned him the name "Tarzan" after the popular films of the time. He was also known as "Deerfoot" to his Tribe.

Despite facing adversity throughout his life, and with no formal training or proper footwear, he emerged as one of the world's greatest athletes. He was a two-time winner of the Boston Marathon in 1936 and 1939 and represented the United States at the 1936 Olympics in Berlin.

Brown is one of two indigenous North Americans to have won the Boston Marathon and the only indigenous person to have more than one victory.

Today, I will take this moment to honor Tarzan Brown, a legend who brought honor to Rhode Island and the Narragansett people, and to echo the words of his nephew, Chief Sachem Sun Rise: "A lot of people leave a footprint. He left a trail."

□ 1215

BORDER CRISIS JEOPARDIZES AMERICANS

(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, President Biden and far-left Democrats continue to jeopardize the safety of American families and national security with open borders.

Mr. Biden's failure has allowed over 9 million illegal aliens to cross our borders, including more than 300 on the terrorist watch list. Due to Mr. Biden's irresponsibility, all families are at risk, as evidenced by the brutal murder of nursing student Laken Riley of Georgia.

House Republicans continue to work to protect Americans and strengthen our borders, including passage of the Secure the Border Act to reinforce border security and impeaching Department of Homeland Security Secretary Mayorkas, who shamefully put every American family at risk of murderous attack.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism moves from the Afghanistan safe haven to America. We don't need new border laws; we need to enforce the laws we have. Biden shamefully opens borders for dictators, as more 9/11 attacks across America are imminent, as repeatedly warned by the FBI.

U.S. COAST GUARD MARATHON

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the United States Coast Guard Marathon brought together talented runners from far and wide to Elizabeth City, North Carolina.

City and U.S. Coast Guard leaders rolled out the red carpet with a warm welcome. I was delighted to see the U.S. Coast Guard Commandant Linda Fagan in northeastern North Carolina in support of the marathon.

We are glad to celebrate the U.S. Coast Guard's commitment to the marathon and, above all, to Elizabeth City. Congratulations to all participants, particularly to the winners who persevered through the challenging course.

The U.S. Coast Guard Marathon is indeed an effort that helps to elevate this wonderful northeastern community to even greater heights.

HONORING SELENA QUINTANILLA

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

Ms. De La CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, this week I introduced legislation that pays tribute to a true cultural icon, Selena Quintanilla. This legislation will honor her legacy with commemorative coins produced by the U.S. Mint.

Selena, known affectionately as the queen of Tejano music, was the pride of south Texas. She transcended boundaries and transformed the music landscape. With her dynamic performances and timeless hits like "Como La Flor" and "Bidi Bidi Bom Bom," she brought Tejano music beyond south Texas and garnered adoration from millions worldwide.

It is fitting that we chose this week to introduce this bill because Tuesday would have been Selena's 53rd birthday. Through these commemorative coins, we honor her artistic talent and her role as a trailblazer for Hispanic artists.

Let this coin reflect the brilliance of Selena's life.

HONORING PAT TILLMAN

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the life and legacy of Patrick Daniel Tillman, Jr., of Arizona. April 22, 2024, marked the 20th anniversary of Pat's tragic and untimely death at only 27 years old.

As a scholar and a football star, Pat led Leland High School to the division championship and earned a football scholarship to Arizona State. His time at ASU was spent studying business and marketing and in athletic achievement as the Sun Devils' starting linebacker.

In 1998, he was drafted to the NFL by the Arizona Cardinals. Again, he was a star, breaking the Cardinals' tackle record with 224 tackles in 2000 as a linebacker.

After the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, Pat and his younger brother, Kevin, answered the call to service and enlisted in the United States Army. He was first deployed to Iraq with his brother in 2003 in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom but returned to Fort Benning, Georgia, to complete Ranger School. In 2004, Pat embarked on a second deployment in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

On April 22, 2004, in Spera, Afghanistan, Pat was tragically killed by friendly fire. He was awarded the Silver Star and Purple Heart for making the ultimate sacrifice.

Let us never forget his patriotism, leadership, and call to service. May we all be so eager to answer that call in our own lives for this wonderful country.

My prayers are with the Tillman family and our Nation's Gold Star families and all United States servicemembers overseas. May God be with them all.

WDUN CELEBRATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 75th anniversary of WDUN.

For 75 years, WDUN has provided north Georgia with a mix of local and nationally syndicated talk radio programming. Based in Gainesville, the radio station is a division of the family-owned media company, Jacobs Media Corporation.

Earlier today, WDUN commemorated this major milestone by returning to its roots, as its broadcast studio relocated to the Gainesville Renaissance Building in the downtown square, just steps away from where the station first went on the air 75 years ago.

I know I speak for all of WDUN's listeners in thanking the station's tal-

ented employees for their commitment to local journalism. It is a privilege to frequently join their programs, such as "The Martha Zoller Show," to connect with folks across the Ninth District to tell them about my work in Congress. Whether it is breaking news, insightful analysis, safety announcements, or heartwarming stories, WDUN has been there to inform, inspire, and unite northeast Georgians.

As President Donald Trump said on "Mornings on Main Street" earlier this month: WDUN is a really special place, and it is a special voice.

Here is to 75 years dedicated to local journalism and many more to come. Congratulations, WDUN.

FOURTH AMENDMENT IS NOT FOR SALE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 4639.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DE LA CRUZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1149 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4639.

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

□ 1222

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4639) to amend section 2702 of title 18, United States Code, to prevent law enforcement and intelligence agencies from obtaining subscriber or customer records in exchange for anything of value, to address communications and records in the possession of intermediary internet service providers, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, the House will vote on H.R. 4639, the Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act.

Last July, the House Judiciary Committee favorably reported the Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act by a vote of 30-0, with one Member voting present.

This bill makes crucial changes and closes a glaring loophole that allows the government to sidestep the requirements of the Fourth Amendment to purchase data of Americans.

I thank my colleague, Congressman DAVIDSON, for introducing this much-needed legislation. This bill is the result of years of bipartisan negotiation, and I look forward to this debate and vote.

The Fourth Amendment guarantees to all of us the right to be free of unreasonable government searches and seizures. However, the law and doctrine concerning the Fourth Amendment has failed to keep pace with the development of digital technologies.

Nearly 40 years ago, Congress passed the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, or ECPA, in an attempt to navigate the digital age, but it is clear that legislation is now insufficient to protect the constitutional rights of Americans. It is time that Congress accounts for the technological advances that have occurred in the decades since ECPA was passed.

Today, seemingly every American carries a smartphone with them wherever they go. These devices contain vast amounts of information of Americans, such as where they travel, what they purchase, their health information, and so on. As the Supreme Court has noted, these devices “hold for many Americans the privacies of life.”

Before the modern internet, the Fourth Amendment required law enforcement to execute a search warrant and subpoena the items they wished to review. The officer executing the search would have to provide a copy of the warrant and an inventory of the property seized. However, today, Federal agencies often sidestep the requirements of the Fourth Amendment and access and collect massive amounts of private information on Americans by exploiting a legal loophole in the ECPA and Fourth Amendment doctrine.

While ECPA prohibits communications companies from providing customer information to the government in the absence of a subpoena, warrant, or other court order, no such prohibition exists for providing this information to third parties, such as data brokers. Instead of going to a judge to demonstrate probable cause and obtain a warrant, government agencies, like the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Department of Homeland Security can simply turn to data brokers and purchase mass amounts of Americans data.

The government is collecting vast amounts of data by purchasing it from

data brokers or other third parties. Media reports have detailed that some data brokers have even tracked people at places of worship and at protests.

While the Judiciary Committee has in recent years advanced major reforms to overhaul ECPA, those bills have not yet passed into law. It is long past time that Congress acts to protect the privacy of Americans.

There is strong bipartisan support in Congress to finally address and close the data broker loophole. This bill is exactly the type of legislation needed to rein in the Federal Government and protect the privacy rights of Americans.

The government is rifling through your personal information. You should have the right to know about it, but the government can just purchase your highly sensitive information from data brokers and use it against you without your ever knowing.

The Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act would close this legal loophole and ensure that the government may only use existing statutes compliant with the Fourth Amendment to lawfully surveil Americans.

When the government compels data brokers to disclose Americans' personal data, it should be required to get a court order. With this commonsense legislation, the government will no longer be able to make an end-run around the Fourth Amendment to purchase the data of Americans.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4639, the Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act. I was proud to join Congressman DAVIDSON in introducing this strong bipartisan legislation to help prevent government overreach by prohibiting the warrantless purchase of customer data. When the Judiciary Committee considered this bill at markup last July, it received, as Ms. HAGEMAN noted, a rare unanimous 30-0 vote.

When we download applications to our phones, we do so because we think they will make our lives just a little bit better. Weather apps tell us if we should bring an umbrella to work, delivery apps allow us to order groceries to our homes, and even employee work apps let us know the schedule for the week. Some of these convenience applications, however, can come with a dark side that they generally do not disclose to the American public, that the data they collect from us is immediately sold to the highest bidder.

Third-party purchasers of this data, often referred to as “data brokers,” collect and package the data to sell to advertisers, market researchers, and government entities, to name a few. While many argue that the data they purchase from applications, websites, and social media is deidentified when it

is sold, experts agree that just four points of data are needed to reidentify this data.

Because of this, the purchaser of a dataset can piece together significant information about us. For example, they can track an individual's commuting habits, including which businesses they drive by on their way to work, when they are not at home, and even when they visit places that are not part of their normal commute.

□ 1230

That anyone should have Americans' private information is highly troubling to me. But that our Federal Government can obtain it without a warrant should be troubling to all of us.

The Supreme Court in U.S. v. Jones unanimously found that the government's use of a GPS tracker on the subject's car is considered a search under the Fourth Amendment. But in 2004, when the search in Jones occurred, not everyone had a phone in their pocket—the ecosystem of data brokers had not yet come to life.

If the government wants to track a suspect today, they can go through the trouble of establishing probable cause in getting a warrant, which is what they should do, or Federal law enforcement could simply purchase data from a third party about the target of their operation.

If that purchased data included location data for their subject, they would have no need for checks and balances, no need for a warrant, and during an ensuing criminal trial, no obligation even to tell the court how they obtained the initial data in the first place.

We have the Fourth Amendment for a reason. If law enforcement wants to gather information about you, they should first obtain a warrant. They should have to go to a judge and explain why there is probable cause and why they need to know this information. When Federal law enforcement agencies purchase this data, however, they bypass our judicial system entirely.

Our current state of affairs is clearly not what our Founders intended. Our right to privacy is being abrogated every day by those whose job it is to keep us safe. The Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act would change that.

Under the bill before us today, the Federal Government would be prohibited from exchanging anything of value for data from third-party vendors. The law already prohibits applications and websites, electronic communication services, and remote computing services from sharing information with the government without a warrant.

The Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act would extend that same rule to the data brokers to which they sell. This legislation would also ensure that the government does not circumvent these rules by prohibiting both indirect acquisition of information and agency sharing of third-party data.

This way, Federal law enforcement could neither acquire prohibited data from individuals who purchase the data and then pass it on to the government, nor could they receive the desired data from non-law enforcement Federal agencies.

The whole point of this bill is to stop the end run that is being done around the Fourth Amendment because of modern technology.

I thank Congressman DAVIDSON and Chairman JORDAN for their leadership, and I thank my Democratic colleagues, Representatives Lofgren, Jayapal, and Jacobs for their hard work to get the bill to the floor.

I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Frankly, in the House it is rare today that we have an issue that doesn’t break on party lines, and privacy, unfortunately, isn’t unanimous.

The Fourth Amendment is clear that if the government wants to serve your data, they need to have probable cause and a warrant or a subpoena.

The Fourth Amendment is a restriction on what government can do. It is not a restriction on commerce.

Unfortunately, government agencies are buying nonpublic data that would otherwise require a warrant or a subpoena.

Congress confronts an opportunity today to end that practice by passing the bipartisan and bicameral Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act. Nothing in this bill would prohibit a search, paid for or otherwise, of public information. It would, however, restore privacy protections grossly infringed by current practices. Congressman HIGGINS, a career law enforcement officer, is offering an amendment today that makes that clear. We have heard from law enforcement agencies, and we want to make it clear, nothing in this bill is designed to make your job harder to do.

Mr. LALOTA will offer an amendment that I do adamantly oppose. Frankly, it strips much of the content of the bill, and I regret that I do oppose that amendment because it undermines the intent of the bill.

Closing this data broker loophole is an important step toward restoring a government small enough to fit within the Constitution, and we could afford a government that small.

Finding bad guys would be easier if you had perfect information on everybody and full surveillance all the time. It has been recognized that the Third Amendment was put in place, despite the fact that we all might be more secure if we had a soldier stationed in our homes, but the Third Amendment prevents the government from doing that.

The reality is that technology today effectively puts the government every-

where we go. We all essentially have a digital ID. It is a phone number, and we carry it with us. It is tracked. It goes to your car. Your car spies on you, as well.

This data is being collected. People say, well, this amendment doesn’t deal with all that. So let me address that concern. People back home might not realize that the committee structure in Congress is broken up into areas of jurisdiction, meaning that certain committees can deal only within their area of jurisdiction.

The Judiciary Committee can reform things in that committee of jurisdiction, but other committees like Energy and Commerce would have to address a broader topic.

People back home wonder why there so many half-baked solutions to problems. Well, a lot of it comes down to our jurisdiction. We don’t solve the whole problem often.

What about foreign governments buying our data? Congress in the House passed a ban on that last month. Just prior to the House ban, exporting your data was banned by executive order from the Biden administration. These are safeguards that are bipartisan, and, in some ways, they have already reached to the executive branch.

Again, the Fourth Amendment is designed as a limitation on what the government can do. I am grateful to have the support of over 150 organizations from Gun Owners of America on the one hand to the American Civil Liberties Union on the other.

This is an issue that goes far and wide. It is important to understand, too, people might realize that if they have got a journal that they close it up and they keep it in their house, whether it is by their bed or in a bookshelf or in a safe, the government has to get a warrant or subpoena to get access to that, but your electronic communications don’t enjoy the same kinds of protection. They are not being protected by the Fourth Amendment because you have trusted a third party with that, like Gmail, like Microsoft, like Apple. Somebody has your emails, and, because of that, the government is getting access to some of this very private information, nonpublic information, because they are able to buy it.

They shouldn’t be able to buy it. If this bill passes and becomes law, they won’t be able to buy it and bypass your Fourth Amendment rights.

I encourage all of our colleagues to support this important legislation. Look, freedom surrendered is rarely reclaimed. We have such an opportunity today to reclaim the right to privacy that is supposed to be protected by the Fourth Amendment. I hope everyone will join me in defending freedom today.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I am proud to cosponsor this important bipartisan

bill that protects Americans’ constitutional privacy rights in this digital age by closing loopholes so that the government cannot purchase Americans’ private data from data brokers without a warrant.

Last year, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence declassified a report on how the intelligence community buys significant amounts of Americans’ data from data brokers.

We are talking about very sensitive personal information that can cover anything from Americans’ location data to internet activity.

That report noted that this data “has increasingly important risks and implications for U.S. person privacy and civil liberties, as [the data] can reveal sensitive and intimate information about individuals.”

This isn’t just some small group of people saying that we don’t like this. It is actually the Office of the Director of National Intelligence saying that this practice of buying peoples’ personal information without a warrant from these data brokers is dangerous, and it is a runaround of our constitutional protections.

Just last month, we banned foreign adversaries from buying this data. It is important that this body today protect Americans, protect our constitutional rights, and ban this practice. Vote “yes” on this bill.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, the government is not allowed to get your information without a warrant. They are not allowed to do it. Even if they buy it, they are not allowed to do it. That is all this thing says. It couldn’t be more straightforward or simple. It shows respect for the Fourth Amendment and respect for Americans’ privacy.

What we are saying is—and it has been said before by the ranking member and Ms. JAYAPAL and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN), you can’t do an end run. You can’t do a work-around. You can’t say, oh, we are allowed to get information we otherwise wouldn’t be able to get because we are going to purchase it from a data broker.

No, you can’t do that. That is all this says.

If it would otherwise require a warrant, you can’t go buy it, you can’t do a work-around.

It is a fundamental principle in our country. If the executive branch wants to get your stuff, wants to look at your information, they have to go to a separate and equal branch of government and get a probable cause warrant. They can’t go around that and say, oh, we are purchasing it. This is public. They can’t do it. It is plain and simple.

I commend the ranking member and the Democrats on the committee for their bipartisanship. Again, as the ranking member said, we very seldom

have legislation that comes out unanimous like this.

But this committee, which is charged with more than any other committee in Congress with protecting Americans' civil liberties, their rights, the fundamental principles and liberties that make our country the best place ever, unanimously agreed this thing should pass. I thank them, and I thank Ms. HAGEMAN for leading this debate on the floor today for the committee and for our team. I also want to thank, of course, the sponsor of the legislation, Mr. DAVIDSON.

This is so simple.

Last week, we had a similar fight, a similar debate. Unfortunately, we lost 212–212. Let's hope we can win this one.

I think this makes so much sense, so much common sense. It is so consistent with how this great country has always operated. One branch of government doesn't get a side at all. We have separate and equal branches of government. If this branch wants information, the executive branch wants your information, they have got to go to a separate and equal branch and get a warrant. They can't go buy it from somebody else and be sneaky about it and avoid what the Constitution clearly mandates has to happen.

I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member NADLER for his leadership on this issue.

Under almost any other circumstance, law enforcement and intelligence agencies need a warrant to access our personal information. Even in the cases of utmost national security like when Americans are suspected of terrorism, espionage, or cybercrimes, our government gets a warrant.

This process isn't too burdensome, and it doesn't prevent law enforcement from investigating crimes or bringing people to justice.

But there are a few loopholes in this process when it comes to section 702 queries and this data broker loophole, which allows our government to circumvent our Fourth Amendment rights to access our personal information without a warrant, a court order, or even a subpoena.

This is only legal because they are buying the information. But our rights shouldn't have a price, and cash shouldn't hold the same legitimacy as a warrant.

Law enforcement claims—they say this, this is their claim—this loophole, this data that they buy from data brokers is most useful before probable cause can be demonstrated. That is the whole point of the Fourth Amendment, of our right to prevent unreasonable seizures and searches.

If you can't establish probable cause, you shouldn't be able to access or buy this information unless a court says otherwise.

That is why we need this bipartisan Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act, which I am proud to co-lead.

Our bill doesn't inhibit law enforcement's investigations. Instead, it ensures that police searches are above board, follow due process, and protect Americans' privacy.

In a Congress where it feels almost impossible to get anything done and where the American people think all we do is disagree, this shows that we can do big things and there is a bipartisan consensus especially when it comes to Americans' privacy rights.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

□ 1245

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4639, the Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act, and all of the attending amendments, as well.

Mr. Chair, I also stand with, I think, every major law enforcement agency association in the country. This bill will only make our communities less safe by preventing local law enforcement and State law enforcement from being able to access information that has been legally collected and is publicly open-source information.

Every day, law enforcement officers use open-source, legally collected, and commercially available data. We use that to connect the dots to actually develop and find the leads that solve crimes like child abduction, drug trafficking, terrorism, and all sorts of different heinous crimes.

The Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act will require law enforcement to get a warrant before they can access otherwise publicly open data.

Google and Facebook can access it. The Chinese can access it. The cartels and criminals can access it. Private actors can access it, but not the police. Only law enforcement will be blocked.

I can tell you, as a former sheriff, police officers work on time-sensitive cases every day where accessing this information quickly is a matter of life and death. I am a 40-year law enforcement officer, and I can think of dozens of cases where minutes mattered and my officers saved lives by accessing this data.

Some of the supporters of this bill say that all of those other folks who I just listed that still have access can't put you in jail. Let's be truthful here. The police can't put you in jail either without probable cause of a crime.

The Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act will make communities far less safe by making officers' jobs harder. In fact, it helps out only the criminals.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous, antipolice bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO).

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Chair, I rise this morning in strong opposition to H.R. 4639, the Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act.

While I thank my good friends and colleagues and House Republicans from the Committee on the Judiciary for all the work that they do to keep law enforcement safe and to give law enforcement the resources they need to protect and serve, this bill is only going to hinder their ability to investigate crimes.

Like my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) said, you cannot arrest a suspect without probable cause.

The information that is no longer going to be obtained by law enforcement agencies is information that has already been legally collected. Nearly every major law enforcement union and agency throughout this country is opposed to this legislation.

I was proud to serve in the City of New York Police Department as a detective. It has investigated thousands of crimes, and we have utilized these third-party platforms to obtain information that has already been legally collected.

This legislation would, without a doubt, make communities less safe and, in the process, would also lead us to follow in the same disastrous direction that New York Democrats have by handcuffing the ability of law enforcement to do their jobs.

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

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly support H.R. 4639, the Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act. This critical bill would prohibit government agencies, including the intelligence community, from purchasing Americans' data from third-party data brokers.

U.S. Government agencies are purchasing Americans' data through a loophole with third-party groups when they would otherwise need a warrant. Recently, the Internal Revenue Service purchased records and locations of millions of American cell phones. The FBI purchased geolocation data for mobile advertising.

The Cato Institute recently reported that data brokers collect and sell huge amounts of Americans' sensitive information, including whether they have an interest in firearms. Data brokers sell lists—in their words—of "shooting fanatics" and "concealed carry licensed gun owners." They even sell information about Americans' interest in political organizations.

Government agencies like the FBI purchase this information as a loophole to obtain private information about U.S. citizens without a warrant.

Mr. Chair, I am deeply concerned that the practice of buying commercial data could not only threaten Americans' Fourth Amendment rights but could also pose a threat to their Second Amendment freedoms and be used as a way to track and target lawful gun owners in America. We must prevent this.

H.R. 4639 will provide the necessary guardrails to ensure that these three-letter government agencies, including the intelligence community, do not and cannot overstep and infringe on Americans' constitutional rights.

Why can civilian companies buy this data but not the government without a warrant? Because the government can take away your liberties. The government can put you in jail. Civilian companies cannot do that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand with the Constitution and support H.R. 4639, the Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, data brokers collect massive amounts of information about Americans that can track and identify our most intimate details. It is bad enough that companies have access to all this personal data, but now the government can access this data, too, without securing a warrant just by purchasing it on the open market. This amounts to an end run around the Fourth Amendment.

This legislation would end this practice and protect our privacy as the Constitution demands.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, there are a couple of points that I would make. One is that I reject the notion that in order to beat China or other foreign adversaries, we must become like they are.

If the real opposition to this bill is that it prevents the United States Government from becoming the same type of surveillance state that Communist China is, then I think that says everything that we need to know about those opposed to the bill, and I challenge them to explain that position to their constituents.

Mr. Chair, I believe absolutely in protecting our constitutional rights, and I believe it is important to understand the significance of how these various Federal agencies have been abusing this power to surveil and persecute American citizens.

As part of the Committee on the Judiciary's investigation into the IRS' troubling visit to the home of journalist Matt Taibbi on the very day that he testified before the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government, we learned that the IRS collected personal data from data brokers to use in its investigation of Mr. Taibbi. For example, the IRS

collected data from the data broker Anywho, a people search website.

It is concerning enough that the IRS would take the extreme step of visiting someone's home on the day he testified before Congress, but the IRS also compiled its information from a data broker, potentially accessing vast amounts of Taibbi's private information.

That is the nature of the abuse that these Federal agencies are engaging in in violating Americans' civil rights.

Mr. Chair, the Fourth Amendment exists for a reason. There is no exception to the Fourth Amendment requirement of getting a warrant.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) to speak on this bill.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition of H.R. 4639. Vote "no" on H.R. 4639.

The bill bans law enforcement from paying for information available to any willing buyer in all contexts. There is no exception, zero. There is no exception to even allow law enforcement to pay for stolen information to investigate and solve identity theft, data theft, data breaches, ransomware attacks.

The bill will not make people safer. The bill puts police officers' lives at risk. It bans the police from data used to understand the danger they face when executing a search warrant or an arrest warrant.

If this bill becomes law, police will be going in blind when executing a warrant, and this could cost lives.

This bill is bad for law enforcement, bad for the intelligence community, and bad for national security.

That is why, yesterday, The Wall Street Journal wrote an editorial opposing this bill. It is also why this bill is uniformly opposed by the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National Association of Police Organizations, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Major County Sheriffs of America, the National District Attorneys Association, the National Fusion Center Association, and the National Narcotic Officers Association Coalition.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues: Do not digitally defund the police.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chair, I think it is important for the American people to understand the scope of what we are talking about and what our government is purchasing from these third-party brokers. Data brokers aggregate packages and sell the data acquired from a variety of sources, including those that have already been described today.

Often, data brokers have thousands of different data points reflecting information about a person that, when combined, reveal valuable and intimate

insights about an individual that would otherwise be unavailable.

In other words, for data brokers, consumers and their information are the product. For example, data brokers can receive geolocation data, sometimes accurate to just a few yards, from a mobile device up to 14,000 times per day.

This data allows a purchaser to identify patterns that can reveal where a person lives, where they work, and where they spend their free time.

These actions allow government agencies and law enforcement to evade the Fourth Amendment if they are allowed to purchase this data and collect limitless information on Americans.

The Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act closes this legal loophole and stops data brokers from selling Americans' personal information to the government by requiring the government to obtain a court order before acquiring customer or subscriber information from a third party.

The fact is that we all support our police. We want them to have the tools that they need to catch the bad guys, but I think if there is anything that has been disclosed over the last several years, it is that there are people within our intelligence community and who work for the Federal Government, including the FBI, the IRS, and similar agencies, who are abusing their power and authority and going after people for political reasons.

Mr. Chair, that is one of the most important reasons as to why we need to close this loophole.

As technology continues to advance and Americans incidentally share more data through the devices we use every day, it is imperative for Congress to protect privacy interests and ensure that government agencies and law enforcement abide by the Fourth Amendment.

This bill does nothing more and nothing less. It simply protects our Fourth Amendment rights.

Every person who has been elected to this body took an oath of office to uphold our Constitution. That is what we are attempting to do with the Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BOST). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 118-28 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 4639

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 “Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act”.

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF RECORDS HELD BY DATA BROKERS.

Section 2702 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PROHIBITION ON OBTAINING IN EXCHANGE FOR ANYTHING OF VALUE CERTAIN RECORDS AND INFORMATION BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES.—

“(I) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘covered customer or subscriber record’ means a covered record that is—

“(i) disclosed to a third party by—

“(I) a provider of an electronic communication service to the public or a provider of a remote computing service of which the covered person with respect to the covered record is a subscriber or customer; or

“(II) an intermediary service provider that delivers, stores, or processes communications of such covered person;

“(ii) collected by a third party from an online account of a covered person; or

“(iii) collected by a third party from or about an electronic device of a covered person;

“(B) the term ‘covered person’ means—

“(i) a person who is located inside the United States; or

“(ii) a person—

“(I) who is located outside the United States or whose location cannot be determined; and

“(II) who is a United States person, as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801);

“(C) the term ‘covered record’ means a record or other information that—

“(i) pertains to a covered person; and

“(ii) is—

“(I) a record or other information described in the matter preceding paragraph (1) of subsection (c);

“(II) the contents of a communication; or

“(III) location information;

“(D) the term ‘electronic device’ has the meaning given the term ‘computer’ in section 1030(e);

“(E) the term ‘illegitimately obtained information’ means a covered record that—

“(i) was obtained—

“(I) from a provider of an electronic communication service to the public or a provider of a remote computing service in a manner that—

“(aa) violates the service agreement between the provider and customers or subscribers of the provider; or

“(bb) is inconsistent with the privacy policy of the provider;

“(II) by deceiving the covered person whose covered record was obtained; or

“(III) through the unauthorized accessing of an electronic device or online account; or

“(ii) was—

“(I) obtained from a provider of an electronic communication service to the public, a provider of a remote computing service, or an intermediary service provider; and

“(II) collected, processed, or shared in violation of a contract relating to the covered record;

“(F) the term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003);

“(G) the term ‘location information’ means information derived or otherwise calculated from the transmission or reception of a radio signal that reveals the approximate or actual geographic location of a customer, subscriber, or device;

“(H) the term ‘obtain in exchange for anything of value’ means to obtain by purchasing, to receive in connection with services being provided for consideration, or to otherwise obtain in exchange for consideration, including an access fee, service fee, maintenance fee, or licensing fee;

“(I) the term ‘online account’ means an online account with an electronic communication service to the public or remote computing service;

“(J) the term ‘pertain’, with respect to a person, means—

“(i) information that is linked to the identity of a person; or

“(ii) information—

“(I) that has been anonymized to remove links to the identity of a person; and

“(II) that, if combined with other information, could be used to identify a person; and

“(K) the term ‘third party’ means a person who—

“(i) is not a governmental entity; and

“(ii) in connection with the collection, disclosure, obtaining, processing, or sharing of the covered record at issue, was not acting as—

“(I) a provider of an electronic communication service to the public; or

“(II) a provider of a remote computing service.

“(2) LIMITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A law enforcement agency of a governmental entity and an element of the intelligence community may not obtain from a third party in exchange for anything of value a covered customer or subscriber record or any illegitimately obtained information.

“(B) INDIRECTLY ACQUIRED RECORDS AND INFORMATION.—The limitation under subparagraph (A) shall apply without regard to whether the third party possessing the covered customer or subscriber record or illegitimately obtained information is the third party that initially obtained or collected, or is the third party that initially received the disclosure of, the covered customer or subscriber record or illegitimately obtained information.

