



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 2024

No. 75

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 1, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ERIN HOUCHIN 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.

FOOD SECURITY IS NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, California is in its second consecutive wet year.

Every major reservoir in our State is above the 15-year average, and our snowpack in the Sierras is at more than 100 percent of average for this time of year.

These conditions should mean that our farmers and communities are fi-

nally getting the water deliveries that they desperately need after years of drought.

Sadly, that is not the case. Central Valley Project contractors rely on meaningful allocations from the Bureau of Reclamation for their yearly planning, including the type of crops they will plant and when.

Despite these favorable conditions, our South-of-Delta farmers were still not allocated 100 percent of the water they contract and pay for this year from Reclamation.

In February, our South-of-Delta farmers were allocated just 15 percent of their contracted supply. In March, these numbers were updated to 35 percent. Just last week, these allocations were bumped to 40 percent, a mere 5-percent increase, with no real explanation or transparency on the decision-making process.

A 5-percent increase is insufficient for our family farms and downstream communities who rely on meaningful allocations from Reclamation to grow the food that feeds the world.

California grows a quarter of our Nation's food, so these allocations are critical to the fate of our Nation's food supply.

I urge Reclamation to significantly increase the allocations for South-of-Delta water contractors so our communities can meet the Nation's food supply needs.

Food security is national security, and our ability to grow food for the Nation will not survive without a reliable water supply for South-of-Delta agriculture.

REMEMBERING THE HONORABLE DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, it breaks my heart to

share that something just doesn't seem quite right speaking without first hearing the voice of the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable Donald Milford Payne, Jr.

No matter how soon you would come to do a 1-minute speech, Donald Payne was always first. I never figured out how he somehow beat everyone to the Chamber all the time. No matter how many 1-minute speeches the rest of us did, Donald would always do more.

One time our friend, Mr. JOE NEGUSE from Colorado, suggested that I had done more 1 minutes than Mr. Payne. Why did he say that? Donald quickly corrected him.

The name "Donald" means ruler or king. Indeed, Donald was the 1-minute king.

Many days we sat together. He would review his notes, going over what he was going to say, waiting to hear those words, "For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey seek recognition?"

Donald would then gently walk to the podium with his iPad in hand. Although he mostly said what he needed to in 1 