“(3) LIMIT ON SHARING BETWEEN AGENCIES.—An agency of a governmental entity that is not a law enforcement agency or an element of the intelligence community may not provide to a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity or an element of the intelligence community a covered customer or subscriber record or illegitimately obtained information that was obtained from a third party in exchange for anything of value.

“(4) PROHIBITION ON USE AS EVIDENCE.—A covered customer or subscriber record or illegitimately obtained information obtained by or provided to a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity or an element of the intelligence community in violation of paragraph (2) or (3), and any evidence derived therefrom, may not be received in evidence in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, officer, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof.

“(5) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall adopt specific procedures that are reasonably designed to minimize the acquisition and retention, and prohibit the dissemination, of information pertaining to a covered person that is acquired in violation of paragraph (2) or (3).

“(B) USE BY AGENCIES.—If a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity or element of the intelligence community acquires information pertaining to a covered person in violation of paragraph (2) or (3), the law enforcement agency of a governmental entity or element of the intelligence community shall minimize the acquisition and retention, and prohibit the dissemination, of the information in accordance with the procedures adopted under subparagraph (A).”.

SEC. 3. REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.

Section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) COVERED CUSTOMER OR SUBSCRIBER RECORDS AND ILLEGITIMATELY OBTAINED INFORMATION.—

“(I) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ‘covered customer or subscriber record’, ‘illegitimately obtained information’, and ‘third party’ have the meanings given such terms in section 2702(e).

“(2) LIMITATION.—Unless a governmental entity obtains an order in accordance with para-

graph (3), the governmental entity may not require a third party to disclose a covered customer or subscriber record or any illegitimately obtained information if a court order would be required for the governmental entity to require a provider of remote computing service or a provider of electronic communication service to the public to disclose such a covered customer or subscriber record or illegitimately obtained information that is a record of a customer or subscriber of the provider.

“(3) ORDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A court may only issue an order requiring a third party to disclose a covered customer or subscriber record or any illegitimately obtained information on the same basis and subject to the same limitations as would apply to a court order to require disclosure by a provider of remote computing service or a provider of electronic communication service to the public of a record of a customer or subscriber of the provider.

“(B) STANDARD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a court shall apply the most stringent standard under Federal statute or the Constitution of the United States that would be applicable to a request for a court order to require a comparable disclosure by a provider of remote computing service or a provider of electronic communication service to the public of a record of a customer or subscriber of the provider.”.

SEC. 4. INTERMEDIARY SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—Section 2711 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) the term ‘intermediary service provider’ means an entity or facilities owner or operator that directly or indirectly delivers, stores, or processes communications for or on behalf of a provider of electronic communication service to the public or a provider of remote computing service.”.

(b) **PROHIBITION.**—Section 2702(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

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

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) an intermediary service provider shall not knowingly divulge—

“(A) to any person or entity the contents of a communication while in electronic storage by that provider; or

“(B) to any governmental entity a record or other information pertaining to a subscriber to or customer of, a recipient of a communication from a subscriber to or customer of, or the sender of a communication to a subscriber to or customer of, the provider of electronic communication service to the public or the provider of remote computing service for, or on behalf of, which the intermediary service provider directly or indirectly delivers, transmits, stores, or processes communications.”.

SEC. 5. LIMITS ON SURVEILLANCE CONDUCTED FOR FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE PURPOSES OTHER THAN UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2511(2)(f) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(f)(i)(A) Nothing contained in this chapter, chapter 121 or 206 of this title, or section 705 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) shall be deemed to affect an acquisition or activity described in clause (B) that is carried out utilizing a means other than electronic surveillance, as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

“(B) An acquisition or activity described in this clause is—

“(I) an acquisition by the United States Government of foreign intelligence information from international or foreign communications that—

“(aa) is acquired pursuant to express statutory authority; or

“(bb) only includes information of persons who are not United States persons and are located outside the United States; or

“(II) a foreign intelligence activity involving a foreign electronic communications system that—

“(aa) is conducted pursuant to express statutory authority; or

“(bb) only involves the acquisition by the United States Government of information of persons who are not United States persons and are located outside the United States.

“(ii) The procedures in this chapter, chapter 121, and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) shall be the exclusive means by which electronic surveillance, as defined in section 101 of such Act, and the interception of domestic wire, oral, and electronic communications may be conducted.”.

(b) EXCLUSIVE MEANS RELATED TO COMMUNICATIONS RECORDS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) shall be the exclusive means by which electronic communications transactions records, call detail records, or other information from communications of United States persons or persons inside the United States are acquired for foreign intelligence purposes inside the United States or from a person or entity located in the United States that provides telecommunications, electronic communication, or remote computing services.

(c) EXCLUSIVE MEANS RELATED TO LOCATION INFORMATION, WEB BROWSING HISTORY, AND INTERNET SEARCH HISTORY.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “location information” has the meaning given that term in subsection (e) of section 2702 of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act.

(2) EXCLUSIVE MEANS.—Title I and sections 303, 304, 703, 704, and 705 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq., 1823, 1824, 1881b, 1881c, 1881d) shall be the exclusive means by which location information, web browsing history, and internet search history of United States persons or persons inside the United States are acquired for foreign intelligence purposes inside the United States or from a person or entity located in the United States.

(d) EXCLUSIVE MEANS RELATED TO FOURTH AMENDMENT-PROTECTED INFORMATION.—Title I and sections 303, 304, 703, 704, and 705 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq., 1823, 1824, 1881b, 1881c, 1881d) shall be the exclusive means by which any information, records, data, or tangible things are acquired for foreign intelligence purposes from a person or entity located in the United States if the compelled production of such information, records, data, or tangible things would require a warrant for law enforcement purposes.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “United States person” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

SEC. 6. LIMIT ON CIVIL IMMUNITY FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION, FACILITIES, OR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT ABSENT A COURT ORDER.

Section 2511(2)(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (ii), by striking clause (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) a certification in writing—

“(I) by a person specified in section 2518(7) or the Attorney General of the United States;

“(II) that the requirements for an emergency authorization to intercept a wire, oral, or elec-

tronic communication under section 2518(7) have been met; and

“(III) that the specified assistance is required;”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) For assistance provided pursuant to a certification under subparagraph (ii)(B), the limitation on causes of action under the last sentence of the matter following subparagraph (ii)(B) shall only apply to the extent that the assistance ceased at the earliest of the time the application for a court order was denied, the time the communication sought was obtained, or 48 hours after the interception began.”.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 118-464. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1300

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-464.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 10, insert “702,” after “304.”.

Page 14, line 12, insert “1881a,” after “1824.”.

Page 14, line 21, insert “702,” after “304.”.

Page 14, line 23, insert “1881a,” after “1824.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, the purpose of this amendment is a technical correction. Often this is done simply in the Rules Committee. For some reason, they chose not to do it.

The bill itself states that existing Federal laws are the exclusive means by which the government obtains location information of U.S. persons or persons inside the United States, their web browsing history, internet search history, or any other data that would require a court order.

The list is complete except for section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. That needs to be added. That is all this amendment does is simply cover comprehensively the list of authorities, including section 702 as a covered authority. The bill isn’t really complete without covering that.

I think last week the body spoke that they want to continue to have the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. This bill would say it also covers everything, including what just passed last week.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chair, this amendment makes technical changes to the bill to clarify that it does not interfere with section 702 of FISA, including but not limited to section 702, is the only way the government should acquire data that in any other scenario would need a warrant. While we may have different opinions on how the government should treat the incidentally collected U.S. person data, as we debated last week, we should all agree that this bill is not intended to address or affect section 702 in any way.

This amendment is a technical change to correct a minor error in the bill, and I hope that all Members will support it.

I thank my colleague for offering the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, I will close by saying I think the case is clear. I appreciate Mr. NADLER for working with me.

I thank Senator WYDEN and Senator LEE for being champions of this on the Senate side. I thank the unusual cohort of colleagues here. We have ZOE LOFGREN, PRAMILA JAYAPAL, SARA JACOBS, and JERRY NADLER from the Democratic Party, and on our side Chairman JIM JORDAN, ANDY BIGGS, THOMAS MASSIE, and me.

There are so few things today that everyone agrees on. When you have the political spectrum covered from those angles, I think, hopefully, the American people will see this is a reliable solution. It moved through the Judiciary Committee with unanimous support. We don’t believe it will get unanimous support today, but I sure hope that it passes.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 118-464.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, strike line 24 and all that follows through line 8 on page 3, and insert the following:

“(C) the term ‘covered record’—

“(i) means a record or other information that—

“(I) pertains to a covered person; and

“(II) is—

“(aa) a record or other information described in the matter preceding paragraph (1) of subsection (c);

“(bb) the contents of a communication; or

“(cc) location information; and

“(ii) does not include a record or other information that—

“(I) has been voluntarily made available to the general public by a covered person on a social media platform or similar service;

“(II) is lawfully available to the public as a Federal, State, or local government record or through other widely distributed media;

“(III) is obtained by a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity or an element of the intelligence community for the purpose of conducting a background check of a covered person—

“(aa) with the written consent of such person;

“(bb) for access or use by such agency or element for the purpose of such background check; and

“(cc) that is destroyed after the date on which it is no longer needed for such background check; or

“(IV) is data generated by a public or private ALPR system.”.

Page 5, line 22, strike “and” at the end.

Page 6, line 9, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 6, insert after line 9 the following:

“(L) the term ‘automated license plate recognition system’ or ‘ALPR system’ means a system of one or more mobile or fixed high-speed cameras combined with computer algorithms to convert images of license plates into computer-readable data.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, as the underlying bill was being developed, those of us on both sides of the aisle were concerned about constitutional protections, the preservation of our representative Republic, and the core principles of individual rights, liberties, freedoms, and privacies that our representative Republic relies upon and our citizenry anticipates and expects, rightfully so, that their Congress shall protect.

As the underlying bill was being developed, there were concerns communicated from law enforcement and citizens across the country, at the local level especially, and there began an effort, a very good-faith effort, across the spectrum politically here in this body to address those concerns. That is what my amendment does.

The Fourth Amendment specifically calls for probable cause to be necessary for a warrant particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

My amendment seeks to address the concerns of law enforcement. We have sworn an oath to protect our Constitution, but we are bound by duty to protect the communities that we serve. Therefore, legitimate investigations are required. Consistent with that

ethic, I propose my amendment to not include as a covered record the following items to ensure that law enforcement has the clarity to know that they will continue to have the tools they need to succeed:

Records made available to the general public on social media. This remains available to law enforcement, as clarified by my amendment.

Records made lawfully available through government records or widely distributed media. This remains available to local law enforcement and is clarified in my amendment.

Records wherein consent has been given by the citizen or the business for the government to access for a background check. This remains undisturbed and is clarified by my amendment.

Records generated by public or private ALPRs, automated license plate recognition systems. This is a very important consideration that law enforcement was concerned about. Again, my amendment clarifies and addresses the fact that this right for legitimate investigation through ALPR remains undisturbed.

I encourage full support of my amendment from my colleagues.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS), my friend and colleague of the Thin Blue Line.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of Mr. HIGGINS’ amendment before us today which seeks to address some of the concerns several law enforcement groups have with this legislation.

As someone who has served in law enforcement for nearly 30 years, I understand the concerns our brave men and women in blue have with this bill.

Now, more than ever, we must uphold law and order in our society and also ensure the Fourth Amendment rights of the American people are protected.

That is why this amendment is so important. It clarifies data exceptions for public content, public records, background checks, and license plate readers in order to help preserve some of the tools law enforcement currently uses.

I will give you an example. A kid threatens to shoot up a school on Facebook. A data collector is scanning social media for posts like this and sends it to local law enforcement. The police would be able to use this information gathered from social media under this amendment because it is a public user-generated information.

The same applies to police records, property deeds, and other public records. We want to make crystal clear these records will remain available for our law enforcement community to use in their investigations while also preventing unreasonable search and seizure by the government.

As a former sheriff, I will always back the blue and always uphold the Constitution and the rights of citizens therein. I believe this amendment allows us to do both.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “yes.”

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, 15 seconds, for a gentleman from Louisiana, is just about enough time to say thank you.

Mr. Chair, I encourage support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chair, this amendment will clarify that the underlying bill will not impact information that is publicly available, that the government has in its own databases, or that the government lawfully acquires. Scraping pictures and data off public social media accounts for facial recognition technology is certainly a problem, but it is not this problem.

It does us no good to conflate one surveillance issue with another. This legislation is intended to prohibit the purchase of data in cases where Federal law enforcement would otherwise need a warrant. License plate databases, facial recognition technology platforms, and advanced policing technologies are often powered by publicly available data.

We are not here to impede government access to data that is public or that law enforcement already contains in its databases. While I have serious concerns about the irresponsible deployment of advanced policing technologies, those are fights for another day.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his amendment. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LALOTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-464.

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 16, insert after “information.” the following: “This subparagraph does not apply in the case of information that the law enforcement agency or element of the intelligence community could lawfully access without a warrant.”

Page 7, line 11, insert after “value.” the following: “This paragraph does not apply in

the case of information that the law enforcement agency or element of the intelligence community could lawfully access without a warrant.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Indeed, Mr. Chair, the Fourth Amendment should not be for sale. We agree on that. That is to say our government should not be able to buy from a third-party information about American citizens that it could otherwise not obtain without a warrant.

The title of the bill, the Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale, is compelling. We should all agree to that, yet the language of the bill does not coincide with the title of the bill. The bill, without amendment, is somewhere between innocently misleading and a full-on Fourth Amendment bait and switch.

My amendment would narrowly tailor the bill to include searches and seizures normally covered by the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. Chair, the Fourth Amendment states: “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.”

□ 1315

So let's agree that Congress should restrict the government from, via a third party, searching or seizing persons that it could not otherwise search or seize without a warrant. We should all agree on that. Everyone in the House, from the Freedom Caucus to the squad and everybody else, should agree on that.

If that is what the bill actually said, then the bill would likely sail through the House without any real, legitimate opposition because government should not be able to contract out its violation of our Fourth Amendment protections.

Yet, without my amendment, the bill would prevent our law enforcement officers from utilizing information that is currently publicly available, information that is accessible without a need for a warrant in fighting crime.

This Republican Conference backs the blue. It is part of our Commitment to America to keep America safe. Unfortunately, the bill, without my amendment, breaks our commitment and would prevent law enforcement from using everyday tools which do not violate any American's Fourth Amendment rights.

My amendment would clarify that any restriction made on this bill and

information that could be obtained by law enforcement or the intelligence community would not include information that is lawfully obtainable without a warrant.

If my amendment is adopted, then the name of the bill would actually fit, and the bill would actually give more weight and confidence to our Nation's Fourth Amendment.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, this amendment would create exceptions for government purchase of data that a Federal agency can already lawfully access without a warrant. I am sure that my colleague from New York means well, but I worry that this amendment would create confusion in the long run rather than clarify an area where we both agree.

I agree that the government should continue accessing information that it is already able to acquire without a warrant, but we should be closing the door on government purchase of third-party data, period.

First, it is unclear how a data broker subscription for “only information that law enforcement could acquire without a warrant” would work. By suggesting that some data could be purchased, we open up a Pandora's box of hypotheticals instead of turning off a tap that should not be on to begin with.

Second, when section 2703 of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act was passed back in 1986, the internet was in its nascent. At that time, there were few, if any, data brokers purchasing data and selling it to the government. I am confident that if they had existed, then third parties' data sales would have been included in the prohibition against service providers sharing their data with the government without a warrant.

As I said, I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do, but I cannot agree with this approach.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose Mr. LALOTA's amendment.

He makes a great point. We all want to stand with law enforcement. That is a unifying position for Republicans, and I think most Democrats want to support them, as well.

Nothing in this bill prohibits them from doing their job. The Fourth

Amendment is a restriction on government activity though, and they are already used to getting warrants for all kinds of things. The novelty is the way that they acquire data to avoid getting a warrant or subpoena. In fact, under the Electronic Communications Privacy Act and the Stored Communications Act, they are required to get a court order.

This amendment doesn't make it clear that this isn't an effort to expand that to say, no, you don't really have to do that anymore.

It is an expansion of surveillance without a warrant instead of the purpose of the bill, so it is hostile to the entire purpose of the bill. It guts the core of the protection that is meant to be restored here.

Mr. Chair, for that reason, I oppose Mr. LALOTA's amendment, and I strongly encourage our colleagues to do the same so that we can pass a very functional Fourth Amendment Is Not For Sale Act and restore the infringed right to privacy that Americans need restored.

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, we cannot say that we support law enforcement officers and then take away the tools they need to do their job.

My amendment would strike a proper balance between ensuring our government does not use a third party to violate the Fourth Amendment while at the same time preserving the ability for law enforcement to do its job.

Without adopting my amendment, this bill will make it almost impossible for State, local, and Federal law enforcement to investigate crime. We should be making it easier for law enforcement to do their job rather than tying one hand behind their back. At the same time, we should protect against government's warrantless searches and seizures of American citizens.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. We all support the police and criminal investigations, but we all support, we hope, the Fourth Amendment, the requirement to get a warrant for probable cause in order to search something or somebody.

This bill is to avoid an end run around that by the government purchasing information from data brokers for which they should need a warrant. This amendment would gut that and destroy the whole purpose of the bill.

The bill is essential to protecting liberty and to protecting the protections of the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge the defeat of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA) will be postponed.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LALOTA) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4639) to amend section 2702 of title 18, United States Code, to prevent law enforcement and intelligence agencies from obtaining subscriber or customer records in exchange for anything of value, to address communications and records in the possession of intermediary internet service providers, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

STANDING AGAINST HOUTHI AGGRESSION ACT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1149, I call up the bill (H.R. 6046) to designate Ansarallah as a foreign terrorist organization and impose certain sanctions on Ansarallah, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-29 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 6046

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 “Standing Against Houthi Aggression Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) It was reported by Reuters on March 21, 2017, that Iran, a designated state sponsor of terror, sent advanced weapons and military advisers to assist and support Yemen’s Ansarallah, commonly referred to as the “Houthis”.

(2) On January 19, 2021, the Trump Administration designated Ansarallah as a foreign terrorist organization and a specially designated global terrorist.

(3) On February 16, 2021, Secretary of State Blinken revoked the designation of Ansarallah as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219(a)(6)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)(6)(A)).

(4) Since October 7, 2023, the Houthis have launched over 40 ballistic missile and Unmanned

Aerial Vehicle attacks on international shipping in the Red Sea, including direct attacks on United States sailors and taking an international ship and its crew hostage. This follows years of Houthi cross-border attacks against Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

(5) Houthi attacks on global shipping have caused many shipping companies to re-route to avoid the area, resulting in a de-facto blockade against Yemen, while also driving up shipping costs, disrupting supply chains, and negatively impacting the global economy.

(6) In addition to providing the Houthis with advanced conventional weapons and component parts, Iran and their Hezbollah proxies have also enabled the Houthis with financial support, training, and technical knowledge to manufacture weapons, including long range drones and ballistic and cruise missiles in Yemen, resulting in increased Houthi weapons stockpiles and illegal weapons proliferation throughout the region.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION AS FTO; IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) DESIGNATION AS FTO.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall designate Ansarallah as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)).

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in paragraph (2) with respect to—

(A) Ansarallah; and

(B) any foreign person that is a member, agent, or affiliate of, or owned or controlled by Ansarallah.

(2) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all authorities granted under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of Ansarallah or the foreign person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(i) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien described in paragraph (1) shall be—

(I) inadmissible to the United States;

(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(ii) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The visa or other entry documentation of any alien described in paragraph (1) is subject to revocation regardless of the issue date of the visa or other entry documentation.

(II) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under subparagraph (I) shall, in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i))—

(aa) take effect immediately; and

(bb) cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the possession of the alien.

(3) PENALTIES.—Any person that violates, or attempts to violate, paragraph (2) or any regulation, license, or order issued pursuant to that subsection, shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this subsection.

(5) REGULATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this subsection.

(B) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—Not less than 10 days before the promulgation of regulations under paragraph (1), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the proposed regulations and the provisions of this subsection that the regulations are implementing.

(C) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(6) EXCEPTIONS.—

(A) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under this subsection shall not apply to any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(B) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under this subsection shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary—

(i) to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations; or

(ii) to carry out or assist authorized law enforcement activity in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCARTHY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCARTHY).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because of the grievous errors of the Biden administration.

The Biden administration’s failed policies have emboldened the Houthi rebels at the expense of our regional partners. By projecting weakness on the world stage, this administration has invited aggression.

The Houthis were previously designated as a foreign terrorist organization, or FTO, and a specially designated global terrorist organization. Then-Secretary of State Mike Pompeo issued both designations in January 2021.

This was in response to the Houthis' violent takeover of Yemen's capital, years of civil war, and wide-scale suppression of Yemeni civilians, as well as the hundreds of cross-border attacks on Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. The Houthis undertook this entire campaign of destruction with the backing of Iran, the leading state sponsor of terrorism.

Regrettably, the incoming Biden administration removed the two terrorist designations, even though Houthis continued to traffic in terror. Removing these designations with no concessions only emboldened the Houthi rebels.

After the designation was removed, the Houthis breached the former U.S. Embassy compound in Yemen. They forcibly detained several current and former U.S. Embassy locally employed staff and international aid workers, and Houthi cross-border attacks against Saudi Arabia doubled compared to the previous year.

The Houthis' terrorist activities reached new heights after Hamas' October 7, 2023, terror attack on Israel. Since then, the Houthis, with the support of Iran and their Hezbollah proxies, have undertaken a deadly and disruptive campaign. They have launched over 100 missiles and drone attacks on global shipping in the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden. The Houthis' missile and drone attacks have killed mariners and have even sunk a ship. The Houthis have hijacked a ship and continue to hold its crew hostage.

Iran and Hezbollah are, according to declassified U.S. intelligence, directly involved in the Houthi campaign against international shipping.

These disruptions pose a serious threat to the global economy. Ships are rerouting around the Horn of Africa, adding approximately 10 days in additional travel time and up to \$1 million in fuel costs. Moreover, insurance premiums for ships using the Red Sea have increased tenfold.

The United States and our international partners have responded with military force to defend against the incoming Houthi attacks and, in some cases, undertaken strikes on Houthi military infrastructure in Yemen.

We need to be exerting all forms of pressure and deterrence on the Houthis to stop these attacks. We cannot ignore the Houthis' true nature. Their slogan, Mr. Speaker, is: "Death to America, Death to Israel, Curse on the Jews, Victory to Islam."

They are a terrorist organization and must be designated as such. This will ensure that all forms of support to the Houthis are subject to sanctions or criminal penalties.

While the Biden administration reimposed the specially designated global terrorist designation, it has substantial carve-outs that weaken the impact, essentially rendering it useless.

The stakes are too high, Mr. Speaker. One can only think about last Saturday night when Iran fired over 300 missiles and drones into Israel. It is the

first time in history that rockets have been fired out of Iran into the State of Israel.

We must take action, and that is why this bill directs the Secretary of State to redesignate the Houthis as an FTO with no exceptions and no carve-outs.

The Houthis are waging an all-out war on global commerce and freedom of navigation, and Iran is bankrolling them.

□ 1330

If the United States and international community do not respond, we are, in essence, yielding to the demands of the terrorists. We are emboldening them and empowering them.

The Biden administration's weakness invited further Houthi aggression. Now it is up to the Congress to act and preserve our national security.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2024.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN McCUAUL: I write regarding H.R. 6046, the Standing Against Houthi Aggression Act. Provisions of this bill fall within the Judiciary Committee's Rule X jurisdiction, and I appreciate that you consulted with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee agrees that it shall be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee takes this action with the understanding that forgoing further consideration of this measure does not in any way alter the Committee's jurisdiction or waive any future jurisdictional claim over these provisions or their subject matter. We also reserve the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees in the event of a conference with the Senate involving this measure or similar legislation.

I ask that you please include this letter in your committee's report to accompany this legislation or insert this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 6046 on the House floor. I appreciate the cooperative manner in which our committees have worked on this matter, and I look forward to working collaboratively in the future on matters of shared jurisdiction. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

JIM JORDAN,
Chairman.

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

Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JORDAN: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6046, the Standing Against Houthi Aggression Act, so that the measure may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation

in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will place our letters into our Committee's report on this bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. McCUAUL,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6046, which would force the administration to designate the Houthis a foreign terrorist organization, an FTO, a designation that risks jeopardizing the very lifesaving assistance Yemeni civilians are dependent on for their survival.

Let me be clear. Everyone in this body recognizes the threat the Houthis pose both in Yemen and the Red Sea. We have seen the Iran-backed proxy launch a campaign of missile attacks on commercial vessels in the Red Sea, attempting to halt global trade, violating international law. Their disruptive campaign has not only endangered merchant vessels, but also United States personnel with the clear-stated intention of harming Israel and any of its allies.

That said, I believe that this legislation is the wrong approach. The Biden administration has undertaken the correct approach. In response to the Houthis' unprecedented attack in the Red Sea, the administration, rather than unilaterally, worked multilaterally with more than 40 countries to curb the Houthi behavior while not escalating tension in the Middle East.

The administration has targeted military strikes on Houthi targets and implemented, specifically, specially designated global terrorist sanctions with appropriate humanitarian provisions.

Working collectively with our allies, not America alone, is the way that we win this battle. That is the correct route instead of this measure, which does not address the Houthi threat.

Instead, it undermines the United States' national security objective in the region and endangers innocent Yemenis, who are already on the brink of perishing.

First, the H.R. 6046 mandate does not include humanitarian provisions, thereby unnecessarily punishing millions of Yemeni civilians. This would create a scenario in which commercial vessels and humanitarian organizations would not be able to continue to provide lifesaving goods to many Yemenis due to severe criminal penalties they would incur for doing so.

After nearly a decade of brutal war, the majority of the Yemenis, nearly half of them children, face serious malnutrition, and millions more Yemenis remain on the brink of starvation. This legislation would only deepen the humanitarian crisis at a time when aid is

most needed. That is why a broad coalition of NGOs and humanitarian organizations oppose an FTO designation without humanitarian provisions.

While some may point to existing general licenses or provisions as a mitigating factor, the legal implications of an FTO designation and the sweeping consequences it entails, without regard to type of activity or transaction, renders such licenses moot without any such new statutory authorizations or exemptions.

Secondly, this designation would also undercut important ongoing diplomatic efforts by the United States, the U.N., and European countries to achieve de-escalation in the region, the world, together. That is the right thing to do.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill is theatrical. It will have no real-world impact on the Houthi behavior, but would likely serve as a public relations win and recruiting fodder for the movement while, at the same time, the people that would be punished are the Yemenis, those innocent children and women and men. It is unnecessary.

This and any future administration already has the authority to implement such a designation per section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons and others, I urge my colleagues not to support H.R. 6046, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the author of this bill.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman McCaul for his leadership on this bill, as well. It is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that we are considering my bill, H.R. 6046, the Standing Against Houthi Aggression Act, today.

This legislation would reimpose the foreign terrorist organization designation on the Iran-backed Houthis, as well as reinstate additional sanctions against the group.

The Houthis have long been a source of terror and violence, not only to Yemen, but to the whole region. Yet, for incalculable reasons, the Biden administration refuses to call them what they are. They are terrorists.

President Donald Trump rightfully classified the Houthis as a foreign terrorist organization in January of 2021 after a series of heinous attacks against civilians. However, in a shocking and politically motivated retraction, the Biden administration reversed President Trump's decision just 1 month later, further empowering the Iran-backed Houthis in their acts of terror.

The Houthis have carried out a series of ongoing attacks in recent months, including ballistic-missile and unmanned-aerial-vehicle attacks against international shipping vessels in the

Red Sea. The attacks began last year when Houthi forces landed a helicopter on a cargo vessel and seized the crew. Since then, there have been more than 40 attacks on commercial ships by the Houthi rebels.

We express our deep gratitude to the brave men and women of the USS *Carney* who have taken defensive measures against the Houthi anti-ship ballistic missiles on multiple occasions to safeguard the waters of the Gulf of Aden.

Tragically, two Navy SEALS were recently lost at sea and later declared deceased after a U.S. operation to intervene and seize Iranian weapons being transported to the Houthis. American blood has been spilled because of the Houthi terrorists.

Additionally, over this past weekend, the Houthis joined Iran's assault on our greatest ally in the Middle East, Israel. While the Israeli Iron Dome and the United States Central Command thankfully intercepted 99 percent of the projectiles, the Houthis' growing aggression represents an existential danger in the region.

In response to these ongoing attacks, the Biden administration felt pressured, and so they recognized that they had to do something. Therefore, they designated the Houthi movement as a specially designated global terrorist group in January, but this lower-tier designation is simply not enough. It comes nowhere close to matching the force of a foreign terrorist organization designation.

President Trump designated the Houthis as both, and they should be both designations. The foreign terrorist organization designation, as provided in this bill, goes much farther, allowing for special criminal penalties for materiel support, like military supplies; immigration restrictions; and the ability for victims to seek damages. H.R. 6046 would require that the Houthis receive the foreign terrorist organization designation within 90 days after the enactment of this bill.

The Houthis' intentions are abundantly clear, but by passing my bill, we make our intentions perfectly clear, that the United States does not bargain with, nor capitulate to terrorist regimes.

Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of this legislation, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 6046, the Standing Against Houthi Aggression Act, to forcefully show that there will be consequences for the Houthis' egregious acts of terror.

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

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6046, the Standing Against

Houthi Aggression Act, which I am proud to be a cosponsor of.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am appalled that I have to say this, but the President of the United States has emboldened Iran to attack our greatest ally in the Middle East and the only democracy in that region, Israel.

In February of 2021, the Biden administration removed the Houthis from the U.S. list of foreign terrorist organizations. This was a terrible, terrible misjudgment that mirrors this administration's complete lack of authority on issues of national and international security.

Iranian-backed terrorist organizations have repeatedly proven that they will carry out the Iranian regime's radical Islamic ideology to no end. This weekend was a sobering reminder of that.

It is time to hold Iran and its proxies accountable for their actions. This requires that the U.S. take a firmer stance against Iran's state-sponsored terrorism. The Standing Against Houthi Aggression Act places the Houthis back onto the list of foreign terrorist organizations, where they should have been all along, and it imposes immediate sanctions on any individual associated with the group.

If President Biden refuses to lead, I hope this body will step up in his absence to fight against anti-Semitism and state-sponsored terrorism. Anything less than that, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6046 would force the administration to designate the Houthis as a foreign terrorist organization without humanitarian provisions and, consequently, make the humanitarian crisis in Yemen even more dire.

Now, Mr. CLYDE says that the Biden administration doesn't want to call the Houthis what they are, but let me read what they are and sanctioned already. They are a specially designated global terrorist. That is what the Biden administration issued. The difference between the two, being an SDGT as opposed to being an FTO, is one allows humanitarian aid in, and the other doesn't.

This bill would have significant adverse impacts, creating a situation in which humanitarian organizations and commercial shippers would be reluctant to provide food, aid, and medical equipment to Yemen out of fear of the severe criminal consequences this bill would impose.

It does nothing really to change the Houthis' behavior. It just hurts innocent Yemeni people. Therefore, I support the administration's efforts to counter Houthi actions with targeted military strikes and the implementation of that specially designated global terrorist sanction, which includes the humanitarian provisions that this bill

lacks. This is, by far, the better path toward ceasing hostile Houthi actions.

The Biden administration's approach holds the Houthis responsible for their violent, destabilizing actions without deepening the crisis for innocent Yemeni citizens.

□ 1345

I am going to stand with a broad coalition of NGOs, humanitarian organizations, and those that understand the wealth and the need and the richness of human life, trying to save human beings, not turning our backs on them with a piece of legislation that will do nothing really to the Houthis or change their behavior.

All of these NGOs, all of these humanitarian organizations, oppose an FTO designation without humanitarian provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to do the same. We should make sure that the NGOs and humanitarian organizations are able to help save innocent lives.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill and ask my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say I learned one thing in my 20 years here and as a history major, as well. It repeats itself.

If you message weakness, that invites aggression, conflict, and war. If you project strength, you have peace. Whether it be Israel, whether it be Ukraine, whether it be China and their ambitions with Taiwan, we are projecting weakness.

We are seeing around the world our global hot spots. The world is on fire now, Mr. Speaker, fires lit by a policy of appeasement.

When they lifted the FTO designation on the Houthi rebels, there is a direct cause and effect. I respect my good friend from the other side of the aisle, but messaging counts. Deterrence does count.

What happened after the Biden administration lifted the terrorist designation? We had crossed borders on Saudi Arabia that doubled to over 400 attacks, more than 180 on international shipping, and they are shutting down the Red Sea and commerce.

We are only emboldening, and unfortunately, the policy in the Middle East has always been to appease and accommodate Iran so that maybe Iran will one day sit down so we can break bread and have this glorious Iran deal.

I am an idealist and an optimist, but I am also a realist and pragmatic in my worldview. That was not going to happen.

What have we seen when the Biden administration lifted sanctions on energy? We have seen \$80 billion in energy sold to China; \$80 billion going to Iran to kill, for terror operations through their proxies; \$80 billion to send missiles, rockets, and drones to

Russia to kill Ukrainians. It is all connected. Those three are our adversaries and our enemies, all three of them.

This is not the time to be sending a message of weakness to the largest state sponsor of terror, for to do so will only invite more aggression.

We also have waived and let expire sanctions on the drones and missiles manufactured by Iran. Let's think about that. That just went away. So, guess what? Iran can now sell their drones and missiles wherever they want, putting more money into Iran for their terror operations.

I can go on and on. We know what is happening there. We saw what happened last Saturday, the reign of terror. Thank God the United States provided the moneys for the Iron Dome, David's Sling, and the Arrow, which brought down 99 percent of these attacks. Ninety-nine percent of these attacks were actually brought down, stopped, and intercepted because of this partnership against terror.

Mr. Speaker, to our servicemembers defending freedom of navigation right now in the Red Sea against the threat of Houthi rockets that they intercept every day, for the other side to say it is not connected to Iran just defies our U.S. intelligence community. We know exactly where it is coming from. They are the proxies. Iran, the Ayatollah, is the head of the snake and the proxies are the tentacles. It is time to deal with the tentacles, and it is also time to cut the head of the snake off.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. McCaul. 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.

IRAN SANCTIONS RELIEF REVIEW ACT OF 2023

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1149, I call up the bill (H.R. 4691) to provide for congressional review of actions to terminate or waive sanctions imposed with respect to Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules

Committee Print 118-30 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4691

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 “Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN ACTIONS RELATING TO SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.

(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF PROPOSED ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, before taking any action described in paragraph (2), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report that describes the proposed action and the reasons for that action.

(2) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An action described in this paragraph is—

(i) an action to terminate the application of any sanctions described in subparagraph (B);
(ii) with respect to sanctions described in subparagraph (B) imposed by the President with respect to a person, an action to waive the application of those sanctions with respect to that person; or

(iii) a licensing action that significantly alters United States foreign policy with respect to Iran.

(B) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subparagraph are sanctions with respect to Iran provided for under—

(i) the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

(ii) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.);

(iii) section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a);

(iv) the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.);

(v) the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.);

(vi) the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); or

(vii) any other statute or Executive order that requires or authorizes the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF ACTION.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) with respect to an action described in paragraph (2) shall include a description of whether the action—

(A) is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran; or

(B) is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran.

(4) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL MATTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran shall include a description of—

(i) the significant alteration to United States foreign policy with respect to Iran;

(ii) the anticipated effect of the action on the national security interests of the United States; and

(iii) the policy objectives for which the sanctions affected by the action were initially imposed.

(B) REQUESTS FROM BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEES.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate or the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives may request the

submission to the Committee of the matter described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (1) that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran.

(5) CONFIDENTIALITY OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Proprietary information that can be associated with a particular person with respect to an action described in paragraph (2) may be included in a report submitted under paragraph (1) only if the appropriate congressional committees and leadership provide assurances of confidentiality, unless that person otherwise consents in writing to such disclosure.

(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraph (2)(A)(iii) shall not be construed to require the submission of a report under paragraph (1) with respect to the routine issuance of a license that does not significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran.

(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report; and

(B) in the case of a report that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) of a report required to be submitted under subsection (a)(1) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period for congressional review provided for under paragraph (1) of a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2), including any additional period for such review as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not take that action unless a joint resolution of approval with respect to that action is enacted in accordance with subsection (c).

(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action for a period of 12 calendar days after the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) passes both Houses of Congress in accordance with subsection (c), and the President vetoes the joint resolution, the President may not take that action for a period of 10 calendar days after the date of the President's veto.

(6) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of

disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (a)(1) proposing an action described in subsection (a)(2) is enacted in accordance with subsection (c), the President may not take that action.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OR APPROVAL.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—The term “joint resolution of approval” means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(i) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution approving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to Iran.”; and

(ii) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress approves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 2(a)(1) of the Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act of 2023 on _____ relating to _____.”, with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(B) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—The term “joint resolution of disapproval” means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(i) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution disapproving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to Iran.”; and

(ii) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress disapproves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 2(a)(1) of the Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act of 2023 on _____ relating to _____.”, with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

(2) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under subsection (b)(1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in subsection (b)(2), a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader’s designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader’s designee).

(3) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 legislative days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be—

(i) referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs if the joint resolution relates to a report under subsection (a)(3)(A) that relates to an action that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran; and

(ii) referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations if the joint resolution relates to a report under subsection (a)(3)(B) that relates to an action that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with respect to Iran.

(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval was referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs or the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the case may be, reports a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

(E) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(5) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) TREATMENT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION IN HOUSE.—In the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply to a joint resolution of approval or a joint resolution of disapproval received from the Senate (unless the House has already passed a joint resolution relating to the same proposed action):

(i) The joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committee.

(ii) If a committee to which a joint resolution has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 5 legislative days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

(iii) Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution has been referred reports the joint resolution to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(iv) The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(B) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—

(i) RECEIPT BEFORE PASSAGE.—If, before the passage by the Senate of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply:

(I) That joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee.

(II) With respect to that joint resolution—

(aa) the procedure in the Senate shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the House of Representatives; but

(bb) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

(ii) RECEIPT AFTER PASSAGE.—If, following passage of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval in the Senate, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate Senate calendar.

(iii) NO COMPANION MEASURE.—If a joint resolution of approval or a joint resolution of disapproval is received from the House, and no companion joint resolution has been introduced in the Senate, the Senate procedures under this subsection shall apply to the House joint resolution.

(C) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval that is a revenue measure.

(6) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

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

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees and leadership” means—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCaul. 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 measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, even after the Trump administration rightfully withdrew from the dangerous Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA, the Biden administration entered office committed to pursuing a new nuclear deal with Iran.

Throughout this administration’s dealings with Iran, it was abundantly clear that Iran was taking advantage of the administration’s blind commitment to negotiations just for the sake of negotiating.

A nuclear Iran is not acceptable—full stop. However, throughout 2021 and 2022, the Biden administration continued to push negotiations even as Iran escalated its nuclear provocations. Iran suspended compliance with the IAEA Additional Protocol. Iran installed new advanced centrifuges. Iran increased its uranium stockpile toward enrichment. Iran refused to cooperate with an IAEA investigation.

In fact, I met with the Director General of the IAEA at his office in Europe, and he said that the Iranians had a cyberattack on their office and stole all of their documents pertaining to their investigations dealing with compliance from Iran on the sites.

That is not a sign of good faith. You can’t negotiate with somebody like that.

Still, they are intent on getting this nuclear deal done. It became very clear that they are desperate to reach a deal, even if it was a bad deal.

The irony, Mr. Speaker, is this: The very individual charged by Congress and the administration, the special envoy to Iran, Mr. Malley, is under FBI investigation for violations of his security clearance. That is our top negotiator to Iran.

My colleagues and I have been gravely concerned that this administration would lift Iranian sanctions in exchange for insufficient limitations on Iran’s nuclear program. These concerns grew even more severe, again, after Rob Malley came under FBI investigation, which the State Department failed to notify Congress. When I invited him to testify about the Iran deal, I was told he was not available, and now we know why.

It is deeply disturbing that the United States Government no longer trusts the one who is spearheading our negotiations with an enemy regime. We can’t afford any strategic miscalculations when it comes to Iran.

Again, as I said in the prior debate, deterrence is key, and you only deter and get peace through projecting strength, including strengthening our economic sanctions while they have eased them.

Every dollar that goes to the Iranian regime in any form has the potential to be deadly. The events of this past weekend demonstrate that. Iran launched over 350 missile and drone attacks on our ally, Israel—unprecedented in history. Israel, the United States, and other partners intercepted 99 percent of these weapons.

Iran is not 10 feet tall. That is why this legislation is so important. Congress and the American people need an opportunity to review any proposed plans to lift sanctions, especially the ones that Congress has mandated, on this rogue regime.

I thank my good friend, Mr. SELF, on the Foreign Affairs Committee, who is also from the great State of Texas, for this bill. This bill requires the President to report to Congress on any plans to terminate or waive sanctions on Iran. It codifies a process for Congress to conduct oversight of these proposed waivers and terminations.

We have that power under Article I of the Constitution. Yet, when they waive sanctions that Congress passed, they are not notifying us. We deserve that right. We have a responsibility to keep the American people safe, and that requires the executive branch and Congress to work together to determine the national security interests of the United States. Congress must have a say in any attempts to broker any kind of deal with Iran.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2024.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN McCaul: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Financial Services regarding H.R. 4691, the Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act of 2023. I agree that the Committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 4691 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved on this or similar legislation as it moves forward. The Committee also reserves the right to see appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any conference with the Senate involving this or similar legislation, and we request your support for any such request.

Finally, as you mentioned in your letter, I ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this bill be included in your Committee’s report to accompany the legislation, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

PATRICK McHENRY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2024.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN McHENRY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4691, the Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act of 2023, so that the measure may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on this bill into the Congressional Record during floor consideration. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward

to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. McCaul,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2024.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN McCaul: I write regarding H.R. 4691, the Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act of 2023. Provisions of this bill fall within the Judiciary Committee's Rule X jurisdiction, and I appreciate that you consulted with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee agrees that it shall be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee takes this action with the understanding that forgoing further consideration of this measure does not in any way alter the Committee's jurisdiction or waive any future jurisdictional claim over these provisions or their subject matter. We also reserve the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees in the event of a conference with the Senate involving this measure or similar legislation.

I ask that you please include this letter in your committee's report to accompany this legislation or insert this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4691 on the House floor. I appreciate the cooperative manner in which our committees have worked on this matter, and I look forward to working collaboratively in the future on matters of shared jurisdiction. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

JIM JORDAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2024.

Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JORDAN: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4691, the Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act of 2023, so that the measure may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on this bill into the Congressional Record during floor consideration. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. McCaul,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2024.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN McCaul: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Oversight and Accountability. The Committee on Over-

sight and Accountability agrees to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4691, the Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act of 2023, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

I agree that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 4691 at this time, the Committee on Oversight and Accountability does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. The Committee on Oversight and Accountability should be appropriately consulted and involved on this or similar legislation as it moves forward. I support your effort to represent the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability on the conference committee if a conference on the bill becomes necessary.

As discussed, I appreciate your inclusion of a copy of our exchange of letters on this bill in the bill report filed by the Foreign Affairs Committee and in the Congressional Record during House floor consideration thereof. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this bill and look forward to future opportunities to work together on matters of shared jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

JAMES COMER,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight
and Accountability.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2024.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Accountability, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4691, the Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act of 2023, so that the measure may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on this bill into the Congressional Record during floor consideration. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. McCaul,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4691.

As I have explained during committee consideration, I have serious concerns about what this bill means to the overall practice of American foreign policy and, therefore, must oppose it.

Some think that diplomacy is weak and that the only way you show strength is to go to war. We have heard from generals that if war was the only option that we had on the table, it would cost us much more in bullets and armor, and that diplomacy helps deter military.

In fact, I would say it is strength. Anybody can say I am going to fight. It is strength in trying to negotiate, in dealing with diplomacy. If that should

fail, going to war should be your last alternative.

Diplomacy and people in the State Department who exercise it are absolutely essential. It brings others with us so we are not out there by ourselves but working in a multilateral way.

□ 1400

It is hard for any Member, particularly me as a ranking member, to be opposed to a bill that is meant to increase congressional oversight of sensitive foreign policy issues. However, in the specific case of this bill as drafted, were it to be signed into law, I believe it would damage America's ability to conduct effective diplomacy.

Here is why. When dealing with our enemies, a strong diplomatic corps and a strong military are both necessary to achieve our goals. In the specific case of Iran, they can clearly see from our consistent joint military exercises, regional deployments, and last weekend's missile defense that we mean business.

Our diplomatic efforts have also proven very effective. Case in point was the successful implementation of the JCPOA, which verifiably cut off all pathways to an Iranian bomb. The dangerous nuclear moment we now find ourselves in, where Iran has stockpiled highly enriched uranium and is limiting the access of inspectors is the direct result of the shortsighted cancellation of that diplomatic agreement. The Iranian nuclear threat has never been more dangerous than it is right now.

Again, when we had the JCPOA, working in a multilateral way with our other allies, and even at that point, two who are not allies, and when you speak to most individuals, IAEA included, who had eyes on what was taking place in Iran, once we pulled out and stopped using diplomacy, they have no eyes now, which is why Iran is more dangerous today than it was when they were in this agreement.

The United States must keep diplomacy on the table as a tool to address the Iranian threat. If this proposed bill is set into law, Iranian negotiators will know and allied negotiators will know that the executive branch officials in the negotiation room cannot independently make decisions. Our negotiators will be at an acute disadvantage. Other parties, friend or foe, will know any adjustment in sanctions implementation would become subject to a joint motion of disapproval. Carefully negotiated multilateral agreements risk becoming subject to partisanship right here in the United States House of Representatives, in Congress. Such an action is worrisome and also without precedent.

I also believe that this bill directly interferes with the INARA process, the bipartisan agreement currently in statute to provide Congress the ability to approve or disapprove a negotiated nuclear agreement.

Diplomatic agreements with Iran are already subject to congressional review as a whole. This bill goes far beyond

that statute. Even if the United States Congress cleared an Iran deal through a comprehensive INARA process, sanctions implementation would once again become subject to binding congressional review, risking the agreement itself.

This legislation could also harm efforts to deescalate tensions with Iran shy of a comprehensive agreement. If this or a future administration tried to negotiate a short-term diplomatic agreement on nuclear or other issues, such as regional troop protection, this legislation would interfere with that process.

I would also like to make a more general point about sanctions that I believe this Congress sometimes forgets—one I feel that I have to make over and over and over again nowadays in this Congress. Sanctions are meant to be lifted if they achieve our goals. You don't keep a sanction if the goal has been achieved. Our nuclear sanctions were not passed to foment regime change in Iran, no matter how much we hoped they were. They were designed to drive Iran to the table to negotiate an end to their nuclear weapons program. If we reach an agreement that clears INARA, one that verifiably cuts off pathways to a nuclear weapon, we have to live up to our end of the agreement.

Legislation like this one is designed to thwart our obligations, damaging our diplomatic flexibility and trustworthiness if we care about diplomacy. Now maybe we don't care about diplomacy; I think that is the wrong way to go. I think that we should very much care about diplomacy.

Finally, some will argue that there is precedent for such a policy vis-a-vis Russia. That is inaccurate. The scope of Russian sanctions in CAATSA is much smaller. For instance, national emergencies past and present are included in this proposed bill but not in CAATSA. The new Russia sanctions EO's aren't covered in CAATSA, and any new Iran EO would be. There are also many sanctions in CAATSA where there is no congressional review. This bill, however, would apply to the entire universe of Iran sanctions. Finally, CAATSA mechanisms were established specifically to deal with Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election. It wasn't about trying to prevent legitimate diplomacy, as this bill will do.

My friends and colleagues, we must look beyond Iran before going down this road. I have been around here 26 years, and I know that if passed into law, this type of policy will not stop with Iran. If this were to become law, it would only be a matter of time before the lifting of any sanction, no matter how small, would be subject to a congressional vote. It is our duty to provide the authority and the appropriations for effective foreign policy, not to undermine diplomacy in this manner.

We cannot have 535 Secretaries of State in a negotiating room. It never

happens that way. You do not negotiate that way. Diplomacy does not work that way. I say: Please think. Think carefully before steering us down this road. Think what it means if you think diplomacy is important. If you don't think diplomacy is important and the only thing that is important is going to war, then we have a difference of opinion.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCaul. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the author of this bill.

Mr. SELF. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4691, my bill. In response to the surprisingly bellicose comments by the ranking member, Madam Speaker, no one wants to go to war with Iran, but when the Iranian regime chants "Death to America" or "Death to Israel," America's response must be swift with immediate deterrence.

While I cannot compare to the chairman and the ranking member's years in this body, I did spend many years as a military planner, and I will tell you, I agree with President Reagan: "We know only too well that war comes not when the forces of freedom are strong, but when they are weak." Case in point, Iran's massive attack on Israel just days ago.

Make no mistake, the Biden administration has covertly fueled Iran's global sponsorship of terrorism. Three times in the last year, the administration signed off on a sanctions waiver to Iran, unlocking \$10 billion that were previously frozen.

Then, in September, the President agreed to give \$6 billion to Iran in exchange for hostages. Lifting sanctions freed up billions of dollars that Iran used to support terrorist proxies, such as Hezbollah, the Houthi rebels, and Hamas.

Shockingly, after Hamas terrorists savagely murdered 1,200 innocent Israelis on October 7, the White House refused to correct course.

Before President Biden was sworn into office, Iran had \$4 billion in foreign reserves. That number today is \$70 billion. Again, \$4 billion before, \$70 billion today. Congress was never involved in these decisions, and this is only the most recent tip of the iceberg.

Let's not forget Obama's Iran deal, which most agree was a disaster. The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, otherwise known as the JCPOA, was a plan of action to benefit Iran. The JCPOA did not end Iran's nuclear weapon production but lifted sanctions, including access to at least \$50 billion in liquid assets.

Later, in 2017, Congress passed a sanctions bill against the areas overlooked in the Iran deal on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. There is no reason to allow the White House to override Congress by providing sanctions relief to the number one donor to

Hezbollah, the Houthi rebels, and Hamas.

My bill, the Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act, will prevent just that. This legislation establishes a detailed procedure for Congress to review any action by the President to terminate, waive, or modify sanctions on Iran. Under the bill, the President must report to Congress on any proposed sanctions relief and the reasons for the change in policy.

Congress must not allow the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism to get a payday as it continues to spread its malign influence on a global scale.

Madam Speaker, Congress must rein in the actions of a lawless President. Congress must reassert Article I authority.

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

Mr. McCaul. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I think everyone has heard by now how important diplomacy is. I think that we should show it in our budget. I am a firm believer in diplomacy. The fact of the matter, the direct quote from General Mattis was: "If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition ultimately."

I guess my friends and colleagues from the other side of the aisle just want to buy ammunition, and that is why the State Department is continually being cut, because they don't really focus on or put diplomacy on the same level, and that is what is happening here with this bill.

This bill would significantly impede America's ability to conduct effective diplomacy with Iran. By requiring that any adjustment in sanctions implementation be subject to a joint motion of disapproval, the bill would undermine diplomacy and U.S. negotiators, and makes that clear to anyone sitting across from them at the table. That is the negotiating table, not the battlefield, where we hope we don't have to go, but we are prepared and have shown that we are ready to do it if we must, and that is discussed first at a negotiating table.

□ 1415

This would also let them know when we are at the table—those that are sitting across that table—that they have no authority to relax or adjust sanctions. It would subject any negotiations to undue congressional partisanship.

Can anyone deny that what we see happening on this floor—and what is happening in this 118th Congress—partisanship plays a huge role? In fact, we can't get anything done because of partisanship. Iran would know this. In fact, our allies would know this.

We are tied up in partisanship. This would only weaken our position. This only compromises the agility required

to address urgent international threats and opportunities.

Moreover, the stipulations of this bill undermine the very purpose of sanctions which are intended as tools to bring nations like Iran to the negotiating table—not as a permanent punitive measure. But if they do something where they are disregarding, and we are not working together and are aggressive at that negotiating table, we also are letting them know that we are ready or what we have the capability of doing.

This bill hurts diplomacy. It hurts trying to make sure that we are driving others to the negotiating table. As General Mattis said, he doesn't have to buy more bullets. Let's fund the State Department. Let's promote and speak good will of diplomacy. It is the best way to move forward in a multilateral way with our allies.

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

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

I agree with some of the things my good friend has said. Diplomacy is extremely important. We deal with it on the committee all the time. It is called soft power. Then we have hard power. We sign off on foreign military weapons sales. Diplomacy at all costs needs to be tried, but when the diplomats fail, often we go to war or we have conflict.

The question before us is twofold. One, has Iran negotiated in good faith such that we would both waive or not enforce or let expire sanctions, many of them passed by Congress?

The second question is, are Article I authorities under the Constitution?

All we are simply asking for is when we pass a sanction—or the administration does so—that they notify Congress.

And I will tell you why this is important.

For months I tried to get Robert Malley, our special envoy to Iran, into the committee to testify on this Iran deal, but guess what? He refused to come testify. Why? Because we then find out he was under investigation by the FBI for potential violation of his security clearance.

This great Iran deal that they talk about has only brought Iran closer to a nuclear bomb, closer to weapons-grade uranium. They can go to 90 percent in days. If they get a nuclear warhead from Russia or North Korea, they have full capability, and they will become a nuclear state. We cannot let that happen.

They failed to declare nuclear sites in Iran. They kicked out investigators from the IAEA. Then in one of the most horrific displays of bad faith in negotiations, Mr. Speaker, do you know what they did? They launched a cyberattack on the IAEA to steal their documents related to their investigations on the very sites that the JCPOA was supposed to allow them in to examine. Then they blocked the inspectors from having access to these sites.

Now, I am all for negotiating. I am all for diplomacy. I don't think the Ayatollah is a good faith partner here, and I don't think he has our best interests at heart. They chant “death to America,” and “death to Israel” and call us “Great Satan,” and they call Israel “Little Satan.” They are closer to a bomb than they have ever been.

All we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is before you waive sanctions that Congress passed, or not enforce sanctions, just let us know. I don't think that is a big deal. I mean, Malley wouldn't testify before Congress. We didn't know why because they were hiding it from us. They didn't want us to know about the FBI investigation until the press reported it. We found out from the press—not from the administration, but from the press.

Let's look at some of the sanctions that they let expire and they have waived, and you tell me if that makes sense. The sanctions on energy, exporting energy to China, the majority going to China; we are allowing this axis of evil—the Ayatollah, Putin, and China—to work together with Iran exporting energy.

Mr. Speaker, \$80 billion from China went into Iran to fund the very missiles and rockets and drones that we saw last Saturday night. It was the first attack from Iran into Israel in history.

Then they let the U.N. sanctions on exports to other countries for their missiles and drones to expire. Now, we have a bill to reinstate those sanctions. The very same drones and missiles were used to attack Israel last Saturday night, the very same drones and missiles that have been bought by Russia to kill Ukrainians. It is all interconnected. China is in this, the Ayatollah is in it, Putin is in it, and they are all profiting from Iran, who they provide technical expertise. Iran makes the stuff and the energy that they then buy from them to put the money in Iran to reign terror.

I think it only fair that the American people through their Representatives under Article I have the opportunity to even know when they are doing this and not operate behind a veil of secrecy. When a Republican President gets into office, what will the Democrats say then if they are hiding things on sanctions and investigations? I think we will hear the same argument that we are making on this side.

That is why this is not a partisan issue. This is about this institution under Article I. We have every right to know this, especially the sanctions that we pass in Congress. We always put a Presidential waiver in these things. Remember Nord Stream 2, we put a Presidential waiver. Nobody thought that a President would waive sanctions on a pipeline to put Europe in a state of dependency on Russian energy. Look how that one worked out. Did we know about it in advance? No. That didn't work out so well, did it?

Right after Afghanistan, guess what happens? Putin, the Russian Federation went into Ukraine. Chairman Xi is watching it. He is looking at Taiwan.

No. We have tried. We have tried acting in good faith with them. They are not acting in good faith with us, and the American people through its Representatives and the Congress, I say, have a right to know.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIMENEZ). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RESCISSON OF CERTAIN WAIVERS AND LICENSES RELATING TO IRAN

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1149, I call up the bill (H.R. 5947) to provide for the rescission of certain waivers and licenses relating to Iran, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5947

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

SECTION 1. RESCISSION OF CERTAIN WAIVERS AND LICENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On the date of enactment of this Act, the following measures shall be terminated:

(1) The waiver exercised on the pursuant to section 1245(d)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 and sections 1244(i) and 1247(f) of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 and transmitted to Congress on September 11, 2023, for the transfer of certain funds from the Republic of Korea to Qatar.

(2) Any general or specific license issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control at the Department of the Treasury directly or indirectly related to the funds cited in paragraph (1).

(b) LIMITATION.—The President may not reissue any new waiver or license described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) for the same or similar purposes.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION OF APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LICENSES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President may not—

(1) exercise the waiver authority described in section 1245(d)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 and sections 1244(i) and 1247(f) of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 permitting the Government of Iran or any Iranian person access to any account established or maintained pursuant to or in accordance with section 1245(d)(4)(D)(ii)(II) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012; or

(2) issue a general or specific license, frequently asked question, or any other licensing action or guidance permitting the Government of Iran or any Iranian person access to or to benefit directly or indirectly from any account established pursuant to or in accordance with any account described in 1245(d)(4)(D)(ii)(II) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 30 minutes. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, we saw Iran unleash an unprecedented missile and drone attack on our ally Israel. Iran launched over 350 missiles and drones. We are incredibly fortunate that Israel, the United States, and other partners successfully intercepted 99 percent of those weapons. Had they not, the damage would have been catastrophic.

How did a regime that has been subject to international sanctions for decades have the resources to develop such advanced weaponry? The answer is that Iran is incredibly skilled at illicit finance, sanctions evasion, and exploiting every possible loophole to fund their malign activities.

Time and time again, we have allowed ourselves to accept the fiction that we can issue sanctions waivers that give Iran access to funds for limited use on allegedly humanitarian transactions without enabling the regime's malign activities.

We need to face facts. This is patently false.

Money is fungible, and the Iranian regime does not care about its people, as evidenced by their wide-scale human rights abuses and repression.

Under President Trump's maximum pressure campaign, Iran was starved for foreign reserve currency. This forced the Iranian regime to make hard choices.

With these waivers in effect, every dollar or euro that we provide the Ira-

nian regime, even if purportedly for purchases of agriculture equipment or other humanitarian uses, frees up another dollar or euro that Iran's regime will spend on missiles, drones, its nuclear program, or its terrorist proxies.

Beyond the question of money being fungible, Iran has a demonstrated track record of falsifying humanitarian purchases.

□ 1430

In fact, the Department of Justice has previously charged a bank for "facilitating transactions fraudulently designed to appear to be purchases of food and medicine by Iranian customers, in order to appear to fall within the so-called 'humanitarian exception' to certain sanctions against the Government of Iran, when in fact no purchases of food or medicine actually occurred."

Enough is enough. With this bill, H.R. 5947, we are eliminating the sanctions waivers tied to the \$6 billion in Iranian funds in restricted accounts in Qatar and tied to the \$10 billion Iran has received from Iraq in electricity payments. It is too dangerous to allow Iran continued access to these funds, even with the nominal restrictions on how they are used.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to revoke these sanctions waivers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5947. This legislation may be short, but it is equally shortsighted with considerable long-term consequences.

Let's start with the impact this would have on Iraq. This bill would rescind a waiver that currently allows Iraq to pay for electricity from Iran.

This waiver is what allows the Iraqi Government to keep the lights on. Without it, massive blackouts would leave millions without electricity and cause precipitous chaos. It would hamper the fragile stability that Iraq has achieved over the past several years.

I don't believe anyone in this body wants to see a return to Iraq of the past, where Iraqis from previous decades suffered from never-ending wars and repression like that of the Saddam Hussein era.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of this bill goes even further than that. It would harm and cause the Iraqi people terrible consequences. An Iraq without electricity serves no American interest and would do nothing to promote our, the United States', national security.

Let's not forget, ISIS emerged from a chaotic Iraq. ISIS, I will repeat, emerged from a chaotic Iraq—long-term consequences, shortsighted bill.

When ISIS emerged, the result was not just widespread disorder, destruction, and violence in the Middle East but the growth of a global terrorist movement that struck my home city and State of New York, Orlando, San

Bernardino, as well as Paris, Brussels, and Barcelona.

I agree that we absolutely need to help Iraq find alternative sources of energy besides Iran, but it is simply not true that Iran is filling its coffers with payments from Iraq. There is roughly \$10 billion in Iraqi payments for Iranian electricity being held in escrow. Only very small portions of the money have been transferred to an account in Oman, into which the United States has oversight. Iran can only access that account to purchase humanitarian goods, like food or medicine. None of the funds—zero, nada—are going to nefarious purposes.

Maybe we have a difference and some don't care about humanitarian causes, humanitarian aid, and things of that nature. I know my side of the aisle does.

Human life, innocent human life, is very important, and it is also how we show what our values are.

This bill would risk our ability to have oversight and control of the \$6 billion in Iranian funds we are monitoring in Qatar, and much more. This measure would have the opposite effect of what it intends to do, leading to less control of Iranian assets.

I am deeply concerned that this bill removes all flexibility from our current Iran sanctions program. The point of sanctions, again, is to bring Iran back to—as I have said over and over on the various bills we have seen today—the negotiating table.

Sanctions are not an end but a means to an end. A diplomatic path, I say again, is the best path, and this measure removes the flexibility necessary for that strategic objective and the utilization of diplomacy.

Let me also say a quick word about process. Yes, we need to respond to global events, and that is why I supported seven Iran-related measures on the floor just yesterday. While I disagree with some of the other bills on the floor today, at least those pieces of legislation received proper committee consideration.

Yes, we do, on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, practice what I believe is some diplomacy. My friend and chairman, MICHAEL McCaul, and I talk. We give a chance to trying to work it out first. Sometimes we do; sometimes we don't. These bills never gave us a chance to do that.

This bill did not follow that process. It has not been marked up by the Committee on Foreign Affairs or, for that matter, the Committee on Financial Services or, for that matter, the Committee on Ways and Means or, for that matter, the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, even though every single one received a referral on this bill—process.

Mr. Speaker, in my tenure as the former chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, now the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, this week is the first time ever that we are considering a bill under a rule that

had not gone through the committee process—not only in my time as a chair or ranking member, but almost an entire 25 years that I have been on the committee.

This is, I believe, a very unfortunate precedent that we are setting here. If we actually want to support—I know I do fully—our ally, Israel, what we should be doing is passing a bipartisan Senate national security aid bill that would send important funds to Israel so that they could defend themselves against Iranian aggression, as well as, of course, supporting our friends in Ukraine and Taiwan, and providing necessary humanitarian assistance.

I know we have been negotiating, which is okay. We know that, and we are going to try to figure out some of the things, from what I am hearing. What we should be doing, what really is necessary right now, given the needs of our allies, is just pass a bipartisan bill. Seventy Members of the Senate in a bipartisan way passed it. It is waiting for us to vote on it.

Many of us, I think at least over 300 of us, will agree that if that bill just had the light of day on the floor, because our Ukrainian friends are at a desperate end—they need assistance right now. What took place in the Middle East, the strikes against Israel, they need the money right now. Our Taiwanese friends need the money right now. The innocent individuals in Gaza, in Sudan, and around the world need the assistance right now.

If today, we put that bill on the floor and let Congress do its will, it would be on the desk of the President of the United States either later this evening or first thing tomorrow, signed into law, and our allies that we claim we care for would get the aid and assistance that they need now.

That is the bill we should have been debating in February. That is the bill we should have been debating in March. That is the bill we should be debating today, really, not this bill, which will have a far greater impact on innocent Iraqi civilians than any minuscule impact on Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I guess you know that I oppose this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), my colleague and friend, the author of this bill, and a member of the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Homeland Security.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, the theme that we are talking about right now is a complete overturning of a maximum pressure campaign on Iran from 2017 through the end of 2020.

In 2021, we began a new theme, and that theme was appeasement: appeasement of Iran; appeasement of its policies; an overturning of the JCPOA; a message to the world that: We trust

you, Iran, the largest state sponsor of terrorism on the globe. We don't think you are going to do anything.

That strategy has clearly not worked.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back in time to September 11, 2001. Instead of mourning our Nation and standing firm against terrorism, the President of the United States took the anniversary of 9/11 as an opportunity to give Iran, the world's leading sponsor of terrorism, a \$6 billion present.

It is no coincidence that shortly following this foreign policy faux pas, the Iranian-backed terrorist group was emboldened to launch a barbaric attack against our democratic ally, Israel, murdering over 1,400 innocent civilians and abducting hundreds of hostages, some of whom still remain inside Gaza.

In the 6 months following those attacks on that fateful morning of October 7, Iran's proxies—Hamas, Hezbollah, Houthis, the Shia militia groups, and others—have continued carrying out terrorist attacks against Israel and the Middle East, culminating in Iran's direct and unprecedented attack this past weekend against Israel.

When it comes to foreign policy, the theme that I mentioned, a turning away from maximum pressure, a turning away from deterrence, a turning away from holding a hard line and toward appeasement, the President has gotten it wrong every single time.

□ 1445

In fact, on September 10, 2001, one day before the attacks on 9/11, then-Senator Joe Biden criticized President Bush's proposed missile defense system as dangerous and potentially disastrous and that it weakens us.

In reality, President Biden's decades-long strategy of appeasement is what weakens us. His choices have made our country less safe. They have resulted in the disastrous Afghanistan withdrawal. They have emboldened our adversaries to attack around the world.

When asked what his message to Iran was in the lead-up to a possible attack on Israel, that we knew about, the President simply said: "Don't."

Well, Mr. President, they did.

I agree with my colleague, the ranking member, that innocent human life is important. The disagreement at this point in time is that we have had 3-plus years of a strategy of appeasement that has not resulted in deterrence. It has weakened our interest, our allies, Israel and others, not just in the region but throughout the world.

I want to talk about electricity. Yes, Iraq needs electricity. The fact is that the waiver given by Secretary Pompeo at the end of the Trump administration was predicated on the theory that Iraq would reform its electricity system and this would not be needed for a long time. This was 4 years ago.

At what point is there accountability?

At what point after waiver and waiver and waiver given do we cut the dependency; do we reform the system; do we make sure that the Iraqi citizens have what they need?

This administration has taken the opposite approach.

When you look in the news just today, everyone around the world, all the major organizations, the major nation-states, are considering additional sanctions on Iran. They understand that appeasement doesn't work. The U.N., the G7, and even France have made the decision to enforce stronger sanctions with no waivers.

President Biden over 3 years ago made a decision to go from maximum pressure on Iran that resulted in unprecedented deterrence and peace to a strategy of appeasement.

The examples are many. Appeasement and weakness have led to chaos and aggression. In fact, every intelligence briefing, every national security pundit, every talking head on TV, every person who knows anything about this subject has said the same consistent theme for 3-plus years, that the threat from the Iranian regime toward the United States and our allies and partners and our interests has only increased. It culminated this weekend with an unprecedented drone attack.

We are so lucky, along with our brothers and sisters in arms, the U.S. military and our partners like the Jordanians and the Israelis, that the air defense systems worked, that these brave airmen and these brave air defense personnel were able to take out these drones and prevent not a single loss of life, to prevent the death of anyone inside Israel. It is unbelievable that that was able to happen.

The reason that we are doing this, I believe, is because the Founders of this country knew that there would be a time when checks and balances had to be issued, there would be a time when we had to have a check on the executive branch because they got it wrong.

This doesn't have to be a partisan exercise. In fact, I hope it is bipartisan. I hope that we can all join together and say we don't believe in appeasement, that that strategy has not worked. They have had 3½ years to see if it works, and it doesn't.

Now is the time to stand fast. Now is the time to come together and to check the executive branch and to pass legislation that prevents the rescission of these waivers that prevents the \$6 billion gift and other gifts from funding the Iranian war machine, the terror war machine that is sowing chaos across the Middle East and even broader than that region.

If we remember back to September 11, then we know this threat is real. Let's believe the Iranians when they have threatened us over the weekend. Let's believe their threats, but let's not cower to their threats. Let's stand strong. Let's show deterrence.

Not a single dollar should be allowed to go to the Iranian Government. Not a

single dollar should be allowed to go to the largest arbiter of terrorism on the planet.

I hope my colleagues across the aisle will join in regaining our Article I authority, will join in asserting American leadership around the globe, to send a strong message not just to Iran but to other would-be adversaries, that we are serious about defending freedom, that we are serious about defending Israel, our greatest ally in the Middle East.

My legislation permanently freezes all Iranian-sanctioned assets and prevents the President from using any waiver authority, including licenses and guidance and otherwise, to lift sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand strong, to support this legislation, to pass H.R. 5947, to protect Israel, and to stop the Iranian war machine.

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the neocon march into another war in the Middle East. It is the same chorus. This time it is Iran.

John Bolton, who blundered us into Iraq, now is calling for strikes on Iran all over CNN and cable news. Then you have Senator MARSHA BLACKBURN saying that we need retaliatory strikes into Iran. Who can forget Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM saying: Hit them hard. Blow them off the map.

This is foolishness. Let me be clear. The American people, Democrats or Republicans or Independents, do not want another war in the Middle East. They do not want us to make the same mistake we made in Iraq. They do not want trillions of our tax dollars going into foreign wars. Instead, they are demanding that we invest in jobs here at home, in childcare, and in healthcare in America.

I call today for the American people to stand up against the foreign policy blob and against the establishment and prevent them from getting us into another war in the Middle East.

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

I strongly oppose this measure, which would remove all flexibility from our Iran sanctions program and thereby strike a fatal blow to our ability to conduct nuclear diplomacy with Iran.

Now, I have heard several times during the course of this debate about the failure of the JCPOA, of which at the time the IAEA had oversight, individuals were knowing what and where the nuclear material was. Most of it, as it has been said now, was moved out of the country.

The fact of the matter is, if I recall correctly, General Mattis, who was initially an opponent of the JCPOA, after seeing what it was doing and how it was functioning, became a proponent of the JCPOA. He said it publicly, that it

was a way through diplomacy to prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say with joy that the former President pulled us out of the JCPOA.

I ask: What was accomplished by pulling us out? Are we safer? Is that what it did? If we are safer by being pulled out, what are we talking about now? Are we in more danger?

Does Iran now have a greater opportunity to get a nuclear weapon? Do we know where the materials are now, since it was a good thing to pull out of the JCPOA, or do we know less? Do we have more access now, since we pulled out of the JCPOA, or do we have less? Why was this thing about pulling out of the JCPOA such a great thing?

I am more worried today about Iran getting a nuclear weapon than I was when we were in the JCPOA. I ask my colleagues: Were you more worried when we were in the JCPOA than you are right now?

I hear that you are worried right now about where Iran is with a nuclear weapon. Back then what we were talking about was diplomacy to try to prevent them from having a nuclear weapon. Are you telling me now, because we don't know, that we should just go to war?

There are choices to be made here. I think we were much better off using diplomacy, getting access to what was going on, watching them move nuclear material outside of the country, than just saying we are going to blow you up.

No oversight, nothing; no contact; no one looking in; no information other than that and they are free to do whatever the heck they want to do now. They are free to do it because they no longer have to be at the negotiating table.

Are we safer now or were we safer under the JCPOA?

Additionally, let me say this bill would have greater consequences across the entire Middle East, particularly in Iraq, which this bill would restrict from purchasing Iranian energy.

I will remind us again, let's not be shortsighted. With no energy, there is chaos in Iraq. What happened before? ISIS was created. Blackouts across Iraq would sow societal chaos in Iraq.

Does that help serve our national security objectives in the region? I don't think so.

If implemented, this bill would undermine the tenuous stability Iraq has worked to establish after decades of war. Are they perfect now? No. Four years is a short period of time when we are trying to do some major accomplishments here.

Importantly, this measure may also cost us our ability to do what we say we want to do, to monitor and control the Iranian funds in Qatar and elsewhere. Do we want to lose control, not have oversight of that either? Then you want this bill.

□ 1500

A smart sanctions policy has a purpose. It is not a blunt tool to wield in an effort to induce regime change. That does not work. It has never worked when it was used just to try to have regime change.

Our sanctions policies must be flexible and allow for United States national security objectives to be realized through thoughtful—and I will use this word one more time—thoughtful diplomacy.

A waiver is always necessary for that purpose.

Our Middle East national security objectives should be about providing Israel aid as part of our national security supplemental and providing humanitarian aid to starving individuals. That is what it should be about. That is what we should be voting on. That is what we should be debating on, not just today. We should have done it months ago.

It shouldn't be about cutting off Iraqis from electricity and creating chaos and the possible rise again of another terrorist group similar to ISIS that killed Americans and allies abroad.

This bill should be opposed. This bill is shortsighted. This bill doesn't accomplish what we needed to do and what we need to do. Let's vote it down.

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

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

Again, returning our attention to the consideration of the bill at hand, H.R. 5947, Congress granted these waiver authorities over a decade ago hoping that they could be used to help the Iranian people without compromising our national security.

What we have seen in the last 10 years is that Iran cannot be trusted. These waivers failed. The JCPOA itself granted access to at least \$50 billion to the primary sponsor of terrorism around the world.

Since then, we have seen some \$70 billion at least given to the Iranian regime by the Biden administration.

Iran continues its dangerous, deadly buildup of weapons and other capabilities. The Iranian people continue to suffer at the hands of the regime which uses evasive tactics to divert money that should be spent on their people to support other malign activities.

Again, Iran is the primary sponsor of terror around the world, and now our partners and allies all over the Middle East are also victims of Iran and its proxies.

We have a responsibility to the freedom loving people of the Middle East not to be funding their oppressors. We need to revoke these waivers, and we need to do it today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. SELF. 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 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALFORD) at 5 p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 17, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 17, 2024, at 3:45 p.m.

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 33.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. McCUMBER,
Acting Clerk.

FOURTH AMENDMENT IS NOT FOR SALE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1149 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4639.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ELLZEY) kindly take the chair.

□ 1701

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4639) to amend section 2702 of title 18,

United States Code, to prevent law enforcement and intelligence agencies from obtaining subscriber or customer records in exchange for anything of value, to address communications and records in the possession of intermediary internet service providers, and for other purposes, with Mr. ELLZEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-464 offered by the gentleman of New York (Mr. LALOTA) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LALOTA

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3, printed in House Report 118-464, offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 246, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

AYES—176

Aguilar	Fletcher	Larson (CT)	Cammack	Ivey
Allred	Flood	LaTurner	Cárdenas	Ross
Bacon	Frankel, Lois	Lawler	Carl	Roy
Barr	Franklin, Scott	Letlow	Carter (LA)	Jackson (TX)
Barragán	Gallagher	Levin	Casar	Sablan
Bera	Gallego	Lucas	Chavez-DeRemer	Jacobs
Bergman	Garbarino	Lynch	Cherifilus-	Sánchez
Bice	Gimenez	Malliotakis	McCormick	Jeffries
Bishop (GA)	Goldman (NY)	Maloy	Chu	Johnson (SD)
Boyle (PA)	Gomez	Manning	Clarke (NY)	Jordan
Brownley	Gonzales, Tony	McCaull	Cleaver	Joyce (PA)
Budzinski	Gonzalez,	McCollum	Cline	Kamlager-Dove
Calvert	Vicente	McGarvey	Cloud	Kelly (MS)
Carbalaj	Gottheimer	McHenry	Clyde	Kihl
Carey	Graves (MO)	Meeks	Collins	LaMalfa
Carson	Harder (CA)	Menendez	Comer	Larsen (WA)
Carter (GA)	Hayes	Molinaro	Crane	Latta
Carter (TX)	Hill	Moore (UT)	Crawford	Lee (CA)
Cartwright	Himes	Moran	Crockett	Lee (FL)
Case	Hinson	Morelle	Curtis	Lee (PA)
Casten	Horsford	Moskowitz	Davidson	Leger Fernandez
Castor (FL)	Houchin	Moylan	Davis (IL)	Lesko
Ciscomani	Houlihan	Mrvan	De La Cruz	Lieu
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Murphy	Dean (PA)	Lofgren
Clyburn	Hudson	Neguse	DeGette	Loudermilk
Cohen	Jackson (NC)	Newhouse	DelBene	Steil
Cole	James	Nickel	Deluzio	Luna
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Norcross	DeSaulnier	Steube
Correa	Joyce (OH)	Nunn (IA)	Mace	Strong
Costa	Kaptur	Panetta	DesJarlais	Takano
Courtney	Kean (NJ)	Pappas	Dingell	Mann
Craig	Keating	Peltola	Doggett	Thanedar
Crenshaw	Kelly (IL)	Peters	Donalds	Thompson (CA)
Crow	Kelly (PA)	Pettersen	Duarte	Matsui
Cuellar	Kiggans (VA)	Plaskett	Duncan	McBath
D'Esposito	Kiley	Quigley	Edwards	McClain
Davids (KS)	Kilmer	Reschenthaler	Emmer	McClellan
Davis (NC)	Kim (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Escobar	Tonko
DeLauro	Kim (NJ)	Rogers (KY)	Eshoo	McClintock
Diaz-Balart	Krishnamoorthi	Rouzer	Espaillet	Trahan
Dunn (FL)	Kuster	Ruiz	Estes	Underwood
Ellzey	LaHood	Ruppersberger	Evans	Van Drew
Ferguson	LaLota	Rutherford	Ezell	Meuser
Fitzpatrick	Lamborn	Ryan	Fallon	Vargas
Fleischmann	Landsman	Salazar	Feenstra	Velázquez
			Finstad	Miller (IL)
				Miller (OH)
				Miller (WV)
				Miller-Meeks
				Mills
				Weber (TX)

Webster (FL) Westerman Williams (TX)
 Wenstrup Williams (GA) Yakym

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Castro (TX)

NOT VOTING—13

Caraveo Langworthy Phillips
 González-Colón Lee (NV) Radewagen
 Granger Luetkemeyer Wexton
 Grijalva Magaziner
 Kustoff Payne

□ 1737

Messrs. WENSTRUP, BALDERSON, MEUSER, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BOST, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. FITZGERALD, KELLY of Mississippi, PENCE, Mses. MENG, GARCIA of Texas, Messrs. VAN DREW, HUNT, YAKYM, TONKO, LOUDERMILK, CURTIS, FALLON, MANN, DUARTE, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. LEVIN, JOHNSON of Georgia, NEGUSE, SHERMAN, CARSON, and COHEN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. MALOY). There being no further amendment, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY) having assumed the chair, Ms. MALOY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4639) to amend section 2702 of title 18, United States Code, to prevent law enforcement and intelligence agencies from obtaining subscriber or customer records in exchange for anything of value, to address communications and records in the possession of intermediary internet service providers, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1149, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of H.R. 4639 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 6046;

Passage of H.R. 4691;
 Passage of H.R. 5947; and
 Passage of H.R. 6323.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 199, answered "present" 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—219

Adams	Fleischmann	Miller (WV)	Costa	Kiley	Ruiz
Alford	Foster	Mills	Courtney	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Allen	Foushee	Moolenaar	Craig	Kim (CA)	Rutherford
Amo	Foxx	Mooney	Crawford	Kim (NJ)	Ryan
Amodei	Frost	Moore (AL)	Crenshaw	Krishnamoorthi	Salazar
Armstrong	Fry	Moore (WI)	Crow	Kuster	Sánchez
Arrington	Fulcher	Moulton	Cuellar	LaHood	Scalise
Auchincloss	Gaetz	Mullin	D'Esposito	LaLota	Schiff
Babin	Garcia (IL)	Nadler	Davids (KS)	Lamborn	Schneider
Baird	Garcia (TX)	Napolitano	Davis (NC)	Landsman	Schrirer
Balint	Garcia, Robert	Neils	DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Scott, Austin
Banks	Golden (ME)	Norman	Diaz-Balart	LaTurner	Sessions
Barragán	Good (VA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Duarte	Lawler	Sewell
Bean (FL)	Gooden (TX)	Ogles	Ellzey	Lee (FL)	Sherman
Beatty	Gosar	Omar	Emmer	Levin	Sherrill
Bentz	Graves (LA)	Owens	Eshoo	Lucas	Slotkin
Bergman	Graves (MO)	Pallone	Fitzpatrick	Luttrell	Smith (NJ)
Biggs	Green (TN)	Palmer	Fletcher	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Bilirakis	Green, Al (TX)	Perez	Flood	Malliotakis	Smucker
Bishop (NC)	Greene (GA)	Perry	Frankel, Lois	Mann	Sorensen
Blumenauer	Griffith	Pfluger	Franklin, Scott	Manning	Soto
Boebert	Grothman	Pingree	Gallagher	McBath	Spanberger
Bonamici	Guthrie	Pocan	McCauley	McClain	Stanton
Bost	Hageman	Porter	Harder (CA)	Stauber	Strickland
Bowman	Harris	Posey	Hayes	McCollum	Steel
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Pressley	Hill	McHenry	Stefanik
Brown	Hern	Ramirez	Himes	Meeks	Stevens
Burchett	Higgins (LA)	Raskin	Hinson	Gimenez	Menendez
Burgess	Hoyle (OR)	Rodgers (WA)	Horsford	Goldman (NY)	Miller-Meeks
Burlison	Hudson	Rose	Houchin	Molinaro	Strong
Bush	Huffman	Rosendale	Houahan	Moore (UT)	Suozzi
Cammack	Huizenga	Ross	Hoyer	Moran	Swalwell
Cárdenas	Hunt	Roy	Jackson (NC)	Vicente	Tenney
Carl	Issa	Salinas	James	Morelle	Thompson (CA)
Carter (GA)	Ivey	Sarbanes	Johnson (GA)	Moskowitz	Thompson (MS)
Carter (LA)	Jackson (IL)	Scanlon	Guest	Mrvan	Thompson (PA)
Casar	Jackson (TX)	Schakowsky	Harder (CA)	Murphy	Titus
Cherifilis-	Jackson Lee	Scholten	Hayes	Neal	Torres (CA)
McCormick	Jacobs	Schweikert	Hill	Neguse	Torres (NY)
Chu	Jayapal	Jeffries	Himes	Newhouse	Trone
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	Johnson (LA)	Hinson	Nickel	Turner
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Johnson (SD)	Horsford	Norcross	Underwood
Cloud	Johnson (SD)	Jordan	Houchin	Nunn (IA)	Valadao
Clyde	Jackson	Kaufman	Houahan	Obernolte	Vasquez
Collins	Kamilarov-Dove	Larsen (WA)	Hoyer	Panetta	Veasey
Comer	Khanna	Letlow	Jackson (NC)	Pappas	Wagner
Crane	Kildee	Lieu	James	Pascrall	Walberg
Crockett	LaMalfa	Lofgren	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	Waltz
Curtis	Larsen (WA)	Loudermilk	Joyce (OH)	Peltola	Wasserman
Davidson	Steil	Luna	Joyce (PA)	Pence	Schultz
Davis (IL)	Steube	Mace	Kaptur	Peters	Webster (FL)
De La Cruz	Lee (CA)	Spartz	Kean (NJ)	Pettersen	Wenstrup
Dean (PA)	Lee (PA)	Takano	Keating	Clarke	
DeGette	Leger Fernandez	Thanedar	Kelly (IL)	Quigley	
DelBene	Lesko	Tiffany	Kelly (MS)	Reschenthaler	
Deluzio	Lettow	Timmons	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)	
DeSaulnier	Lieu	Tlaib	Kigan	Rogers (KY)	
DesJarlais	Lofgren	Tokuda	Watson	Womack	
Dingell	Loudermilk	Tonko	Watson Coleman	Zinke	
Doggett	Luna	Mace	Weber (TX)		
Donalds	Maloy	Maloy	Westerman		
Duncan	Massie	Van Dren	Williams (GA)		
Dunn (FL)	Mast	Van Duyn	Williams (NY)		
Edwards	Matsui	Van Orden	Waterson		
Escobar	McClellan	Vargas	Velázquez		
Espalliat	McClinton	Waterson	Watson		
Estes	McCormick	Watson Coleman	Watson		
Evans	McGarvey	Weber (TX)	Williams (TX)		
Fallon	McGovern	Westerman	Yakym		
Feenstra	Meng	Williams (GA)			
Ferguson	Meuser	Williams (NY)			
Finstad	Mfume	Watters			
Fischbach	Miller (IL)	Watson			
Fitzgerald	Miller (OH)	Watson Coleman			

NAYS—199

Aderholt	Brownley	Casten	Costa	Kiley	Ruiz
Aguilar	Buchanan	Castor (FL)	Courtney	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Allred	Bucshon	Chavez-DeRemer	Craig	Kim (CA)	Rutherford
Bacon	Budzinski	Ciscomani	Crawford	Kim (NJ)	Ryan
Barr	Calvert	Clark (MA)	Crenshaw	Krishnamoorthi	Salazar
Bera	Carbajal	Cleaver	Crow	Kuster	Sánchez
Beyer	Carrey	Clyburn	Cuellar	LaHood	Scalise
Bice	Carson	Cohen	D'Esposito	LaLota	Schiff
Bishop (GA)	Carter (TX)	Cole	Davids (KS)	Lamborn	Schneider
Blunt Rochester	Cartwright	Connolly	Davis (NC)	Landsman	Schrirer
Boyle (PA)	Case	Correa	DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Scott, Austin

Costa	Kiley	Ruiz
Courtney	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Craig	Kim (CA)	Rutherford
Crawford	Kim (NJ)	Ryan
Crenshaw	Krishnamoorthi	Salazar
Crow	Kuster	Sánchez
Cuellar	LaHood	Scalise
D'Esposito	LaLota	Schiff
Davids (KS)	Lamborn	Schneider
Davis (NC)	Landsman	Schrirer
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	LaTurner	Sessions
Duarte	Lawler	Sewell
Ellzey	Lee (FL)	Sherman
Emmer	Levin	Sherrill
Eshoo	Lucas	Slotkin
Ezell	Luttrell	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Fletcher	Malliotakis	Smucker
Flood	Mann	Sorensen
Frankel, Lois	Manning	Soto
Franklin, Scott	McBath	Spanberger
Gallagher	McCauley	Stanton
Garcia, Mike	McClain	Stauber
Gimenez	McCollum	Strickland
Goldman (NY)	Miller-Meeks	Strong
Gomez	Molinaro	Suozzi
Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)	Swalwell
Gonzalez,	Moran	Tenney
Gore	Morelle	Thompson (CA)
Gotheimer	Moskowitz	Thompson (MS)
Guest	Mrvan	Thompson (PA)
Harder (CA)	Murphy	Titus
Hayes	Neal	Torres (CA)
Hill	Neguse	Torres (NY)
Himes	Newhouse	Trone
Hinson	Nickel	Turner
Horsford	Norcross	Underwood
Houchin	Nunn (IA)	Valadao
Houahan	Obernolte	Vasquez
Hoyer	Panetta	Veasey
Jackson (NC)	Pappas	Wagner
James	Pascrall	Walberg
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	Waltz
Joyce (OH)	Peltola	Wasserman
Joyce (PA)	Pence	Schultz
Kaptur	Peters	Webster (FL)
Kean (NJ)	Pettersen	Wenstrup
Keating	Clarke	
Scott (VA)	Quigley	
Scott (DA)	Reschenthaler	
Self	Wild	
Simpson	Kelly (IL)	
Schakowsky	Kelly (MS)	
Scholten	Rogers (AL)	
Schweikert	Rogers (PA)	
Spartz	Rogers (KY)	
Stansbury	Rouzer	
Steil	Zinke	
Steube		
Sykes		
Takano		
Trahan		
Van Dren		
Van Duyn		
Van Orden		
Vargas		
Velázquez		
Waterson		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Williams (TX)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		
Westerman		
Williams (GA)		
Williams (NY)		
Watson		
Watson Coleman		
Weber (TX)		</

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 285, nays 135, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

YEAS—285

Aderholt	Garcia, Mike	Moore (AL)
Alford	Gimenez	Moore (UT)
Allen	Golden (ME)	Moran
Allred	Goldman (NY)	Moskowitz
Amodei	Gonzales, Tony	Moulton
Armstrong	Gonzalez, Mrvan	Barragán
Arrington	Vicente	Beatty
Babin	Good (VA)	Bera
Bacon	Gooden (TX)	Bishop (GA)
Baird	Gosar	Blumenauer
Balderson	Gottheimer	Blunt Rochester
Banks	Graves (LA)	Bonamici
Barr	Graves (MO)	Bowman
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Brown
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Brownley
Bergman	Griffith	Bush
Bice	Grothman	Carbajal
Biggs	Guest	Cárdenas
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Casten
Bishop (NC)	Hageman	Casper
Boebert	Harder (CA)	Carter (LA)
Bost	Harris	Casar
Boyle (PA)	Harshbarger	Case
Brecheen	Hayes	Keating
Buchanan	Hern	Cherifilus-
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Kim (NJ)
Budzinski	Hill	McCormick
Burchett	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Burgess	Horsford	Rodgers (WA)
Burlison	Houchin	Clark (NY)
Calvert	Houlahan	Clarke (MA)
Cammack	Hoyer	Larson (CT)
Carey	Hudson	Cleaver
Carl	Huizenga	Clyburn
Carter (GA)	Hunt	Correa
Carter (TX)	Issa	Courtney
Cartwright	Jackson (NC)	Leger Fernandez
Chavez-DeRemer	Jackson (TX)	Lieu
Ciscomani	James	Lofgren
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Roy
Cloud	Johnson (SD)	Crow
Clyde	Jordan	Davis (IL)
Cohen	Joyce (OH)	DeGte
Cole	Joyce (PA)	DeLauro
Collins	Kaptur	McClellan
Comer	Kean (NJ)	McCullom
Connolly	Kelly (MS)	McGarvey
Costa	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Craig	Kiggans (VA)	Deluzio
Crane	Self	McGovern
Crawford	Kiley	DeSaulnier
Crenshaw	Kilmer	Dingell
Cuellar	Kim (CA)	Escobar
Curtis	LaHood	Hoover
D'Esposito	LaLota	LoBiondo
Davids (KS)	LaMalfa	Long
Davidson	Lamborn	McDermott
Davis (NC)	Landsman	McFaul
De La Cruz	Latta	McNerney
DesJarlais	LaTurner	McNerney
Diaz-Balart	Lawler	McNerney
Doggett	Lee (FL)	McNerney
Donalds	Lesko	McNerney
Duarte	Letlow	McNerney
Duncan	Loudermilk	McNerney
Dunn (FL)	Lucas	McNerney
Edwards	Luna	McNerney
Ellzey	Luttrell	McNerney
Emmer	Lynch	McNerney
Espaillet	Mace	McNerney
Estes	Malliotakis	McNerney
Ezell	Maloy	McNerney
Fallon	Mann	McNerney
Feenstra	Manning	McNerney
Ferguson	Mast	McNerney
Finstad	McCaull	McNerney
Fischbach	McClain	McNerney
Fitzgerald	McClintock	McNerney
Fitzpatrick	McCormick	McNerney
Fleischmann	McHenry	McNerney
Flood	Menendez	McNerney
Foxx	Meng	McNerney
Frankel, Lois	Meuser	McNerney
Franklin, Scott	Miller (IL)	McNerney
Frost	Miller (OH)	McNerney
Fry	Miller (WV)	McNerney
Fulcher	Miller-Meeks	McNerney
Gaetz	Mills	McNerney
Gallagher	Molinaro	McNerney
Gallego	Moolenaar	McNerney
Garbarino	Mooney	McNerney

Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 141, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

YEAS—278

NAYS—135

Adams	Eshoo	Morelle	Aderholt	Gonzalez,
Aguilar	Evans	Mullin	Alford	Vicente
Amo	Fletcher	Nadler	Allen	Good (VA)
Auchincloss	Foster	Napolitano	Amodei	Gooden (TX)
Balint	Foushee	Neal	Armstrong	Gosar
Barragán	Garamendi	Neguse	Arrington	Gottheimer
Beatty	Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Auchincloss	Graves (LA)
Bera	Garcia (TX)	Omar	Babin	Graves (MO)
Beyer	Garcia, Robert	Pascrell	Bacon	Green (TN)
Bishop (GA)	Gomez	Pelosi	Baird	Greene (GA)
Blumenauer	Green, Al (TX)	Peters	Balderson	Griffith
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pettersen	Banks	Grothman
Bonamici	Hoyle (OR)	Pingree	Barr	Pallone
Bowman	Huffman	Pocan	Guthrie	Panetta
Brown	Ivey	Porter	Bentz	Pappas
Brownley	Jackson (IL)	Pressley	Bergman	Peltola
Bush	Jackson Lee	Boyle (PA)	Bice	Pence
Carbajal	Quigley	Boyle (PA)	Harris	Perez
Casten	Jacobs	Burgess	Harshbarger	Perry
Castro (FL)	Jayapal	Burgess	Bilirakis	Pfluger
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Burgess	Boehert	Hern
Cleaver	Kildee	Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Posey
Clyburn	McCormick	Burgess	Bost	Hill
Correa	Kuster	Burgess	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Burgess	Burlison	Rogers (WA)
Leger Fernandez	Takano	Burgess	Issa	Rutherford
Lieb	Thompson (CA)	Burgess	Lee (CA)	Ryan
Liu	Thompson (MS)	Burgess	McCormick	Salazar
LoBiondo	Titus	Burgess	Titus	Smith (KY)
McCormick	Velázquez	Burgess	Wade	Rose
Deluzio	Waters	Burgess	Wade	Rosendale
McGovern	Watson Coleman	Burgess	Wade	Rouzer
DeSaulnier	Meeks	Burgess	Wade	Roy
Dingell	Mfume	Burgess	Wade	Schneider
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Burgess	Wade	Scholten
Hoover	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Schrier
LoBiondo	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Schweikert
Long	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Scott, Austin
McDermott	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Scott, David
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Self
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Sessions
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Sherman
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Simpson
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Slotkin
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Smith (MO)
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Smith (NE)
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Smith (NJ)
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Smucker
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Sorensen
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Soto
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Spanberger
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Spartz
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Stanton
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	De La Cruz
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Lee (FL)
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	DesJarlais
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Lesko
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Diaz-Balart
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Letlow
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Doggett
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Donalds
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Duarte
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Duncan
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Dunn (FL)
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Edwards
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Ellzey
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Emmer
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Espaillat
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Estes
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Ezell
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Fallon
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Feenstra
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Ferguson
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Finstad
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Fischbach
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Fitzgerald
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Fitzpatrick
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Fleischmann
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Flood
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Foxx
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Frankel, Lois
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Franklin, Scott
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Fry
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Fulcher
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Gaetz
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Gallagher
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Gallego
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Garbarino
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Garcia, Mike
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Gimenez
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Golden (ME)
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Moran
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Gonzales, Tony
McNerney	Williams (GA)	Burgess	Wade	Moskowitz

IRAN SANCTIONS RELIEF REVIEW
ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 4691) to provide for congressional review of actions to terminate or waive sanctions imposed with respect to Iran, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—271

Aderholt Gosar Nunn (IA)
 Alford Gottheimer Obernolte Bonamici
 Allen Graves (LA) Ogles Bowman
 Amodei Graves (MO) Owens Blunt Rochester
 Armstrong Green (TN) Pallone
 Arrington Greene (GA) Palmer
 Auchincloss Griffith Panetta
 Babineau Grothman Pappas
 Bacon Guest Peletola
 Baird Guthrie Pence
 Balderson Hagedorn Perez
 Banks Harder (CA) Perry
 Barr Harris Pfluger
 Bean (FL) Harshbarger Posey
 Bentz Hayes Quigley
 Bergman Hern Reschenthaler McCormick
 Bice Higgins (LA) Rodgers (WA) Chu
 Biggs Hill Rogers (AL) Clark (MA) Jayapal
 Bilirakis Hinson Rogers (KY) Clarke (NY) Jeffries
 Bishop (NC) Horsford Rose Cleaver
 Boebert Houchin Rosendale
 Bost Hudson Ross Connolly
 Boyle (PA) Huizinga Rouzer
 Brecheen Hunt Roy
 Buchanan Issa Rutherford
 Bucshon Jackson (NC) Ryan Courtney
 Budzinski Jackson (TX) Salazar
 Burchett James Salinas
 Burgess Johnson (LA) Scalise
 Burlison Johnson (SD) Schiff
 Calvert Jordan Schneider
 Cammack Joyce (OH) Scholten
 Carey Joyce (PA) Schrier
 Carl Kaptur Schweikert
 Carter (GA) Kean (NJ) Scott, Austin
 Carter (TX) Kelly (MS) Scott, David
 Cartwright Kelly (PA) Self
 Chavez-DeRemer Kiggans (VA) Sessions
 Ciscomani Kiley Sherman
 Cline Kilmer Simpson
 Cloud Kim (CA) Slotkin
 Clyde LaHood Smith (MO)
 Cole LaLota Smith (NE)
 Collins LaMalfa Smith (NJ)
 Comer Lamborn Sorenson
 Craig Landsman Soto
 Crane Latta Spanberger
 Crawford LaTurner Spatz
 Crenshaw Lawler Stanton
 Cuellar Lee (FL) Stauber
 Curtis Lesko Steel
 D'Esposito Letlow Stefanik
 Davidson Levin Steil
 Davis (NC) Loudermilk Steube
 De La Cruz Lucas Stevens
 DesJarlais Luna Strickland
 Diaz-Balart Luttrell Strong
 Donalds Lynch Suozzi
 Duarte Mace Swalwell
 Duncan Malliotakis Sykes
 Dunn (FL) Maloy Mann
 Edwards Manning Thompson (PA)
 Ellzey Mast Tiffany
 Emmer McClain Timmons
 Espaillat McClintock Torres (NY)
 Estes McCormick Trone
 Ezell Feenstra McHenry Valadao
 Fallon Ferguson Menendez Van Drew
 Finstad Meng Van Duyne
 Fischbach Meuser Van Orden
 Fitzgerald Miller (IL) Vasquez
 Fitzpatrick Miller (OH) Wagner
 Fleischmann Miller (WV) Walberg
 Flood Miller-Meeks Waltz
 Foxx Mills Wasserman
 Frankel, Lois Molinaro Schultz
 Franklin, Scott Mooleenar Weber (TX)
 Fry Mooney Webster (FL)
 Fulcher Moore (AL) Wenstrup
 Gaetz Moore (UT) Westerman
 Gallagher Moran Wild
 Gallego Moskowitz Williams (NY)
 Garbarino Mrvan Williams (TX)
 Garcia, Mike Murphy Wilson (FL)
 Gimenez Nehls Wilson (SC)
 Golden (ME) Newhouse Wittman
 Gonzales, Tony Nickel Womack
 Good (VA) Norcross Yakym
 Gooden (TX) Norman Zinke

NAYS—147

Adams Amo Beatty
 Aguilar Balint Bera
 Allred Barragán Beyer

Bishop (GA) Frost Morelle
 Blumenauer Garamendi Moulton
 Blunt Rochester Garcia (IL) Mullin
 Bonamici Garcia, Robert Napolitano
 Bowman Brown Nadler
 Brownley Goldmark (NY) Neguse
 Bush Gomez Ocasio-Cortez
 Carbajal Gonzalez, Omar
 Cárdenas Vicente Pascrall
 Carson Green, Al (TX) Pelosi
 Carter (LA) Himes Peters
 Casar Houlahan Pettersen
 Case Hoyer Pingree
 Casten Hoyle (OR) Pocan
 Castor (FL) Huffman Porter
 Castro (TX) Ivey Pressley
 Cherifus- Jackson (IL) Ramirez
 Hayes Jackson Lee Raskin
 McCormick Jacobs Ruiz
 Chu Jayapal Ruppersberger
 Clark (MA) Jeffries Sánchez
 Clarke (NY) Johnson (GA) Sarbanes
 Cleaver Kamlager-Dove Scanlon
 Clyburn Keating Schakowsky
 Cohen Kelly (IL) Scott (VA)
 Connolly Khanna Sewell
 Correa Kildee Sherrill
 Costa Kim (NJ) Smith (WA)
 Courtney Krishnamoorthi Stansbury
 Crockett Kuster Takano
 Crow Larsen (WA) Thanedar
 Davids (KS) Larson (CT) Thompson (CA)
 Davis (IL) Lee (CA) Thompson (MS)
 Dean (PA) Lee (PA) Titus
 DeGette Leger Fernandez Tlalib
 DeLauro Lieu Tokuda
 DelBene Lofgren Tonko
 Deluzio Massie Torres (CA)
 DeSaulnier Matsui Trahan
 Dingell McBath Underwood
 Doggett McClellan Vargas
 Escobar McCollum Veasey
 Eshoo McGarvey Velázquez
 Evans McGovern Waters
 Fletcher Meeks Watson Coleman
 Foster Mfume Williams (GA)
 Foushee Moore (WI)

NOT VOTING—13

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1814

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, my votes were not recorded today. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 135, NAY on Roll Call No. 136, YEA on Roll Call No. 137, YEA on Roll Call No. 138, YEA on Roll Call No. 139, and YEA on Roll Call No. 140.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote for Roll Call Votes Nos. 135 through 140. Had I been present, I would have voted: Nay on Roll Call Vote No. 135, LaLota Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 4639; Yea on Roll Call Vote No. 136, H.R. 4639, Nay on Roll Call Vote No. 137, H.R. 6046; Nay on Roll Call Vote No. 138, H.R. 4691, Nay on Roll Call Vote No. 139, H.R. 5947; and Nay on Roll Call Vote No. 140, H.R. 6323.

HONORING THE LAST SURVIVING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT OF THE KOREAN CONFLICT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the lying in honor of the remains of Ralph Puckett, Jr., the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient for acts performed during the Korean conflict, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 33

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. HONORING THE LAST SURVIVING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT OF THE KOREAN CONFLICT.

(a) USE OF ROTUNDA.—In recognition of Army Colonel Ralph Puckett, Jr., the last surviving recipient of the Medal of Honor for acts performed during the Korean conflict, his remains shall be permitted to lie in honor in the rotunda of the Capitol on April 29, 2024, in order to honor the Silent Generation and the more than 5,700,000 men and women who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the "Forgotten War" from 1950 to 1953.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall take all necessary steps to carry out this section.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING SENATOR BOB GRAHAM

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, last night the Sunshine State lost a brilliant statesman who loved Florida and all of her people.

With the sad passing of our beloved Bob Graham, our entire Nation lost a proud world citizen, a dedicated American patriot, and a devout public servant.

A true son of Florida, Graham rose to serve in our Governor's mansion and three terms as a United States Senator. Despite that august resume, Bob

Graham was, at heart, a man of the very people he represented.

In his first campaign for Governor, Graham pledged to put in 8-hour days working the same tough but rewarding work that Floridians do every day to make our State so strong. He paved roads, delivered luggage in hotels, taught school, and picked tomatoes.

True to his word, Graham completed over 400 of these workdays so he could touch, see, and feel the challenges and triumphs of the neighbors he so proudly represented.

As Governor, he led our most ambitious program ever to boost education, notably improving our State universities. Like me, he was a proud University of Florida Gator.

Today, Bob Graham can look down with pride on his alma mater and the university system that he helped ensure rivals the best in the Nation.

His love and dedication to education was passed on to so many in our State and, thankfully, to his own daughter, Gwen. Fittingly, Gwen Graham, our former congressional colleague, now serves in the U.S. Department of Education.

Perhaps his most visionary achievement in Florida will be his ambitious environmental protection agenda. His Florida programs are still being carried forward to this day, including his work to save the Everglades. This issue, like so many, demonstrated his skills to build consensus across the political spectrum, and that bipartisan spirit still guides Florida's diverse delegation.

As a foreign affairs expert, Senator GRAHAM stood out as a brilliant master of statecraft. As chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, he understood all too well the very real global threats we face as a Nation. He never shrank from asking the tough questions, even as America reeled from the September 11 attacks.

He bore a heavy weight to demand accountability for this tragedy, yet this man who epitomized what we all think of as an elder statesman was a far more complex figure than that.

When the Tallahassee press corps did their annual roast of State leaders, there was Governor Graham helping them turn the spit, even if it meant poking fun at himself.

When a constituent flagged a problem or a task he needed to circle back on, he would scribble it in his notepad, just like his dad did.

His love of family is something every one of his children and grandchildren will testify to as they all loved their "Doodle," as he was affectionately called.

Even in his "retirement" from government, he established the Bob Graham Center for Public Service. To the very end, he nurtured in others the noble custom he perfected of serving that very community that he served so well.

There are no words to express my gratitude and respect for Senator GRA-

HAM, and it is evidenced by our entire delegation being here today to honor him. We will all miss him dearly.

Today, we keep his entire family and all those who loved him in our thoughts, including his wife, Adele Khoury Graham; his four daughters, Gwen—our former colleague—Cissy, Suzanne, and Kendall; all his grandchildren and great-grandchildren; his former staff; and all those across the country who knew and loved him.

May his memory be a blessing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all those present in the Chamber and in the gallery, as well as all staff members and visitors throughout the Capitol complex, rise for a moment of silence in honor of our former colleague and friend, Senator Bob Graham.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate, sitting as a court of impeachment in the trial of Alejandro N. Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, upon articles of impeachment exhibited against him and upon the receipt and exhibit of House Resolution 863, has dismissed the articles of impeachment and has adjourned sine die.

HONORING WILLIAM HERBERT HUNT

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of William Herbert Hunt, who passed away at the age of 95.

Herb was born in Arkansas before moving to Texas as a young child. He attended boarding school in Pennsylvania before earning a bachelor's degree in geology from Washington and Lee University.

At university, Herb met his soulmate, Nancy Jane Broaddus. They were married for 72 years and raised a large, loving family.

Herb joined the family oil business and had a successful career in oil and gas exploration where he contributed to discoveries and field developments. His success and expertise in the petroleum industry awarded him various seats on oil industry boards.

Herb was President of the Boy Scouts of America Circle Ten Council and received awards for his service to youth. He also served on the Presbyterian Hospital Building Corporation and the Wadley Blood Bank board.

Herb achieved legendary success in industry and business with extensive civic involvement and philanthropy. However, he found his greatest pride and joy in the family he and Nancy raised together.

BLACK MATERNAL HEALTH WEEK

(Ms. McCLELLAN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise, as we close out Black Maternal Health Week, to underscore the pressing need to continue addressing the maternal mortality crisis that plagues our Nation.

The United States has the highest maternal mortality rate of any high-income nation in the world, and Black women bear the brunt of these disparities and are three times more likely to die in childbirth than White women.

This crisis has been made worse by the overturning of Roe v. Wade, as the States with abortion bans have higher mortality rates than those that do not.

I know the risks that Black women face all too well as I nearly died giving birth to my daughter, Samantha, when she was born 9 weeks prematurely and spent 6 weeks in the NICU.

As a member of the Black Maternal Health Caucus, I am encouraged by some of the progress that we have made, such as the Biden-Harris administration's Blueprint for Addressing the Maternal Health Crisis; allowing States to expand Medicaid postpartum coverage from just 60 days to 12 months postpartum, impacting approximately 65 percent of births for Black mothers; and adopting new regulations under the Pregnant Worker Fairness Act that gives millions of workers access to unpaid leave. We must do more, including passing the Momnibus Act.

□ 1830

POLITICAL BIAS AT NPR

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for this body to take a few minutes to discuss and deal with the recent headlines regarding the National Public Radio editor who made public that 87 out of 87 members of their editorial newsroom staff registered Democrat—not one registered Republican.

It is obviously of interest, and it should be of particular interest to fair-minded people everywhere and Republicans in particular.

We, right now, are losing the culture, and members of the Republican Party are the ones who stand athwart and support the Constitution, try to defend it, and try to keep America the great country it has always been.

It is a very difficult thing to get sympathy in our quest from the public as a whole when news outlets have an overwhelmingly leftwing, anti-American bias.

I would like to congratulate—normally a Democrat—Uri Berliner for being able to step out and try to publicize a true diversity problem at NPR and hope that in the future our Appropriations Committee discusses this problem.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REV-EREND WALTER “SLIM” COLEMAN

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor a community activist and fighter for justice: Reverend Walter “Slim” Coleman.

Reverend Slim was part of the Rainbow Coalition. He always worked to help the powerless build power, expand opportunity, and hold the government accountable to the people’s needs. Moreover, he brought Caucasian allies to that fight alongside Latino and Black leaders. Slim helped elect Chicago’s first Black mayor, Harold Washington.

Slim was in it for the long haul. No setback and no loss deterred him from fighting for affordable housing, good schools, community safety, better healthcare, and more.

Alongside his wife, Emma Lozano, the reverend was a leader of Chicago’s sanctuary movement. In 2006, he declared his church as a sanctuary to protect immigrants from deportation, and other churches followed suit.

Our city is indebted to Reverend Slim. We miss him immensely. Rest in peace, my dear friend.

REFORMING FOREST MANAGEMENT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the United States is now the number one importer of wood products. It had been China up until recently when they finally slowed down their building.

This shouldn’t even be possible or happening.

As you see, Mr. Speaker, California, the West Coast, and Western States have massively overcrowded forests due to the inattention of the U.S. Forest Service not keeping up the pace and scale to keep up with the amount of board feet that are growing each year.

Take a look across a lot of rural America, Mr. Speaker, and you will see that these areas are, indeed, too overcrowded with trees. A healthy forest might have 50 to 70 adult trees per acre. We see a situation where there are 500 to 1,000 trees of all sizes.

For a healthy and resilient forest, each tree needs enough nutrients, water, and sunlight to thrive, but when the trees grow too close together, they compete for these resources, are weakened, and then are susceptible to insects and other damage.

You can see on the far side of this poster, Mr. Speaker, a dense forest that is going to be very fire-prone and very likely to be attacked by bugs or go through a drought period and become unhealthy.

A thin forest like this is what we need the Forest Service to be doing. It survives fire and is much healthier for much longer. This is what we need.

CONGRATULATING NORTHWEST OHIO SCIENCE FAIR WINNER CALEB KOWALSKI

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Caleb Kowalski, a bright young student who is the future of northwest Ohio. He won recognition for his scientific achievement.

Caleb is a seventh grader at Put-In-Bay Middle School, and when he needed a project for his school’s science fair this winter, he turned to our nearby Great Lake Erie for inspiration.

Caleb chose to explore solutions to the algae blooms that historically plague our freshwater kingdom. He did this by testing the ability of various plants to keep dangerous nutrients from flowing into rivers, lakes, and streams. Those nutrients harm the ecosystem and endanger boaters, and if not addressed, swimmers will have difficulties. These blooms also could turn Lake Erie and Lake Ontario into swamps if not addressed.

Caleb’s project earned a superior rating. Then, the district allowed him to compete at the Northwest Science and Engineering Fair in February. There he earned, again, first place in his category, allowing him to apply for a slot to compete at the national level this October.

Mr. Speaker, let’s applaud Caleb for his curiosity and scholarship. We hope that his generation will help us usher in complete health for the largest body of freshwater on Earth, the Great Lakes.

FOCUSING ON BLACK MATERNAL HEALTH WEEK

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, this week we are closing out Black Maternal Health Week, focused on bringing attention, awareness, and, most importantly, action to improving maternal health for Black mothers.

Across the United States, Black mothers are three times more likely to die from pregnancy, making them the most at risk for maternal mortality of any group. In New Mexico, our Black babies have the highest ratio of infant mortality and premature births.

In addition, Black women and families are more likely to experience economic instability, lack of access, racism, and implicit bias within the system.

Black maternal health is a crisis that demands action. That is why I am proud to cosponsor Representative

LAUREN UNDERWOOD’s Black Maternal Momnibus Act to help address the leading causes because access to care is a right, not a privilege, and we cannot leave Black women alone in this fight.

Our Black mothers are strong and resilient, and we must work every day to ensure that they have the respect, support, and care they need.

EMBRACING DIVERSITY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, there is just not enough time to speak on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, as we go into a number of religious holidays, which brings us together around peace, faith, and harmony, I want us to recognize that racism is raising its own ugly head again. It is raising its head on DEI, something that most of us of a certain age have no clue as to diversity, inclusion, exclusiveness, and the many different terminologies that can be utilized. We know the question of race and who we are.

It is important, as we take to our home districts, that we embrace the diversity that is in our districts, talk about the need for harmony and unity, and, as well, that we recognize that we are better together than we are separated.

I want to offer a commitment that we stand against racism, that we acknowledge it, that we join together in supporting H.R. 40, which is a commission to study reparations and develop reparation proposals.

I look forward to us ridding ourselves of the ugly face of racism as well as ensuring that we find a way to solve why we are divided instead of united.

Racism is ugly, and we must rid ourselves of it.

RESPONDING TO AMERICANS’ CONCERNs

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS of New York). 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, I appreciate this opportunity to join my colleagues and share some very important perspectives and messages.

House Republicans are responding to many concerns held by Americans

across the country, from this historic crisis happening at our southern border to the increasing cost of everyday goods and services as a result of the Biden administration's tax-and-spend agenda that is burdening hardworking families from New York to California, from Utah to Ohio.

Just this weekend, Americans watched as Iran launched an unprecedented attack on Israel, our ally, and yet again threatened Israel's very existence.

The American people deserve better. They deserve better leadership from this administration, better stewardship of our Federal resources, and better strength on the global stage.

I am grateful to my colleagues for joining me on the House floor this evening to share their thoughts on how these issues are impacting their constituents and our Conference's solutions.

We look forward to hearing from a few of my colleagues this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MOORE for his leadership. We appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker, last week, on April 2, the New York Post published an op-ed that explained the proven conservative position of peace through strength. This continues the world-changing success for expanding freedom of Senator Barry Goldwater and President Ronald Reagan. There are over 20 countries now of Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia that are free today because of the defeat of Soviet communism, which war criminal Putin wants to revive.

The article is titled: "Kudos to Speaker Johnson: Moving Ukraine aid is critical to national security," by Daniel Kochis, a senior fellow of the Hudson Institute's Center on Europe and Eurasia. The Hudson Institute was founded by the visionary Herman Kahn and is universally respected for its research and accuracy.

I am grateful to find and learn that Ambassador and Governor Nikki Haley of South Carolina will now be a valued fellow.

The column in the New York Post reads: "Speaker Mike Johnson's Easter announcement that he will bring a new Ukraine aid package to a vote . . . is welcome news. Congressional backing for Ukraine assistance has been mired in the political muck for months. More than 5,000 miles away on the front lines, the maddening impasse has needlessly cost Ukrainian lives and territory.

"Three-quarters of Americans recognize that the Russian war against Ukraine and the conflicts that allies Israel and Taiwan face are important to U.S. national interests. It is time Congress got on the same page as its constituents and found a way to move critical support over the finish line.

"For Ukraine, the dearth of new aid has left soldiers to ration ammunition.

Russia's artillery advantage has consequently increased by an order of magnitude. Moscow has been firing five times the number of shells per day as Kyiv for most of the year."

This isn't in the article, Mr. Speaker, but you should understand many of these shells came from North Korea, from the dictatorship in the DPRK, which is also threatening our allies South Korea and Japan.

"Russian forces simply out-pummeled Ukraine's defenders. Some good news came 2 weeks ago: The Czech Republic has stepped into the breach in a major way, scouring the world to secure 800,000 artillery shells. The first batch could reach Ukraine early this month, a lifeline that will allow defending forces to start shooting more rounds, secure in the knowledge that replacements are on the way.

"But while the Czech Republic's role as intermediary in finding, purchasing, and securing permissions for the export of critical stocks of munitions is phenomenal, it won't fill the void left by a lack of American assistance and leadership."

□ 1845

"It is in America's interest to continue to aid our friends, most especially those defending their families and homes in Ukraine. Inaction not only harms U.S. national interests; it is expressly not what the American people have told policymakers they desire.

"Multiple recent polls have found a majority of Americans continue to back the aid to Ukraine, both economic and military. Behind closed doors, most congressional Members recognize the importance of continuing assistance

"From a military point of view, Ukraine is far better off today than it was 2 years ago and Russia far worse. And though from a moral perspective, the war remains starkly black and white . . . declined

"The administration allowing the war to fester by continuing to balk at sending Ukraine the systems it needs to win hasn't helped

"Team Biden's shockingly shortsighted and incompetent Afghanistan withdrawal is still fresh in the minds of many Americans, and they do not want a repeat. But failing to robustly stand with Ukraine and decisively defeat Russia makes this specter more likely to happen. The outcome of Russia's genocidal campaign there will have far broader implications for America's future security than either Afghanistan or Iraq. There is, however, room for optimism.

"Unlike in Afghanistan or Iraq, America is not a combatant in Ukraine, but we do benefit from its success. Despite some recent territorial setbacks, Ukraine can defeat Russia and its backers in Beijing, Pyongyang, and Tehran—if it has its allies' consistent, stout backing.

"The situation on the front lines—and in the minds of Americans—is far

from irretrievable, but it starts with Congress finding the will to do what is in the long-term American interest: Send Russian President Vladimir Putin a clear bipartisan message that the United States will stand by Ukraine for the long haul.

"Conservative lawmakers certainly have a duty to engage the administration on the migrant crisis, an issue of key importance to the public, but they should do so separately, recognizing Ukraine's national security importance. Linking aid to migration is a disservice to the American people. Support for Ukraine is not a worthless donation but a downpayment on a more secure and prosperous future. The American people know this; Congress should prove it does too."

Additionally, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an op-ed that I provided in The Washington Times of February 9, 2022. This indicates: "Why Ukraine Matters for American Families: A destabilized world with higher inflation, gas prices."

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 9, 2022]

WHY UKRAINE MATTERS FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

(By Joe Wilson)

Why does Ukraine matter for American families? Simply put: Energy prices, inflation and the empowerment of our adversaries across the world. Russian President Vladimir Putin wants to recreate the Soviet empire, divide our allies in Europe, and expand his malign influence across the globe.

Rather than former President Donald Trump's approach of Peace Through Strength, President Biden's foreign policy can best be characterized as war through weakness. During the Trump administration, Mr. Putin never attempted anything close to such an invasion of Ukraine. Mr. Putin understood that a severe price would be paid, as Mr. Trump, along with Congress, more than tripled the size of the European Deterrence Initiative, providing military support to countries on Russia's borders, and selling Javelin missiles to Ukraine, which former President Barack Obama failed to deliver.

The Biden administration gave Mr. Putin the biggest gift an American president has ever given the Russian dictator by waiving sanctions required by Congress in the Protecting Europe's Energy Security Act, despite Mr. Putin's hacking and shutting down the Colonial Pipeline for six days, and shocking gas prices, just months earlier. Mr. Putin's answer: more aggression and the largest-ever military buildup on Ukraine's border. Rather than push back, Mr. Biden just two weeks ago appeared fine with a "minor incursion" into Ukraine. Biden officials have floated pulling back missile defense deployments in Europe, limiting the size and scope of military exercises, and even reentering the failed Intermediate Nuclear Forces treaty, which was violated by Russia and was withdrawn from by Mr. Trump, if Mr. Putin promised not to enter Ukraine. Yet even Mr. Biden seems to understand that his policy has completely failed, with CNN reporting that Mr. Biden told Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy on Thursday that an invasion by Russia is all but assured.

Mr. Putin wants to keep Ukraine dependent on Russian oil. He wants the Nord Stream 2 pipeline to neutralize Germany. With money, the oligarchs controlling the oppressed Russian people can attempt to re-

create the Soviet empire with a military-industrial complex, recently developing hypersonic missiles to attack America as Russia threatens to send troops in Cuba and Venezuela. In addition, Mr. Putin is working closer than ever with China in the military and economic arenas. Both countries are directly helping Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, bypass American sanctions.

The effect of a war in Ukraine on American families will be catastrophic. China is following our weak response to Mr. Putin's aggression in Ukraine closely, in addition to our surrender in Afghanistan, as it threatens Taiwan in an unprecedented fashion and moves even closer to aggression against the island. In addition, the results will be felt by Germany, Japan, Korea, Israel and India with the cost of gas increasing, doubling in my state of South Carolina alone, from the Trump administration to the Biden administration, crippling families with more inflation as transportation and delivery costs create shortages.

On my visit to Kyiv, Ukraine, in December, I was shocked that the Biden response was repeating the Afghanistan disaster of leaving Americans behind to provide \$40 million "after the invasion." Of note, there are currently 10,000 Americans in Ukraine, and 14,000 Ukrainians died in the 2014 Putin invasion.

I am grateful with bipartisan cooperation, the Biden policies have changed to reinforce the Trump policies of javelin missiles to Ukraine, reinforcing American troops in Poland, and promoting blocking of Nord Stream 2. It was revealing that our Delegation Leader, Democrat Ruben Gallego of Arizona, was publicly threatened in a television interview by a member of the Russian Duma to be kidnapped and brought to Moscow for trial for supporting Kyiv.

The Biden policy should be Peace Through Strength. War can be avoided if we impose real costs on Mr. Putin. The latest defensive weapons for land, air and sea should be provided to Ukraine, the largest country in Europe by geography with 43 million citizens. Our German allies should terminate Nord Stream 2 and its corruption forever. We should also immediately kick Russia out of the International SWIFT Code System, sanction the Russian financial system and sovereign debt to ensure that Mr. Putin does not have the resources to finance an invasion.

I was grateful to co-lead the Putin Accountability Act with the Republican Study Committee, which would do just that along with sanctions of Mr. Putin and his family directly, and his network of corrupt oligarchs.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Indeed, this op-ed, over 2 years old, actually is as true today as it was when it was published; that is, it does matter to American families, and we need to be understanding to protect the borders of Ukraine, of Israel, Taiwan, and America.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his words and his steadfast work on the Armed Services Committee and all national security matters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank our vice chair for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a link for a document styled, "Unwelcome in Niger: The Interim Report from Congressman Matt Gaetz on the

Crisis in Niger." Https://gaetz.house.gov/sites/geo-subsites/gaetz.house.gov/files/geo-media-document/Rep.%20Gaetz%27s%20Niger%20Report%20-%20Unwelcome%20in%20Niger%204.17.24_compressed%20281%29.pdf.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the actions taken by the U.S. Embassy in Niger, particularly involving the Ambassador, Kathleen A. FitzGibbon and the Senior Defense Official/Defense Attaché (SDO/DATT). Colonel Nora J. Nelson-Richter. The recent events have raised serious questions about the conduct and decision-making of these officials, and I believe Congress must address these issues.

As a service member deployed to Niger, Africa, I have noticed that the Embassy, and more specifically the SDO/DATT, intentionally suppressed intelligence information from the ground force collection elements to maintain the facade of a great country-to-country relationship. They failed to be transparent with U.S. service members deployed to this country. They gave a pretense that "things are being worked" and "that is above our level," all the while Diplomatic Overflight Clearances for U.S. Military aircraft were purposefully not being approved by the country's Military Government as a political bargaining chip to entice the U.S. Government back to negotiate their withdrawal.

Since July 23rd, the day of the Coup d'état, the Americans deployed here have not been able to perform their primary mission and have been told to "sit and hold." It is clear that the country of Niger does not want a permanent military presence in their country and they have informed us that we need to leave. At this time, there are approximately 1,100 U.S. Military Service Members in the country who are essentially being held hostage from returning home to their families while the State Department continues with failed diplomacy by not communicating with the Country of Niger on what their withdrawal plan would look like after the Status of Forces Agreement was repudiated by the Host Nation. Additionally, the government of Niger is not processing Visas for U.S. members for entry into the country, which is especially concerning considering that all U.S. forces were scheduled to end a six-month deployment early this month when relief forces arrived. The Embassy failed to share any of this information with decision-makers at any level in the Department of Defense regarding this, further complicating our ability to conduct that swap of personnel.

These actions have deeply troubled me and many others in the community at home, as well as all the service members deployed here with me, and their families back in the States. Our diplomatic and defense representatives need to uphold the highest standards of professionalism and ethical conduct, especially in sensitive regions like Niger. The actions taken by the embassy officials not only reflect poorly on the United States but also have potential implications for our bilateral relations with other Partner Nations and the safety of our personnel in the region.

As a concerned citizen, I urge you to use your position and influence to investigate these matters and hold the responsible parties accountable thoroughly. Transparency and accountability are fundamental to the integrity of our diplomatic and defense institutions, and any misconduct or negligence must be addressed promptly and decisively.

I trust that you will take appropriate action to ensure that the necessary inquiries

and corrective measures are undertaken. It is vital for the reputation and effectiveness of our diplomatic and defense efforts in Niger, Africa, and beyond.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue. I look forward to your leadership in addressing these concerns.

Sincerely,

USAF,
Air Base 101, Niamey.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this evening to expose a cover-up in the African country of Niger. This cover-up exists to conceal the humiliating failures of the Biden administration in Niger, throughout Africa, and throughout the world. We learn of the victims of this cover-up, the 1,100 U.S. troops currently stationed in Niger, functionally stranded by a Biden administration which cares more about saving face than saving their lives.

Our troops in Niger have been pleading for help. They have sent intelligence reports and letters stating that they are rarely getting safe water. They can't get diplomatic oversights to receive medicine, fresh troop rotations, or basic supplies. They have no mission.

In addition, the local authorities are becoming increasingly hostile. The current government of Niger has called the U.S. presence in the country illegal.

Why have these pleas not been heard? It is because U.S. Embassy Niger has been blocking the intelligence. I fear, as we speak, the conditions may be forming to create another Benghazi-style attack.

How did we get here with 1,100 American troops stuck, thoroughly unwelcome in a country where we have invested more than half a billion U.S. taxpayer dollars? It all began when Biden and Blinken chose Niger to be the centerpiece of their Africa strategy. Blinken even visited the country in March of last year saying: "Niger is . . . an extraordinary model . . . a model of resilience, a model of democracy, a model of cooperation."

What a difference a year makes. Just 1 year and 1 day after those remarks, the democratically elected government of Niger was replaced by a military coup, and the United States military literally trained the coup leaders.

I asked General Langley, who runs AFRICOM, why this happened, why so many coup leaders are trained by our servicemembers. He said: Well, Congressman, training people to overthrow their democratically elected governments is not in our curriculum.

However, the results are staggering and embarrassing in Guinea, Mali, Niger, Burkina Faso, and other countries. There were coups, and in each of those coups, there was one common element: U.S. training for the coup leaders.

Now, the coup government currently in charge of Niger wouldn't even meet with General Langley when he went to talk about our base. The Prime Minister literally slammed the door in his

face. One would think, if we trained you to overthrow your democratically elected government, we could at least get a meeting. However, instead of a burgeoning pro-U.S. sentiment, we now have the coup leaders we trained turning to Russia as their preferred security partner.

Where does that leave our 1,100 troops, our Americans? I did not serve in the military. I represent a military community, and I hear that these senior-enlisted servicemembers at a U.S. installation abroad, they are a big deal. They are kind of like the mayor of the installation.

The senior-enlisted servicemember at Airbase 101 in Niger wrote a letter to Congressman DUSTY JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter.

“Dear Congressman JOHNSON, I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the actions taken by U.S. Embassy Niger, particularly involving the Ambassador Kathleen A. FitzGibbon. . . The recent events have raised serious questions about the conduct and decisionmaking of these officials, and I believe Congress must address these issues.

“As a servicemember deployed to Niger, Africa, I have noticed that the Embassy . . . intentionally suppressed intelligence information from the ground force collection elements to maintain the facade of a great country-to-country relationship. They failed to be transparent with U.S. servicemembers deployed to this country. They gave a pretense that ‘things are being worked’ and ‘that it is above our level,’ all the while, diplomatic overflight clearances for U.S. military aircraft were purposefully not being approved by the country’s military government as a political bargaining chip to entice the U.S. Government back to negotiate their withdrawal.

“Since July 23, the day of the coup d’etat, the Americans deployed here have not been able to perform their primary mission and have been told to ‘sit and hold.’ It is clear that the country of Niger does not want a permanent military presence in their country and they have informed us we need to leave. At this time, there are approximately 1,100 U.S. military servicemembers in the country who are essentially being held hostage from returning home to their families while the State Department continues with failed diplomacy by not communicating with the country of Niger on what the withdrawal plan would look like. . . . Additionally, the government of Niger is not processing visas for U.S. servicemembers for entry into the country, which is especially concerning considering that all U.S. Forces were scheduled to end a 6-month deployment early this month when relief forces arrived. The embassy failed to share any of this information with decision-makers at any level in the Department of Defense regarding this, further complicating our ability to conduct the swap of personnel.

“These actions have deeply troubled me and many others in the community at home, as well as the servicemembers deployed here with me, and their families back in the States. Our diplomatic and defense representatives need to uphold the highest standards of professionalism and ethical conduct, especially in sensitive regions like Niger. The actions taken by the embassy officials not only reflect poorly on the United States but also have potential implications for our bilateral relations with other partner nations and the safety of our personnel in this region.”

When I became aware of this letter, my office conducted a number of interviews, which confirmed the claims made by the senior-enlisted official, and he signed his name to that letter, which we have entered in the RECORD. We have done those investigations. We have learned that the top public health official says that in the month of May, they are going to run out of medicine in Niger. It is worse than that. Our partner countries, Italy and Germany, who you would think would help us facilitate medicine and supplies, but they won’t even help transport needed materiel to our servicemembers because they are worried about being expelled from the country.

If that isn’t worse, the fact that we have got Russia as the preferred security partner now means there are Russians behind the wire at Airbase 101. We have Russians on our base somewhere. That would never happen. The only reason it is happening is because Blinken and Biden are humiliated that their plan failed, that they poured half a billion dollars into this country where now we are being thrown out by the scruff of our neck. Well, Joe Biden and Tony Blinken’s failures should not have to be visited on the 1,100 servicemembers who are there fighting for us, wanting to do patriotic duty and they are being held hostage and they are stranded.

I will fight for them. I will fight against this administration that would use our servicemembers as pawns because they can’t get their act together.

Just because Biden and Blinken can’t say oops doesn’t mean we should abandon our troops.

Mr. Speaker, and I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE) for his indulgence and the time.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for sharing that information. It is part of the job that we need to be doing and what we can do to uncover and for a thorough analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I will next yield to my colleague from the great State of California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate and navigate our way through these hard times, the difficult economy with, indeed, Bidenomics working the way it has been the last couple years for us in this country, we have to get to what is the root cause and what is the route out of this? It

really comes down to getting back to our roots, getting back to the source of our economy. Where does the economy come from, and how do we make things reasonably priced again and affordable for our countrymen?

If you look here, they are all tied together when you get right down to it. Cost of electricity up over 28 percent, food over 20 percent, residential rent nearly 20 percent. What are the building blocks that help us to thrive and help us get back out of this mess?

Well, I will start. There are a few items that I work quite a bit on in my committee work, back at home and here in D.C., as well. Forestry is right at the beginning of that. What do you get from good forestry: Healthy forests and an economy that comes from our rural areas of the country that are suffering so much due to shutdowns, regulations, and inactivity by the U.S. Forest Service.

You see here a forest, how it looks when it has been treated properly, when it has been thinned on this side of the poster here. That is a healthy forest. That is one that will withstand fire. It is good for the wildlife population. It is good for the trees themselves. They won’t have to compete for limited soil and water resources, especially through a drought period.

This side here is a tinderbox that is going to go up and it is going to be devastating as so much has happened in the West over these last years. A million-acre fire happened in my district. There are many six-digit fires all over the western States. This does not work for very long. It is not good for wildlife when it is green, and certainly not for when it is caught in the middle of a forest fire.

Indeed, we have to do much more work in order to catch up on that because of what I mentioned. The cost of rent, when you have high costs of building inputs which can come from wood products that, just a couple years ago, were in short, and paper products. Remember the toilet paper shortage. Why in the world did we have that? We need to have our American forests be very active.

There are over 800 million acres of forest that have approximately 350 billion trees in this country, a total inventory of 13 trillion board-feet, annual growth of 300 billion board-feet, whether we harvest it or not. America’s total wood use via lumber, paper, biomass, and firewood is approximately half of annual growth, 150 billion board-feet. We see we have an issue, don’t we? If we are only harvesting and using half of what grows each year, that means these forests will get more and more dense every year.

We have the ability to do something about that. For some reason, I keep wondering why the U.S. is—recently surpassing China since their economy is slowing down—now the number one importer of wood products when we have the resource here that actually needs to be thinned, needs to be harvested, needs to be taken care of, and

not clear cut, not the whole works. That isn't what it is about. That is the first thing that the city folks want to say: Oh, you are going to cut all the trees. No.

□ 1900

We thin them out. This is what that looks like right here. Then that forest keeps on growing and is healthy. The next wave of harvest happens 30, 40, 50 years later, and it is a successful program instead of importing and sending the jobs somewhere else.

Now that China has receded somewhat—number one importer of wood. It doesn't make a lick of sense to me.

In the farm bill, we can address some of these issues coming up if we can be successful on passing what would be best in a 5-year farm bill soon and help with our forest health as well as the cost of housing and building new housing, building new apartments, whatever, for people.

That will get me to my next poster here having to do with food, which is another part of the building blocks.

I mentioned electricity. Those prices have gone up, food, and then housing.

Here, we have an example of the food that is grown in my home State of California, but it is important to the whole country. Many other States are key to food supply in the Midwest, the Southern States, and so many areas of the country.

I will point out what we have growing in California because we oftentimes have a water problem where the water supply, in tougher years, doesn't get to agriculture. The last 2 years, we have had an amazing water supply, amazing snowpack—indeed, above the 100-percent level of normal.

Our lakes are filling. We can keep after the people making the decisions to allow them to fill the last bit to top it off because we still have several reservoirs that have a lot of space in them. I want to see them all hit 100 percent so we can survive maybe the next drought or certainly allocate water to agriculture as well as the people in the urban areas who are seeing themselves having to ration water. They are going to be cut back to 42 gallons per day, in some cases, due to the extreme measures that people who are not planning water supply are going to cause them to do.

I don't know how that looks to my colleagues in L.A. County, Orange County, San Francisco County, having to tell people they are only going to get 42 gallons of water per day because of the mismanagement of water supply in our State.

We could be building more storage. We should be building more storage. We have the chance to build a place called Sites Reservoir, 1.5 million acre-feet of storage. We could raise Shasta Dam only 18 feet, which would yield 630,000 acre-feet more of water.

If we were actually filling the San Luis Reservoir the last 500,000 acre-feet of space it has right now—because they

won't run the pumps because of some phony numbers they are using on fish and it affecting the fish by running the pumps. There are half a million acre-feet we are leaving on the table this year right now unless something changes dramatically soon on running the pumps down there in the delta.

The priority these days everywhere is fish and environmental water. People are being left behind on this. We are going to see the allocation of water to some of the San Joaquin districts and areas curtailed, again, in a high-water year, in a high-snowpack year—great water. We have been blessed. They are going to see only 30 or 35 percent of their normal allocation, and that means these crops aren't going to be grown.

As I pointed out, these crops are grown in California: 100 percent of the artichokes, celery, garlic, honeydew, kiwifruit, nectarines, olives, plums, shelled almonds, shelled pistachios, shelled walnuts, tomatoes. Basically, 100 percent of what America uses comes from California on a commercial basis. I know people grow patches of it here and there in their garden and stuff around the country, but commercially grown, that is what California represents.

Getting down to some that are not quite 100 percent: mandarins, avocados, grapes, carrots, broccoli.

These are at the 90 percent mark: strawberries, 89 percent; wild rice, 60 percent grown in California; horseradish, 30 percent, a lot of it up in my area of Tully Lake—except they are having their water taken away, except they are having their dams removed due to environmental stuff.

How are we going to get a handle on the high price of inflation? With the dams I just mentioned, electricity is up 20-something percent.

They tear down hydroelectric dams and say they are going to replace them with high-cost solar or wind that has to be massively subsidized; otherwise, no one would ever be able to afford it. They take out the hydroelectric dams. That is not going to make electricity any cheaper.

Let's talk about food. If you don't build the water, allocate the water, and back people off on the regulations, such as making them electrify every aspect of agriculture and even the equipment—they are coming after the locomotives that transport all this and the trucks that transport it. All that does is drive up the cost of food.

As I mentioned also with housing, if we can't cut the timber, if we can't provide for low-cost timber that comes from this country instead of somewhere else—it still baffles me that we are the number one importer of wood products—then housing is not going to get any cheaper either. That is tied into a lot of other regulations, available land use, and things like that.

All of these things work together to drive up the costs for regular Americans who are struggling these days.

They don't have the same options of freedom of movement, their freedom of time, where they might want to send their kids to school, or go on a vacation once in a while, tourism.

All those things are dramatically curtailed because of government regulations, lack of government foresight on energy, where our energy is going to come from, what our energy policy is. Every time you don't allow a pipeline to happen means it is going to have to be coming from somewhere else, imported oil and gas. Yes, we are going to continue to use oil and gas in this country for a long time. The rest of the world is going to be.

If we want to be competitive, we are putting ourselves down a really steep rathole if we are not going to continue to allow oil and gas to power certain aspects of our economy, of our mobility, et cetera.

We are not going to electrify everything at the same time we are pulling out hydroelectric dams because of the environment. We are precariously on the edge of whether we are going to allow the nuclear power plant to continue to run in California past just another a few years.

Are we going to build more nuclear power in this country? If you are worried about CO₂, it is a great way to go, as are the hydroelectric dams. I am not worried about CO₂ because it only represents 0.04 percent of our atmosphere. It is a rounding error, and it has been hyped a lot in order to make climate change scare the heck out of everybody when it really isn't that kind of a factor.

There are other things we can do cleaner, cleaner running engines and things like that, less methane. Those are good things to work at, but CO₂ is not the problem. CO₂ is basically sucked up by these plants that we grow in agriculture and the forest photograph I showed you a minute ago. They are out there enjoying CO₂ and giving us oxygen back if we would just be a little smarter about it.

At the end of it, one of the important things we need to do this year, this spring, really, is move the farm bill because it is important as far as forestry goes. It is important, as far as this food supply goes, to have stability in the ag economy. A big portion of it is the SNAP program, which is important to help keep low-cost food on the table for many Americans who are on the low side of the income scale or going through tough times themselves. We need to pass that in order to have the SNAP program stay viable and stay modernized as things change.

Moving forward with the farm bill, it is going to be very important in the short term to get a 5-year bill and not just another extension, which doesn't really allow us to change or upgrade what the pieces of the farm bill are, like crop insurance.

Some of these crops need to have more ability to access crop insurance. If you have crop insurance, then there

is less need to have a bailout for a disaster because it is being taken care of upfront, as well as a promotion of products, some of that through MAP funds and other programs to promote some of these products that we export.

We do need to have an export economy. We have a giant negative economy with import-export with China and others, and agriculture has been one of our mainstays to have anywhere close to balance on foreign trade, so it is a good thing for us.

Instead, what do we get? We get things such as the Inflation Reduction Act, which is a joke in its name. It didn't reduce inflation. Inflation is still going up.

It is still part of our everyday worry we have here, and that is what we get is more government spending. Instead, unleash the economy by allowing people to log timber, grow food, and produce energy as I am talking about here.

We need to be able to make a difference to help these producers and then help the consumers. We need to produce more fertilizer in this country. We need to mine more minerals in this country. They are important to all of these sectors and producing energy.

If we want to have more gadgets, more equipment that uses electricity, then why aren't we mining the products here instead of making it a problem for some Third World country that doesn't have near the labor protections or environmental protections that we have here?

If we do all of these things, it makes things more affordable, brings the jobs home, and makes us more accountable as a country. Instead, we are losing ground on the world stage in many aspects. Why are we a net agriculture importer when we have so much plenty in this country?

We are less independent. We are less resilient. We are less competitive due to these policies that are associated with Bidenomics. In the face of declining farm income and these other challenges, it is essential that we prioritize farm and ranch families with the farm bill, with what we consume here.

I mentioned crop insurance, which is extremely important. Additionally, the farm safety net is important, which is part of that farm bill.

The input costs I mentioned, water allocations, all the above are important to work our way through instead of ignoring them and thinking that the priorities seemed to be reset around here. They have nothing to do with helping Americans in their everyday lives.

It is a steep road here, but we can get back to a little bit of common sense. I had the chance to speak to the President right on this floor about water supply, about our timber situation, our forest situation here, and he listened. I just hope his Cabinet, his people who surround him, will pay more attention to what we are dealing with and how negatively, when these things aren't

paid attention to and solved, how much it hurts the American people, how much it costs them, how much it costs them options for their family to do other things other than just trying to get by.

It doesn't have to be this way. This inflation we have had the last 3 years—we came out of COVID, yes, but our economy should be thriving much better than what it is and not have these ridiculous regulations and things that limit us so much and advantage our competitors around the world—China, the Pacific Rim, and others—especially at such a perilous time with such unrest in the world, with the wars that are breaking out.

We need to be strong. We need to be self-sufficient.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and appreciate his willingness to participate always.

Mr. Speaker, as I wrap up our Special Order and my remarks, the world watched over the weekend as Iran launched an unprecedented attack on our ally, Israel.

This attack deservedly was met with scorn and contempt from governments across the world, and it was reassuring to see such strong cooperation from the U.S., U.K., Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia to intercept Iranian missiles to keep Jerusalem and its holy sites from being completely destroyed.

I never thought I would be in that situation, to be in Congress, to be a part of legislation this week, to be at this moment, to meet this moment.

People watched across the world because of these holy sites. Look, I have said this before, and as I finalize my thoughts here, I think back to one of my first meetings in my first term of Congress. I got to meet with the Consul General from the Israeli Consulate in Los Angeles. He was in Utah, and I got a chance to sit down with him. I said, as I dig into this, I am so impressed with the Abraham Accords.

Candidly, I think it was President Trump and Vice President Pence's most significant success in our foreign policy during their administration. The Abraham Accords are diplomatic and trade relationships with Israel and Arab nations. I mean, when you think about the years and decades and centuries of us trying to find common ground and peace in that region of the world, we created an opportunity, and the U.S. was a big part of this, to establish these relationships with Arab nations and Israel. Potential bellwether countries like Saudi Arabia could have joined on.

I asked him what the recipe was for success to make that happen, and he said that it came down to one thing, that these Arab states—Arab Emirates, Morocco, Bahrain—knew the U.S. stood firm against Iranian aggression. That was what he boiled the whole entire experience down to.

Nobody in that region wants Iran to gain more influence. They want to destabilize everything over there. The

whole region understands this. Arab nation, Jewish nation, whatever, they all understand that Iran wants to destabilize.

They want to have the U.S. as a presence, a strong presence, to make sure that the U.S. had the backs of Arab nations and had Israel's back against continual potential aggression from Iran.

□ 1915

Knowing that, they were willing to enter into these trade relationships that were potentially treacherous because Iran doesn't want anybody to have a trade relationship, a diplomatic relationship with Israel.

This is my number one, biggest complaint with President Biden's foreign policy, is to just—okay, look, President Obama was going on the JCPOA, so let's just start those talks back up again and completely ignore the success that we had had to create peace in the Middle East.

It is something that every President has wanted. President Clinton, watching what he was trying to do, the absolute tragedy of the assassination that took place during his time. Every President, Republican or Democrat, has wanted peace in the Middle East.

To flatly say and to overlook the reason why the Abraham Accords were successful and to not take that type of same strength to Iran, it was the biggest blunder, I believe, in President Biden's foreign policy approach in that particular region.

Is it any wonder why we are sitting here today with unprecedented drone and missile attacks directly on our ally Israel?

You have to stand up to Iran in order to promote peace in the Middle East. You cannot have it all. You can't have the entire pie. You have to call it as it is sometimes and cut it off.

The JCPOA should never have been reengaged. It has not created any positive outcomes over in the region. Can anybody disagree with that?

Are we better today in the Middle East than we were when we had the Abraham Accords thriving? No, we are not, and everybody knows that. Anybody who is honest is willing to address it.

If you want to be Israel's ally, you cannot also continue to pander to Iran. It is not a recipe for success, and that is not just from the Israeli point of view. That is from the Arab State point of view. I hope to impress upon the Biden administration recognition of that.

That is what we are trying to do this week, putting several floor measures up to hold Iran and its proxy groups accountable for their actions. We will continue to hold the line in supporting Israel and ensuring they have what they need to defend their freedom.

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

HOUSING IS A HUMAN RIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. RAMIREZ. 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 materials on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, the housing crisis impacts us all. Regardless of whether you live in a city, a suburb, or a rural town, many Americans are concerned about their housing stability.

Homelessness has risen every single year since 2017. The shortage of available and affordable housing has only worsened. High interest rates and student debt has made the American Dream of homeownership out of reach and impossible for too many. Severely underfunded programs are unable to tackle the most critical issues facing our communities in a meaningful way, and wages are just not keeping pace with rising housing costs.

The human right to housing is more than a slogan and more than just four walls and a roof over someone's head. The human right to housing means realizing safety and stability and dignity through housing.

I am convening tonight's Special Order hour for the Congressional Progressive Caucus, so that I, along with my colleagues, can talk about the housing challenges facing American households and the progressive solutions we can champion to address this issue.

Some of those solutions are: bridging the gap between income and housing costs and expanding and preserving the supply of affordable, accessible rental homes for people with the lowest incomes, providing emergency rental assistance to households in crisis, strengthening and enforcing renter protections, and opposing efforts to undermine housing first and criminalize homelessness.

Safe, affordable, dignified housing, I know, is a foundation on which so much of our quality of life and our economic security is built. I hear often that housing is just too hard to tackle at the Federal level, but if we want to realize housing for all as a human right, we have to challenge ourselves to move beyond traditional approaches and embrace creativity and innovation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, my son Paul broke my heart with a question. He asked: Mom, will you come visit me when I grow up and live outside of California?

I asked: Why would you want to live out of State?

It wasn't that there is somewhere else he would rather be. He was just a teenager, a teenager already worrying that he wouldn't be able to afford to live where he grew up. He was right to be worried.

We all face a big cost-of-living problem. Housing has become too expensive and affordable housing altogether too scarce. The National Low Income Housing Coalition estimates that there is a nationwide shortage of more than 7 million affordable homes. That is not just a problem; it is a full-blown crisis.

Washington has bungled this for decades, and nothing is changing. Earlier this year, bipartisan House and Senate leaders promised the biggest investment in housing that Congress has made in 35 years. Until the deal fell apart. We are back to solving yesterday's problems tomorrow maybe.

Washington insiders may not have a plan, but I do. Let's start with the easiest step. Let's create a housing committee. We currently lump housing issues into the Financial Services Committee, a body focused on Wall Street, banking, and financial markets. However, housing is about so much more. It is about shelter. It is about well-being. It is about opportunity, not just about Wall Street profits.

Housing should have a dedicated committee, and then Republicans and Democrats on that housing committee must work together to do three related things. First, increase the supply of housing; second, make housing easier to build; and, third, make housing more affordable.

Believe it or not, the supply part is pretty easy. Republicans and Democrats alike actually want to increase our housing supply. You don't have to take my word for it. Look at the Affordable Housing Credit Improvement Act, which would enhance tax credits to build 2 million homes over the next decade. It is publicly supported by 111 Democrats and 111 Republicans, so let's pass that.

Why stop with tax credits? Let's unleash private capital for home construction by guaranteeing and securitizing the construction of one-to-four-unit starter homes, just like the government already does for big apartment buildings built by Wall Street real estate firms.

Those are the steps that we need to take to invest in our housing supply, but actually building those homes is still too challenging, and it shouldn't be. Stick and brick homes are expensive. Manufacturing costs have gone down in virtually every industry except home building. Why aren't we copying and learning from what worked in other industries?

Imagine a home built, at least in part, from 3D-printed materials. Congress can invest in this type of technology and reduce building costs by over 30 percent just by thinking creatively. All levels of government

should be partners in creative thinking. Congress should reward counties and cities that take steps to make their building and zoning requirements more flexible, and the Federal Government should release some of its unused land so we can build homes on it.

With these simple steps, we can build way more affordable homes and get those financed and built. Then we just need to figure out how to make them affordable to own. One problem is that hedge funds have been scooping up all of the affordable homes, especially starter homes.

We need to pass the End Hedge Fund Control of American Homes Act and tax Wall Street investors who purchase hundreds of homes solely for profits. Houses should be for homeowners and mom-and-pop landlords, not Wall Street companies looking to drive up their profits.

With the money we make from that bill, we can invest in downpayment assistance for first-time home buyers. Often the biggest thing stopping people from owning a home is not having the cash to pay up front for the downpayment, even if they can afford the regular payments on that mortgage. Downpayment assistance will solve that.

This is what a plan looks like. Congress just doesn't have one.

The United States did not wind up with a shortage of nearly 7 million affordable homes overnight. Our housing crisis is the gradual consequence of leaders in Washington being asleep at the wheel for over 30 years.

Well, Congress needs to wake up. Lowering people's housing costs isn't pie in the sky. We have done it before. We did it through the GI Bill for servicemembers, and we can do it again for all Americans. That is what we need from Washington, and I will keep pushing to get it done.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman PORTER for her remarks. I could not agree with her more. That is why we are doing this Special Order hour on housing. We need our Congress to wake up.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine we were wrapping up a session, and you had nowhere to go, you didn't have a place where you could lay your head tonight. You had no roof over your head on the coldest day of the year, let's assume we were in January.

The reality is that on any given night in America, more than 600,000 people experience homelessness, and nearly half of these individuals—250,000—sleep outside. In Illinois, the average age of someone experiencing homelessness is not 55, it is not 65, it is not 70. It is just 9 years of age. Can you imagine having a grandchild, a son, a sister, a niece not having anywhere to sleep at the age of 9?

Homelessness is increasing across the country because more and more hard-working families and individuals are struggling to make ends meet; and in the richest country in the world, rents

are far too expensive, wages are way too low, and decades of failed housing policies have brought us to this point.

For example, the National Low Income Housing Coalition has found that a full-time worker must earn \$28.58 per hour to afford a modest 2-bedroom apartment. It doesn't get much better for a modest 1-bedroom apartment because a person would have to earn \$23.67 to afford it. To put that in perspective, Mr. Speaker, a worker earning the minimum wage in this country would have to work 104 hours a week, which adds up to more than 2.5 full-time jobs. That is unacceptable.

In less than a week, one of the most important housing cases in a generation, *Johnson v. Grants Pass*, will be argued before the Supreme Court. *Johnson v. Grants Pass* essentially asked the Court whether cities can punish unhoused people for covering themselves with a blanket even in the absence of shelter.

This is where we are as a Nation. We are willing to consider criminalizing a woman with a 9-year-old child, a person experiencing homelessness, a veteran experiencing homelessness when there is no shelter, and they just want to cover themselves with a blanket.

□ 1930

Luckily, the District Court and the Court of Appeals have held that criminalizing homelessness violates the Eighth Amendment to the Constitution, which establishes the right to be free from excessive bail, excessive fines, and cruel and unusual punishment.

If the Supreme Court upholds the current decision, jurisdictions across the country will no longer be able to criminalize people for existing when they have no place to go.

But if the Supreme Court overturns the lower courts and rules in favor of *Grants Pass* it will give cities and States permission to punish people who have nowhere else to go, other than to sleep outside.

Mr. Speaker, it is despicable that there are those who would seek to punish our neighbors for simply trying to survive in an impossible situation. Regardless of the ruling, homelessness is persistent precisely because we are unwilling to act to solve the problem.

The solution is clear: Unhoused people need housing. Housing is the answer—housing, not handcuffs.

We must bridge the gap between incomes and housing costs, build and preserve homes that are affordable to people with the lowest incomes. We must create permanent tools to prevent evictions and homelessness, and we must strengthen housing-first policies, including permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing which are evidence-based.

Studies show that for permanent supportive housing, a rate of up to 98 percent of households retain their housing after a year—98 percent. For rapid rehousing, that is about 75 percent, and

91 percent of households remain housed a year after being rapidly rehoused.

Because we in Congress hold the power of the purse, we have a duty to provide adequate funding for proven housing programs and new or innovative revenue sources to support proven housing programs.

Look, prior to coming to Congress, I spent 20 years providing social services and working on policy for the unhoused population in Chicago. I witnessed firsthand the multilayered effect of not having a stable home on our unhoused neighbors, the health outcomes, the access to education, economic development, and more.

The bottom line is, there are many proven and data-backed solutions to homelessness. We have no excuse. The answers are there. We just haven't had the will to enact them. Arresting or otherwise punishing homeless folks, veterans, and children is not a solution. Jails and fines make the cycle of homelessness worse by taking resources away from housing and support. It is not only a bad policy, it is cruel.

Advocating for housing not handcuffs is how we lead the progressive fight for housing as a human right.

The Third District, Mr. Speaker, in Illinois has inspiring leaders who have been leading the fight for housing justice. It is why, Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Robert M. Adams and Dirk Enger. These are two combat veterans who embody the essence of compassion and service.

After years of providing assistance to servicemembers returning to civilian life, Robert and Dirk opened the Midwest Shelter for Homeless Veterans to help veterans suffering from homelessness.

Since 2000, the Midwest Shelter for Homeless Veterans has been a beacon of hope, providing vital support to our veterans in DuPage. From affordable housing and employment assistance to service outreach, Robert and Dirk's dream is that no veteran is left behind when it comes to care and services they earned and they deserve.

Their commitment to building a continuum of care for our veterans is truly inspiring, and on behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my great honor to commend Robert M. Adams and Dirk Enger for their commitment to supporting our veterans and ensuring that they receive the care our Nation promised them.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate them.

We can't talk about homelessness without talking about the high cost of housing. I mean, many of our constituents that I serve, nearly 40 percent in my district, are renters. In the Chicago portion of my district, we have seen rent go up 20 percent—in some cases even higher.

For decades, the United States has faced increasing housing costs and declining construction. In 2022, it is estimated that 12 million Americans are spending more than half of their income on rent and utilities.

Now, think about that. You get your income; you get your check. You have worked your 40, 50, 60 hours, and you look, and more than half of it is going to rent and utilities and the rest of it probably to a car payment, most likely to gas, student loans, and credit cards. People are living paycheck-to-paycheck, and given what we have seen since COVID, reduced housing supply, increasing rents, supply chain issues, these statistics have only gotten worse.

When I was tapped to represent the resilient and diverse communities of Illinois in the State legislature, I was clear, I am going to fight like hell to prevent folks from losing their housing and falling into homelessness. During the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic, I passed an expansive housing bill that included eviction moratoriums and rental assistance.

Mr. Speaker, we need more programs and policies that make rent affordable for families. However, I know that staying housed is just one piece of the puzzle. Even if people are able to remain housed, high rent often forces people to choose between basic needs like keeping the lights on or purchasing their medication. I mean, people are having to choose between medication, paying for their light bill, or paying rent.

When people have to make these kinds of choices, a cycle develops. What is that cycle, you would ask? It is the cycle of debt, poor credit, predatory lending, and all of the distressing consequences when unaffordable housing creates financial hardships for our families.

That is why it is more important than ever that we continue to make housing more affordable while we also address predatory practices. We have to expand the use of tools like alternative credit scores that factor in rent and utility payments, and we have to regulate fees like late credit card fees.

I was so encouraged to hear that last month the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB, they finalized a rule to cut excessive credit card late fees that cost American families more than \$14 billion a year. By reducing the typical fee from \$32 down to \$8, more than 45 million people will experience an average savings of—are you ready—\$220 per year.

Consumer protections are part of how we help families navigate financial security in the face of housing stability, but we also have to recognize the important role that the Fair Housing Act plays in protecting tenants and prospective homebuyers from housing discrimination and predatory landlords.

The year 2024 marks the 56th anniversary of the passage of the Federal Fair Housing Act. Today, serving in this Congress, it seems almost impossible that people can come together to set a national policy of fair housing that bars discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, gender, familial status or disability—but we did. And the need is greater than ever.

According to the National Fair Housing Alliance's 2023 Fair Housing Trends Report there were 33,007 fair housing complaints received in 2022; the highest number of complaints ever reported in a single year.

Overall complaints were 5.7 percent higher than the previous year, and complaints based on source of income and domestic violence significantly increased.

While this legislation is still relevant 56 years later, I would argue it could use an update.

In Illinois, the Human Rights Act, which is 45 years old this year, also bars discrimination in housing based on sex, including sexual harassment, age, ancestry, marital status, military status, unfavorable discharge from military service, sexual orientation, gender-related identity, order of protection status, arrest record, source of income, or immigration status.

Here is what I know: If housing is a human right, then we must root out housing discrimination and predatory practice whenever we find it.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN) to speak a little bit more about this housing work across this country and what must be done.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for her leadership, and I thank her for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am telling America, the rent is too damn high. I repeat, the rent is too damn high. It remains too damn high for the majority of Americans.

We believe very strongly that housing is a human right. Every single person in our country should have access to affordable housing—housing that is truly affordable.

If you work full time in our country, you should be able to afford clean, respectful, dignified, adequate housing. No American should spend more than 20 percent of their salary toward rent and/or mortgages.

In my district, you have people paying 30, 40, 50, 60, even 70 percent of their salaries toward rent. How can you afford transportation? How can you afford childcare? How can you afford education or to get your child tutoring or to take additional courses for yourself? How can you afford to put your child in martial arts or science or arts or music programs when the majority of your money is going toward rent?

In Westchester County where the majority of my district resides, you need to make \$40 an hour to afford a modest two-bedroom apartment. That means you will be working 2.6 minimum wage jobs, and you will not have discretionary income. You will not have an exemplary quality of life, which should be the goal of this Congress; to make sure that everyone in our country has their basic needs met, beginning with housing.

President Biden recently announced a rent cap in properties that use the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit. That is a huge help for millions of Ameri-

cans. We thank President Biden—huge shout-out to him. But we need for the President to go further and regulate rent across the country. He should use his authority to cap rent at any property with a federally backed mortgage, which Senator WARREN and I have joined tenant leaders in proposing.

I want to give a huge shout-out to community voices heard who are organizing for tenants in Yonkers, in the Bronx, and all throughout Westchester County. I want to give a huge shout-out to Evelyn Santiago, who is organizing for tenants in White Plains, and throughout Westchester County. I want to give a shout-out to Jeanette Garcia who is working and organizing with United Yonkers for tenants' rights.

As development goes up, we have to make sure rent remains truly affordable for the working class. We should not be allowing the displacement or the gentrification of the most vulnerable in our communities. I want to give a huge shout-out to Westhab. We have worked very closely with them to give them millions of dollars to build and sustain affordable housing for seniors and others in Yonkers and in places all over the county and the district.

We need a Green New Deal for public housing. We have to rebuild our public housing stock. The Federal Government has disinvested in public housing for decades, and over the last 10 years there has not been a dime given to public housing. We need new public social housing in alignment with our climate goals.

We also need to support Representative OMAR's bill, the Housing for All Act, to invest a trillion dollars over the next 10 years to make sure that everyone has a home.

For those who are unhoused and may need supportive housing, we need to build that, too.

America used to be the country of big ideas, but we need to make sure we implement these big ideas for marginalized people and marginalized communities because housing is a human right, and the rent is too damn high.

We still have so many people in our country, millions, not just unemployed, but underemployed—under employed.

□ 1945

Housing costs are through the roof. Food costs are through the roof. Utilities costs—“Ay, Dios mio”; “Oh, my God”—are through the roof. People can't afford childcare.

We are creating a permanent underclass because we do not have a bold vision as a United States Congress. The only way our democracy is going to work for everyone is if we focus on equity. Step one is to focus on equity to make sure everyone has a clean, dignified, respectful, clean energy home. That should be our goal. That should be our mission.

I thank Representative RAMIREZ for her leadership and vision for housing in

our country. Her leadership in Chicago and all throughout the State of Illinois and our country is astounding. She inspires women across this country. She inspires Latinas across this country. She inspires people of color across this country. She inspires me.

I am a sophomore Representative, and she is a freshman. I look up to her and ask her to please continue to share her bold vision with the people of America.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, my colleague is absolutely right—“Ay, Dios mio”; “Oh, my God”—the rent is too darn high.

Today, we heard from Members from California and Congressman BOWMAN from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, “Mashallah,” “God has willed it,” to Representative JAMAL BOWMAN for that incredible speech and for giving a shout-out to my Homes for All Act.

I thank Representative RAMIREZ for yielding and for bringing all of us together to be able to advocate for housing.

Mr. Speaker, in the richest nation on Earth, it is a moral failure that we have a housing crisis, but moral victories are not won by words but by urgent actions and bold policies. Fortunately, our localities are stepping up with sensible housing reforms and creative development models.

In Minneapolis, our Public Housing Authority just unveiled its largest development in decades. The Minneapolis Public Housing Authority created 84 new units that are deeply affordable family housing across Minneapolis, using an innovative modular construction approach that cut development time by 30 percent.

In Montgomery County, local leaders created their own version of an affordable housing development by setting up a revolving loan fund to develop dense, mixed-income, municipally owned housing. Now, their public developer model is being replicated in other communities across the country.

These local initiatives are vital to strengthening housing affordability, but they need more support. The solution to our housing shortage cannot be piecemeal. It demands a combination of local innovation and bold Federal leadership.

Congress cannot sit on the sidelines. We have the responsibility and capacity to solve this crisis. We can start by authorizing significant Federal funding and public financing options for true public and social housing.

That is why I will be reintroducing the Homes for All Act, to transform what housing could look like in the United States, rooted in the right reforms and priorities. It repeals the Faircloth amendment allowing public housing authorities to build more housing on a massive scale, like we once did in times of great need.

To ensure Federal disinvestment and neglect does not happen again, the bill

also converts public housing operating and capital expenses into mandatory spending.

It makes historic investments in our housing stock, building 8.5 million new public housing units and 3.5 million new private housing units for working-class families.

Finally, my bill would establish a fund to help localities develop pro-housing programs that can also prevent residential segregation and displacement.

Congress needs to play a more active and direct role in strengthening our housing supply. This includes making sure that public and private dollars for affordable housing are used effectively and equitably by supporting local zoning reform and robust tenant protections. Such policies can work together, if crafted carefully.

Last Congress, Senator MERKLEY and I introduced the Affordable HOME Act to provide that comprehensive approach to ensuring housing construction and acquisition efforts are fair, inclusive, and sustainable. For renters and first-time home buyers, this legislation provides robust funding for direct rental assistance and downpayment assistance. This bill also establishes programs for a national right of first refusal and right to counsel and bans source-of-income discrimination and no-cause evictions.

For people experiencing homelessness, the bill provides billions of dollars in funding for permanent supportive housing, not only covering capital costs but also expanding rental subsidies and wraparound services.

For communities, the bill invests in innovative housing models, such as resident-owned cooperatives and community land trusts.

My bills are only a couple of examples that could help guarantee housing as a human right.

I am proud to share this floor with my dedicated colleagues who have championed housing policies that are centered on the needs of our communities and advocates.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to shout-out Representative Esther Agbaje, Representative Aisha Gomez, Representative Mike Howard, and Representative Hodan Hassan, who are leading the charge in the State of Minnesota to make sure housing is available for all. Everyone deserves access to a safe and stable place to live.

I thank Representative RAMIREZ for her great partnership in this important fight.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, the truth is, as I hear my colleague from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR) talk, there are bills prepared to bring solutions to this issue. What we need in Congress is the will and courage to prioritize our communities. I thank her for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the work that we do can't be done without the people on the ground who are constantly working to make sure that the people who need to

be seen are seen and heard. These are leaders in our community that often are unsung heroes but that do all the work so that Members of Congress, like me, could be here.

It is why I rise today to recognize my constituent, Catherine Serpa, who is a local organizer living her commitment to safe and dignified affordable housing.

Serpa is a resident of Chicago's Housing Authority's public housing, knowing firsthand the challenges families in Chicago and around the Nation face when it comes to affordable housing. As president of the North Central Scattered Sites, she has worked tirelessly to organize her neighbors, including Section 8 voucher recipients, to protect their rights as tenants.

Serving on the board of the Central Advisory Council, Catherine brings the voice, the perspectives, and the concerns of neighbors living in public housing to ensure that they are represented in the decisions that impact them daily. Her work has been central to ensuring public housing residents have clean, dignified, well-maintained homes and is a key voice in strengthening my legislation, the Tenants' Right to Organize Act.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my great honor to commend Catherine Serpa for her contributions to our community and her commitment to housing for all. I thank and congratulate Catherine.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to commend my constituent, a leader, an inspiration, Jose Zayas, for his more than five decades of service and activism in our communities to realize housing as a human right.

Jose's family migrated from Puerto Rico in the 1950s. They moved into Lathrop Homes, a historic public housing development on the northwest side of the city.

Jose made strong connections with his neighbors as he grew up, and he became a staunch defender of the community and a steward of the strong generational relationships built there.

For years, progress in redeveloping Lathrop Homes to provide hundreds more promised apartments has stalled. While the fight has been long, Jose's leadership has been constant. He has been a committed advocate, testifying, marching, and calling for accountability. As a Lathrop alumni leader, he has consistently held public officials accountable to do more to preserve and protect public affordable housing.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my great honor to commend Jose Zayas for his leadership and commitment to fight for public and affordable housing for our communities. I thank Jose, and it is my honor to congratulate him with this congressional commendation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA), my friend, to continue to hear about the work that needs to be done around housing throughout the country and

the ways that Congress can actually act.

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative RAMIREZ for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces a severe housing crisis, and it is time for Congress to start working on real solutions for working families.

We know that we are facing a shortage of 3 million homes across the country. That is unacceptable, and the deficit has led to years of rising costs for every American.

Housing is a human right, but today, there are millions of people with no access to a safe home, no access to a stable home, and this is happening in cities and towns across America. We know that millions more are at risk.

In 2020, almost half of American renters were forced to spend more than 30 percent of their income just on housing, and 23 percent were forced to spend more than half their income on rent.

We just know that rent is too damn high. This is unacceptable, and it is the single biggest driver of our country's homelessness crisis.

In places like L.A. County that I represent, and in communities across America, rents are going up and housing stock is becoming more and more difficult. We know that working families and middle-class families have less and less access to not just buying a home but even renting a home that they can afford.

We know the most vulnerable constituents are facing the most severe consequences of this crisis, and it impacts especially Black, Brown, and low-income communities across America.

We also know it is a crisis for seniors and for people on a fixed income who can't keep up with skyrocketing housing costs. It is impacting young people, who are entering the job market and starting families but realizing, sadly, that they will never be able to afford a home.

For the past 70 years, being able to buy a home and build wealth has been the gateway to the middle class for millions of families. It has made the American Dream possible for so many generations, but now we are allowing that American Dream to crumble.

The shortage of affordable housing is estimated to cost us approximately \$2 trillion a year due to lower wages and productivity. We need to build more housing.

Housing is a social justice issue. Housing is a climate issue. We know that communities that adopt smart housing policies can build more affordable housing.

Not only does our Federal Government need to invest in more housing, in more vouchers, in more affordability, and focus on more not just local but national tenant protections, but we also need to take a smart approach to growth.

Mr. Speaker, that is why, last year, I also introduced the People Over Parking Act to eliminate minimum parking

requirements near high-quality public transit. For those who don't know, parking minimums force property owners to create a certain number of spaces regardless of the needs of the people who live in those homes.

□ 2000

In fact, parking minimums are often times the single largest driver of housing costs across America, leading to less and less affordable housing. Additionally, many of these spaces go unused, even as the financial costs are passed on to renters and tenants, even folks that may not even own a car.

We need to reduce parking minimums. We need to increase density across the country. We need to look at our zoning to ensure that we can spur more multifamily units and developments across neighborhoods and across communities in this country.

We must expand the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit and invest in housing that is affordable and accessible. That is what the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit can do.

Let's pass commonsense policies. Let's protect renters and tenants. Let's ensure that neighborhoods are for everyone and that folks have access to the middle class. Housing is a human right.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GARCÍA for his words. He is absolutely right. The rent is too damn high.

With skyrocketing inflation and increasing rents, tenants are often finding themselves in a vicious cycle of being rent burdened and vulnerable to unfair housing prices.

While the Fair Housing Act and other nondiscrimination work is critically important, we know most incidents of housing discrimination go undetected or they go unreported.

Marginalized communities, especially nonnative English speakers, new arrivals, immigrants, Black and Brown people, can be afraid to speak out against unfair discriminatory housing policies because they fear retaliation. That is why the protection of tenant unions and tenant organizing rights are critical. Every tenant should be able to use their voice to address the concerns they have regarding their housing situation. This is why I was proud to lead my friends and colleagues, Representatives RASHIDA TLAIB, AYANNA PRESSLEY, JIMMY GOMEZ, and GREG CASAR, in the introduction of the Tenants' Right to Organize Act, a historic measure that protects and expands the community power, changing the landscape of housing for everyone.

This is what it will do. It protects the organizing rights of tenants with housing vouchers and tenants living in Low-Income Housing Tax Credit properties and expands protections to mixed-status families and those who may not be eligible for tenant-based rental assistance.

All tenants must have the right to organize, and protecting and strength-

ening tenant organizing and protecting tenants' unions is another way that we help people stay housed.

I also give a shout-out to Representative Norma Hernandez in the State legislature in Illinois who has an identical bill in the State House to begin doing this work specifically in Illinois. We are so grateful for Representative Norma Hernandez's work.

The truth is that in parts of my district, gentrification is a dire threat to housing as a human right. It drives up housing costs, displaces families, and destroys webs of relationships and community history. That is why I am so inspired with the work of Palenque LSNA, a predominantly Latine community-based organization in Illinois 3. Palenque's youth and mother leaders have fought to resist displacement and addressed gentrification by expanding community control of local land use and zoning.

In much the same way that we protect renters' and homeowners' rights at the Federal level, I encourage us to be inspired by the work of the organizations like Palenque to encourage the models of the future that help us think beyond the status quo, community control, community landownership, and collective financial models, because I know that those are the ways of the future.

As we think about our future, we have to reckon with the consequences of climate change on our collective housing stability. For instance, in my district, polar vortexes are more frequent, and lower average temperatures requires more heat which increases the household's energy consumption and associated expenses. Even if we stabilize rents and make housing more affordable, we also have to address how climate change and climate inaction puts us all at risk.

It is why we have to realize both policy action and investments to secure the future of our public housing, prioritize climate and racial justice, and boost our economy and labor force. It is why I am proud to stand with Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ and Senator SANDERS in introducing the Green New Deal for Public Housing, a bold solution to confront unprecedented challenges.

The sweeping legislation aims to retrofit, rehabilitate, expand, and decarbonize the entire Nation's public housing stock through an estimated \$162 to \$234 billion investment over the next 10 years.

While we must consider how we future-proof our housing against climate uncertainty, we have to pay particular attention to ensure that the 1.6 million people who live in our Nation's public housing are protected.

Working families continue to invest in our communities. They work, shop, eat, worship, learn, and play in our neighborhoods and towns. They deserve to be rooted and deeply connected to the people and places that shape them. That includes the power to put down

roots in the communities that they have lived. That requires long-term affordability for long-term stability.

The solutions we look for are already in our communities. From Humboldt Park to West Chicago, leaders, neighbors, and organizations are working in solidarity to create affordable housing opportunities.

Our role is to expand and support their efforts with transformative investments and commonsense legislation that prioritizes our communities. That is how we lead the progressive fight for housing as a human right.

That is why I am so grateful for the leadership of people who have grown up in the community and continue to do the work to get us closer to housing as a human right.

It is why, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my constituent, Lissette Castaneda. She is an experienced and trailblazing voice for fair housing.

From the Hermosa neighborhood, Lissette Castaneda has dedicated more than 15 years of her life to helping the members of our community find a place they can call home, to keep families safely housed, and to fight for the creation of affordable housing and vibrant communities.

As the former executive director of LUCHA, an affordable housing organization serving my district, Lissette has uplifted the voices and the perspectives of longtime residents in our communities to fight for the housing and resources they need to thrive.

In February, Lissette Castaneda made history by being appointed and confirmed as the very first ever Latina Commissioner of the Department of Housing in Chicago's history. I have been honored to work with her for many years as we fight to maintain and expand affordable housing. I know that Commissioner Castaneda will serve our communities well, fighting tirelessly for all Chicagoans to have safe and dignified housing.

On behalf of Illinois's Third Congressional District, it is my great honor to commend Lissette Castaneda for her visionary leadership and her service to our communities. I congratulate her.

I also rise today, Mr. Speaker, to honor Sally Hamann and Dr. Anne Scheetz, community activists for the preservation of affordable housing who exemplify the true spirit of solidarity.

For more than a decade, Sally and Anne have been strong supporters of our community's fight for housing affordability and accessibility.

In a time when gentrification threatens to erode the fabric of our communities, they have demonstrated what solidarity and fraternity look like.

To support the cause of affordable homeownership, Sally and Anne donated their homes to a community land trust, the Here to Stay Community Land Trust, to ensure they remain affordable home options. How many people would donate their home so that another family can have the dream of owning a home?

Through their actions and the land trust's mission, longtime residents will now find access to affordable homeownership, ensuring that families with roots in Logan Square can continue to thrive and flourish in the neighborhood they call home.

On behalf of Illinois's Third Congressional District, it is my great honor to commend Dr. Anne Scheetz and Sally Hamann for their decades of activism, solidarity, and actionable commitment. Sally and Anne are a true inspiration for Congress. I congratulate them.

I have talked a lot today about the importance of addressing homelessness, not criminalizing people experiencing homelessness. We have talked about the importance of rental housing, creating it, and legislation that actually creates a solution. We certainly know that there is so much work to be done around homeownership, and this Congress has the ability to actually make it possible for people to be able to have housing as a human right.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues who have joined me tonight for the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour, as we talked about the progressive fight for housing as a human right.

Tonight, we have heard from courageous leaders about the work they are doing. You heard about people in my district, inspiring leaders who are literally giving their life so that others can have housing as a human right.

There is power in being rooted. When we are rooted in ways that nurture safety, dignity, security, love, and joy, Mr. Speaker, we bloom, our community blooms, our neighborhoods bloom.

This Fair Housing Month, I call on us to reaffirm our commitment to homeownership as an accessible American Dream, to housing for all as a just social security and to housing as a human right regardless of race and gender.

Before we wrap up, Mr. Speaker, I do want to take a moment to talk about a situation that is weighing very heavily on my heart. For over 2 years, Ukrainians' way of living and democracy have been under attack by a dictator, a war monger, and an extremist. While this country promised to stand by them, we have failed to deliver the aid they desperately need to protect their homes, to care for their wounded and sick, and to recover from Putin's attacks.

To my Ukrainian constituents whose families and hearts are still in Ukraine, know that I stand ready to vote in favor of standalone legislation that provides assistance and humanitarian aid to Ukrainians. I call on my colleagues to bring Ukrainian aid to the floor without conditioning support on the well-being of asylum-seekers or the lives in Palestine or any other poison pill. We have to support Ukrainian families without delay, and we can do that today.

As I wrap up, Mr. Speaker, I realize that today is a special day. Coming to

Congress and sometimes having extended sessions, it means that we may be missing important days back at home. Today, April 17, is a very important day for the love of my life. Today is the birthday of Boris Noel Hernandez, my better half. On this House floor, I want to wish him a very happy birthday.

I also thank the staff who have worked so diligently to make sure that we can do this work, that we can move legislation. I want to give a special thank you to Katherine Bray, who is working with me today and to the leaders across the country.

To the people that are just a moment from homelessness, know that while I am here and while the Congressional Progressive Caucus stands, we will fight like hell every single day until housing becomes a human right in this Congress, in this State, in this country.

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

□ 2015

MATH ALWAYS WINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, we have one-half hour. We have a number of different things to make it through. As we know, our running sarcasm is that we all work in a math-free zone where we use feelings to make public policy and then we wonder what the hell is going on when we actually have to deal with the honesty of the math. So let's have a little bit of fun with the honesty of the math.

A couple of days ago was tax day.

Mr. Speaker, did you know when you paid your taxes that 39 cents out of every dollar you sent in was just interest, 39 cents of every dollar you sent in, Mr. Speaker, as an individual taxpayer?

Now, that is the billionaire and that is down to the working stiff who actually had income tax, you paid 39 cents of your tax dollars just to interest.

The point, once again, that we are going to go through is understanding how fragile we have made part of the American economy because of the scale of the debt. Remember, Mr. Speaker, every 110, 115 days we are clicking off another trillion dollars of borrowing. So yay for that.

We also hit another benchmark. Yesterday, we had \$100,000 a second we were borrowing. Congratulations, once again. It is the third time—the third time outside COVID—when we have clicked through \$100,000 a second.

The reason I break it down to a second is: How many people can visualize \$1 trillion?

It is hard to visualize 12 zeros, so let's actually walk through this. As we are clicking off \$100,000 a second, that basically means gross borrowing. It

looks like it is going to be, if we stay close to this, \$3.151 trillion, \$3 trillion 151 billion.

Now, why is that a big deal?

That was yesterday. Today, it fell way down. We are 99,000 something per second.

We were expecting to see the number actually really bounce down because what happened in the last couple of days? It was tax collection time.

We are trying to figure out what is going on because these are right off the Treasury's website we get every afternoon. You can sign up on our website for our office and get something we call the daily debt. We will text it to you. We break it down both in gross—gross is all borrowing because remember, we borrow from the Social Security trust fund and we borrow from the transportation trust fund. We borrow from all of those. We do pay interest, and we have got to pay it back.

Then there is what they call net borrowing. That is where we go to public bonds. Many of you saw yesterday we had a bond auction that wasn't great at the interest rates we paid, and even if you do the public borrowing, Mr. Speaker, we are crossing over \$2.8 trillion this year.

So let's process this for one moment because I feel as if I can't find a way to get this through people's heads. GDP, now, I believe it was yesterday, which is the Atlanta Fed, they have a neat little app you can sign up for, they will send you updates and give you market predictions on interest rates and these things, but they also give you an estimator of what they think the gross national product is for this quarter. They had a number of 2.9 percent come out yesterday.

That is remarkable. The American people should be given a ginormous hug for how hard they are out there working.

Yet, how much of that 2.9 percent GDP growth that was on the Atlanta Fed website is because we are spending at this remarkable rate?

Just as the left used to attack us when we did tax reform, which actually has the elegance of being proper allocation, they have been spending money at a crazy rate—remember, \$100,000 a second—and here are some of the other parts of the punch line. I hope I am not throwing too much out. Tax receipts so far this fiscal year are up 7 percent.

Okay, that is wonderful. But we are still borrowing close to \$3 trillion this year. Nonetheless, tax receipts are up 7 percent, and we are still having to borrow like that, and Medicare is up 10 percent so far this year.

Does anyone see a problem?

Part of the point we have got to walk through is how much is on autopilot, and we, as policymakers, are terrified to go home and tell the truth, or—let's be honest, let's be honest—we haven't told a lot of our voters the truth for so long, how do you get in front of them and say: It is not foreign aid, it is not waste and fraud, we can't tax our way out of this?

So I have shown this chart a number of times.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you look at a chart like this, do you see the blue area?

That is all we get to vote on. We function and only get to vote on about 26, 25 percent of all spending, and part of that, one-half of that, is basically defense. So if you don't want us to cut defense and you want us to maintain that, Mr. Speaker, then you do realize that the nondefense appropriations in this place is 12 percent, 13 percent of our spending. That is all we vote on. Everything else is on autopilot.

On my chart here, I have \$890 billion as interest, but we already know the interest number now looks like it is going to be 1.1. It could actually be, if interest rates stay where they have been this week, \$1.2 trillion.

One more time, let's do this.

Medicare will be \$1 trillion 450 billion; interest will be \$1.1, \$1.2 trillion; Medicare will be 839; and defense will be right there.

Now, remember, Mr. Speaker, we were just calculating that Medicare spending has already moved up almost 10 percent this year. We have Medicare coming in as number three and defense coming in as number four.

It is a lot different than the folklore out there in society.

Part of the point we keep trying to make here is we have made this society, this government, and the world actually in some ways incredibly fragile because as interest rates move up it is starting to consume everything around us.

So, I have not done this chart in years, but we have updated it. Understand, Mr. Speaker, it is a little hard to see. We will put it up on one of our websites, but we are right here at 2024. We were supposed to only be borrowing about \$1.5 trillion this year. It looks like we may double that.

This chart is only a few months old, and it is already out of date, but understand it is an interest rate scenario chart. Right now, CBO has us at 3½ percent. Well, we are already over that. At 3½ percent in functionally 9 budget years, we are borrowing almost close to \$4 trillion a year. I would say that is actually 8 budget years.

If we go up one full point, then we are well over \$4 trillion. If we go up to the 5.5, which is historically closer to what we were before the fake years of the previous decade, at suppressed interest rates, if you do the 35 years before that, Mr. Speaker, even if you take out the Volcker years, 5½ was closer to what norm was, and then you are starting to approach in 9 budget years almost \$5 trillion in a single year interest.

There is our problem.

We have listened to speeches already today of people telling us that this is a human right and that is a human right. Okay, fine.

Do you want to think like an economist, Mr. Speaker, or someone who believes in fairy tales?

We actually make public policy here by our feelings and not by facts because the facts are uncomfortable, and they don't sound that great on campaign stumps.

I actually originally intended to come here, Mr. Speaker, and just do some basic economics charts and then do some optimism of solutions.

Nonetheless, let's run through these charts, and then we will actually talk about the reality that there is hope. There is a way to deal with this. It just would require thinking, but we are so busy having the drama of: Are we going to remove another Speaker?

Are we going to knife each other over some foreign aid?

Understand, Mr. Speaker, I know some people passionately care about Israel, Ukraine, and Taiwan. Add up the total amount of money, remove the money that functionally comes back to the United States, and you are talking about 3 or 4 days of borrowing. People have no sense of the scale.

So, Mr. Speaker, you look at a chart like this, and here is part of your classic problem. Remove COVID, that is COVID right there, and just look at the basic chart. All we are trying to say is that historically, next year a bunch of TCJA, which was the tax reform, expires. Your tax rates will go up next year. If you have an LLC, a pass-through, a Subchapter S, employee owned, then your taxes go up next year, and that is already based in this number. We still functionally get a little less than 18 percent of the size of the economy in taxes.

Nonetheless, the blue line going up, that you have got to understand, Mr. Speaker—and I know it is a 30-year chart and nobody wants to think about a 30-year chart—but this is the crisis: tax receipts stay stable as a percentage of the economy.

So I have already brought charts here before that show: hey, here are times when we have had remarkably high marginal tax rates, here are times when we have had really low tax rates, and you get this percentage of the economy that always sort of falls in between, about 17 to 19. It is always right there in that bandwidth.

So the secret is: have a bigger economy.

Understand, Mr. Speaker, over the next couple of decades the Congressional Budget Office has a number where we are saying, hey, 2054—that is a long time from now. What is that? It is 28 budget years from now. Mr. Speaker, 31.9 percent of the economy is in spending, but tax receipts are still projected to be about 17.9, 18 percent. So the tax receipts stay level, but our spending—what is the primary driver of spending?

This is the thing we share, at least I share, that gets you unelected, but it happens to be true. From today through the next 30 years, 100 percent of growth of borrowing—and most of the growth is spending—is demographics. We got old.

The fact of the matter is that when I was a kid, \$5 to \$6 was spent for those under the age of 18 and for every \$1 a senior. Today that is reversed. Today we spend about \$5 for a senior for every dollar we spend for those under the age of 18.

It is demographics. There are different population dynamics. Then the healthcare costs, because if Medicare is going up just 10 percent so far this fiscal year, then you have to see what the numbers look like over the next decade—particularly baby boomers—as what is it, close to some 70 million of us age.

So if we had a revolution in changing the cost of healthcare, which we have written about and actually have designed ways to do it, but you couldn't get a hearing around here because there are too many lobbyists running up and down the hallways saying: That will affect our business models or that will affect the bureaucracy.

The bureaucracy has its own lobbyists here.

Math will win, but this place will still curl up in a fetal position of fantasy.

One more time, it keeps ticking away from us.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago we were estimating and saying: oh, yeah, this 2024 budget we will only borrow about 1.3, then it was 1.5, then maybe 1.6. We are looking at numbers now of what the public borrows, that means selling bonds, it is 2.8, the total borrowing now is approaching—and this is from the Treasury. This isn't from my joint economic economists or Schweikert's brain. This is from the Treasury's own numbers. They are at now \$1,1436 trillion in interest this fiscal year, and this was put together before the most recent pop in interest rates.

So I have said this—and this seems to upset some folks—Congress has made a governing decision, and it is not a governing decision of whether we want to go through the chaos of removing another Speaker or the chaos of letting the Democrats have more power around here. It is the chaos that we have made the decision that the bond markets are in charge of your country.

If we have a failed bond auction, Mr. Speaker, do you understand the cascade of hell that happens in this country and around the world?

So it is our moral, fiscal sanity and economic obligation to demonstrate to those who are willing to buy our country's debt that we are adults, that we understand what is going on, we understand our demographics, and we understand our earned entitlements that we have got to pay.

How are we going to pay them when functionally the taxes you just paid, 39 cents out of every dollar you paid, went just to cover the interest, and it will be worse next year?

□ 2030

We live in a country where we have made the decision to put the bond market in charge of our country because

we are too much of a wimp to tell the truth. For those who are going to say: Well, Schweikert, if you would just vote against this or that, and we don't understand those are rounding errors.

The scale, this is not today. It is as we move over the next couple of years. The scale of borrowing is structural. It is what we are demographically. Heaven forbid, in 8 years, 9 years when the Social Security trust fund is exhausted—to my Democrats who get cranky and say we can't use the word "exhausted," that is what the Social Security actuary report, if we actually read the math, actually says. They use the word "exhausted" because it is gone.

At that moment, we get a 25 percent cut in our Social Security check, and we double senior poverty in America. Yesterday, we had a Social Security Subcommittee hearing in the Ways and Means, and one of the members—I think JODEY ARRINGTON gets credit for this—asked a simple question: For Democrats, how many would support policy changes and raising taxes? Nope. They only want raising taxes.

Over here, the Republicans said: We have to do everything. At least the Republicans on the committee and the Republican witnesses told the truth. The Democrats are so locked in that there is this fantasy, and I have shown the charts over and over. The caps can all be raised. If no benefits are given, the caps are raised, so Social Security is functionally turned into everything that FDR swore it would never be. It is functionally a wealth transfer system. It only covers half, at best, of the shortfall.

When you hear people say: Well, we have a solution. We are going to fix it through tax hikes. You do understand that what the fraud is, to be able to close the gap, you have to tax unrealized capital gains all up and down the economy.

We are still trying to figure out what Democrats mean when they say that because we are walking through the details in their proposals, and we are having trouble making the math work.

You have a house. You have a building. You have a retirement account. You have investments. Do they get to come in and take 12.4 percent of everything you gained that year, because that is the only way you start to cover these scales of shortfall. The first year, 2033, first year Social Security is empty, the shortfall is \$616 billion.

Every dime of Defense is in the \$800 billion range. Do you understand the scale of what is coming at us? Look, I have already done these charts before over and over saying: Hey, here we are right now. We are actually a little higher. This is interest rates. We are probably at 3.6 now. We are going to go higher with the recent bond auctions.

Here is what we were during the 2001 to 2022, sort of the suppressed years of the Federal Reserve, suppressing interest rates. However, when we go back to 1975 to 2001, understand what the aver-

age interest rate was on U.S. sovereign debt. It was 3.5 percent.

I just showed a chart a moment ago that said we are almost at Armageddon if we go to 5.5. So don't think it is some sort of crazy, dystopian fantasy, oh, you are never going to get that high. Our math, we are not even going up to what the historical average was. However, we want to live in a fantasy world.

This is another chart trying to show where interest rates are and where they are going.

I wanted to do this one again because I had someone that was looking at the video on YouTube from last week's floor speech, and I used this chart, and we had a misunderstanding, so I want to walk through it again.

This line here is Social Security. This line is Medicare's spending as a percentage of GDP. Understand, one of the key differences in Medicare is there is a trust fund, but it only covers maybe 30, 40 percent. It is the hospital portion. The rest comes out of the general fund.

Social Security, even when the trust fund is exhausted, 75 percent, and then it falls to 70, and a little bit less of that comes from your taxes.

Right now, for every dollar you pay in, they basically take that, and they put it out the door, and then they reach over and cash in a little bit of the special trust bonds, T bills, Treasury bills they have, to pay out, and that is what is exhausting the trust fund.

When you see this, this is not borrowing, but spending, according to GDP. What is fascinating is, sometime in the next decade, you actually have Medicare taking more of the total economy than Social Security.

However, the thing that I was surprised no one noticed, if Medicare, functioning in the 30-year window, gets as high as 6.9 percent of the entire economy, and then Social Security is another 5.9 percent of the economy, that is just the two earned retirement programs.

Start to think about that. If that is consuming that much of the entire economy, how do you pay for the rest of government? How do you pay for military? How do you pay for anything else? You start to understand how, very quickly, the government spending starts getting around 31, 32 percent of the entire economy. That is actually calculated on last year's interest rates.

Think what those numbers will be over the next few months when we update them on what happens if the interest rate environment goes back to normal.

Social Security Subcommittee yesterday, the Democrat solution for Social Security was: Well, we just need to tax people more.

The problem is, of the crisis that we are on the cusp of, two-thirds is healthcare, one-third is Social Security, and the Social Security trust fund still has another 8 years or 9 years.

When we did tax reform, a dirty little secret that the Democrats never want you to hear: The top income, so the top 20 percent of income earners, do you know they actually, today, pay a higher percentage of Federal income taxes than before tax reform?

The U.S. tax code actually got more progressive. Now, a lot of that was because the bottom quartiles, we almost removed from paying income taxes. Now, they still pay payroll taxes. They pay into their Social Security. They pay into their Medicare. They pay into their unemployment. However, from the income tax standpoint, if you take a look, the bottom quartiles functionally pay nothing. The top 20 percent today pay 70, 71 percent of all taxes.

I will do more of this in a future speech. I want to go through these fairly quickly because I want to end on something that is a little more optimistic than some of these more dystopian numbers.

Social Security faces a \$39 trillion shortfall over the next 30 years, \$36 trillion if subtracting the trust fund. Therefore, functionally what we are saying here is this is income. Payroll taxes and benefits, the red. You see the little green part here? That is actually up to the moment; the trust fund is exhausted. That is the interest we get from the general fund. The general fund borrows the money; we pay a little interest back.

See the purple here? That is how much is going out the door.

See this up here? That is the interest covering if the general fund covers the shortfall. These numbers are so stunningly ginormous. A word my 8-year-old likes to use, ginormous.

When you think about this, if Social Security itself has a structural \$36, \$39 trillion shortfall, what happens when I come to you and explain Medicare, \$80, \$90 trillion shortfall? Actually, I think it is closer to 90-something now. That is, when you add in the interest, 100 percent of all the debt from today through the next 30 years.

I just meant to show this to try to make the point again. It is sometimes like talking to a Golden Retriever. They are adorable, but at the end of the day, they are still adorable and didn't really understand a word you said.

Some of my Democrat colleagues, when you walk through saying here is your proposals of raising the cap on all taxpayers and what the outlays are expected on Social Security, that it doesn't actually close the gap. One more time. This chart does it by percentage of GDP, but let's conceptually one more time process this.

The trust fund is almost gone. You basically say: Everyone now pays 12.4 percent. You pay 12.4, and that is your Social Security tax. You give no benefits, no additional benefits for the folks over the cap. You covered, to be generous, 50 percent of the shortfall, and you basically have chewed up all the potential taxes that you needed to

shore up Medicare, and there becomes the math problem. To be honest, you will almost never see someone from the left saying: Well, to save Medicare and Social Security and a couple of these other programs they care about, here is the scale.

You even saw the President stand behind that microphone here at the State of the Union, and you noticed he only talked about the Medicare taxes, and that didn't solve the problem. It just shored up part of the trust fund for a little bit. Still, the vast majority of spending comes out of the general fund.

Look, we have come here repeatedly and said: There are solutions. We actually, several months ago, wrote an entire chapter in the economic position of the Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee, and I thought I was going to get absolute hell for it because I stood on one of the third rails of politics. I had five economists work on a paper. It was a whole chapter in here, chapter 3, and we talked about what would happen in society if we took on obesity.

It turns out the single greatest thing you could do to lower the debt of the United States, produce growth, family formation, all those things, originally, we were coming up with 5 trillion, 7 trillion. We are right now doing the math updating that chapter.

It turns out—I am not committing to it because we still have weeks of math to do—it could be \$9 trillion over the decade. The single greatest thing we can do to save this country and start to stabilize our debt is actually moral. Let's give our brothers and sisters the opportunity to be healthier. There is a way to do it, Mr. Speaker.

Maybe I should stop coming and doing the dystopian anger about people not wanting to deal with the realities of the math, and I will try to spend a little more time talking about the fact there are solutions.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 18, 2024, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3811. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, HHS Executive Secretariat, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicaid Program; Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Managed Care Access, Finance, and Quality [CMS-2439-F] (RIN: 0938-AU99) received April

15, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3812. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Major final rule — PFAS National Primary Drinking Water Regulation Rulemaking [EPA-HQ-OW-2022-0114; FRL 8543-02-OW] (RIN: 2040-AG18) received April 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3813. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on the Millennium Challenge Corporation's FY 2023 Annual Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 7712(a); Public Law 108-199, Sec. 613(a); (118 Stat. 221); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3814. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic that was declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3815. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in and in relation to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13894 of October 14, 2019, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3816. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3817. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report titled, "Cuban Compliance with the Migration Accords", pursuant to Public Law 105-277, Sec. 2245; (112 Stat. 2681-824); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3818. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 2(9) of the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Ratification of the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3819. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the changes that occurred from September 20, 2023 through March 23, 2024, and additional report on departure of ambassadors, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3820. A letter from the Executive Director, Equal Employment Opportunity Office, United States Postal Service, transmitting the Service's FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3821. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division,

Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Non-discrimination on the Basis of Disability; Accessibility of Web Information and Services of State and Local Government Entities [CRT Docket No.: 144; AG Order No.: 5919-2024] (RIN: 1190-AA79) received April 16, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3822. A letter from the National Adjutant, Chief Executive Officer, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the reports and proceedings of the 2023 National Convention of Disabled American Veterans, held in Atlantic City, New Jersey, August 5-8, 2023 (H. Doc. No. 118-132); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

EC-3823. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report Concerning the Operation of the Conservation Facility for the Prior Calendar Year, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2431k(a); Public Law 87-195, Sec. 813(a) (as added by Public Law 105-214, Sec. 1); (112 Stat. 893); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Agriculture.

EC-3824. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Executive Secretariat, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Minimum Staffing Standards for Long-Term Care Facilities and Medicaid Institutional Payment Transparency Reporting [CMS-3442-F] (RIN: 0938-AV25) received April 15, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STEIL: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 4555. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow the use of requirements payments to conduct a post-election audit with respect to an election for Federal office in the State; with an amendment (Rept. 118-465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. MANN, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 8033. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the information required to be included in a certification by an agency that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. COLE (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 8034. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations to respond to the situation in Israel and for related expenses for

the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 8035. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations to respond to the situation in Ukraine and for related expenses for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 8036. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the Indo-Pacific region and for related expenses for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.R. 8037. A bill to continue to fund the IMPROVE initiative through the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 8038. A bill to authorize the President to impose certain sanctions with respect to Russia and Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Armed Services, the Budget, Rules, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Ms. FOXX):

H.R. 8039. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish immigration and residency requirements for individuals served by Federal TRIO programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BUDZINSKI (for herself and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 8040. A bill to limit the closure or consolidation of any United States Postal Service processing and distribution center in Postal Service regions that have failed to meet certain delivery standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 8041. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to extend the duration of the exemption from pre-trip vehicle skills testing for school bus drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 8042. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award

grants to qualified entities to support community paramedicine programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. GOLDEN of Maine):

H.R. 8043. A bill to impose certain sanctions relating to the People's Republic of China and support for the Russian invasion of Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 8044. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to require the Commissioner of Social Security to use the Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers for purposes of determining cost-of-living adjustments under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAGEMAN (for herself and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 8045. A bill to limit the closure or consolidation of any United States Postal Service processing and distribution center in States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. KEAN of New Jersey:

H.R. 8046. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to Rosatom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 8047. A bill to support communities that host transmission lines and to promote conservation and recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McGARVEY (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 8048. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to determine the eligibility or entitlement of a member or former member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a) to a benefit under a law administered by the Secretary solely based on alternative sources of evidence when the military service records or medical treatment records of the member or former member are incomplete because of damage or loss of records after being in the possession of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOONEY (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 8049. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit treatment of certain distributions and reimbursements for certain abortions as qualified medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 8050. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support and strengthen outcomes for student parents through the provision of child care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. OGLES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, and Mrs. SPARTZ):

H.R. 8051. A bill to prohibit the consideration in the House of Representatives of any legislation containing an earmark; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NUNN of Iowa (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. BACON, Ms. BUDZINSKI, and Mr. SORENSEN):

H.R. 8052. A bill to temporarily apply the E10 Reid vapor pressure limitations to E15 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. OGLES):

H.R. 8053. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit Federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia):

H.R. 8054. A bill to ensure fairness and transparency in the processes used by the Navy to award contracts for ship maintenance and repair, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MANN, and Mr. PANNETTA):

H.R. 8055. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to establish a minimum rate of reimbursement for administrative and operating expenses with respect to crop insurance contracts covering specialty crops and to restore the annual inflation adjustment with respect to the general reimbursement rate for administrative and operating expenses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 8056. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish a digital skills at work grant program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. STEEL (for herself, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DUARTE, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KILEY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 8057. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9317 Bolsa Avenue in Westminster, California, as the "Little Saigon Vietnam War Veterans Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. VASQUEZ (for himself and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 8058. A bill to establish and implement an informational campaign and national strategy to prevent minors from working with cartels and transnational criminal organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. GALLEGUO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. CAREY):

H.R. 8059. A bill to eliminate the incentive to distribute e-commerce shipments from foreign countries by providing parity to United States foreign-trade zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CARSON, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. McGARVEY, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Res. 1153. A resolution recognizing the designation of the week of April 11 through April 17, 2024, as the seventh annual “Black Maternal Health Week”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. BARR, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H. Res. 1154. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of “Financial Literacy Month”; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. CARSON, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H. Res. 1155. A resolution expressing support for the recognition of April as “National Arab American Heritage Month” (NAAHM) and celebrating the heritage and culture of Arab Americans in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 1156. A resolution expressing support for the designation of April 17, 2025, as “Cambodian Genocide Remembrance Day” to remember the horrific slaughter of almost 2,000,000 Cambodian people at the hand of the Khmer Rouge regime; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 8033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the information required to be in-

cluded in a certification by an agency that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 8034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7:

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Making emergency supplemental appropriations to respond to the situation in Israel and for related expenses.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 8035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7:

“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Making emergency supplemental appropriations to respond to the situation in Ukraine and for related expenses.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 8036.

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; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the Indo-Pacific region and for related expenses.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 8037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill provides statutory authority for the IMPROVE Initiative at the National Institutes of Health, that supports research on improving maternal health outcomes with a particular emphasis on mitigating maternal health disparities.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 8038.

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 authorize the President to impose certain sanctions with respect to Russia and Iran, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 8039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

The single subject of this legislation is:

Federal college preparation aid

By Ms. BUDZINSKI:

H.R. 8040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill directs the United States Postal Service (USPS) to ban all consolidation, downsizing, and closures of Processing and Distribution Centers in postal districts that are underperforming USPS’s FY23 on-time mail delivery targets for two-day and three-to-five-day mail options.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 8041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize the Secretary of Transportation to extend the duration of the exemption from pre-trip vehicle skills testing for school bus drivers, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 8042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize grants for community paramedicine programs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America

The single subject of this legislation is:

To sanction PRC entities that provide support to the Russian Federation and close export control loopholes to the PRC.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 8044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Social Security

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 8045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Preserving USPS Processing

By Mr. KEAN of New Jersey:

H.R. 8046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

To impose sanctions with respect to Rosatom, and for other purposes.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 8047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Interstate Commerce (energy policy).

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H.R. 8048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Veterans

By Mr. MOONEY:

H.R. 8049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health Savings Accounts

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 8050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support and strengthen outcomes for student parents through the provision of child care services.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 8051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the consideration in the House of Representatives of any legislation containing an earmark.

By Mr. NUNN of Iowa:

H.R. 8052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States 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 temporarily apply the E10 Reid vapor pressure limitations to E15 in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 8053

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Prohibits funding for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 8054

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Navy

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 8055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to establish a minimum rate of reimbursement for administrative and operating expenses with respect to crop insurance contracts covering specialty crops and to restore the annual inflation adjustment with respect to the general reimbursement rate for administrative and operating expenses.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 8056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish a digital skills at work grant program.

By Mrs. STEEL:

H.R. 8057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 7 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Post Office

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 8058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United State Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of the Congress,

The single subject of this legislation is:

Public Safety

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 8059

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:

Trade

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 435: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 525: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 594: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 789: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 871: Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 987: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1097: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STANTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1191: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 1322: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1385: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 1413: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1480: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 1591: Mr. VASQUEZ.

H.R. 1610: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1613: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1619: Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 1632: Mr. NEHLS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. STEUBE, and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.

H.R. 1719: Mr. COLE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. McGARVEY, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1794: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 1814: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1831: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2389: Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mrs. CHERFILUS-MC CORMICK.

H.R. 2413: Mr. McGOVERN and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2474: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2537: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2690: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2693: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2726: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2748: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2851: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2890: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2909: Ms. BALINT.

H.R. 2923: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 2965: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 3005: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 3381: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 3386: Mrs. TORRES of California.

H.R. 3413: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3481: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 3537: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. NORCROSS, and Ms. WILD.

H.R. 3599: Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 3654: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. STEEL, and Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H.R. 3869: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 3916: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 3970: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 4166: Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 4285: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 4315: Mr. BOST, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. McGOVERN.

H.R. 4334: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 4519: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 4711: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 4745: Mr. VASQUEZ.

H.R. 4845: Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 4953: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 5003: Mr. BERA, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER, and Mrs. FOUSHEE.

H.R. 5012: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 5029: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 5077: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 5103: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 5400: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 5488: Mr. FINSTAD.

H.R. 5511: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5840: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 5976: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 5995: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 6021: Mr. CLINE and Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 6049: Ms. BROWN.

H.R. 6451: Mrs. FOUSHEE and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 6515: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 6538: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. DELUZIO, and Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 6743: Ms. SEWELL, Ms. MACE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 6926: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.

H.R. 6929: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 6951: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 6960: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 6969: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. GARBARINO, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 7003: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 7158: Mr. OBERNOLTE and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 7204: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 7218: Mr. BARR and Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 7248: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 7314: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 7346: Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 7372: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 7438: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 7440: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 7513: Mr. BURLISON.

H.R. 7581: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 7585: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 7610: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 7629: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. WILD, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 7649: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 7683: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 7688: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 7704: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 7799: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 7813: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 7814: Mr. PHILLIPS and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 7825: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 7830: Ms. HAGEMAN.

H.R. 7842: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 7849: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 7921: Mr. HOYER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 7931: Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 7932: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 7937: Mr. FRY, Mr. OGLES, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 7951: Mr. FITZGERALD.

H.R. 7953: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 7977: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 8004: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.J. Res. 54: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.J. Res. 82: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mrs. RAMIREZ.

H.J. Res. 125: Mr. BARR.

H. Con. Res. 103: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SCOTT

Franklin of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 104: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. BICE, and Mr. SCOTT

Franklin of Florida.

H. Res. 185: Mr. MAGAZINER.

H. Res. 376: Mr. TURNER.

H. Res. 587: Ms. TOKUDA.

H. Res. 882: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

H. Res. 1019: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H. Res. 1117: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 1118: Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.

H. Res. 1152: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. FROST.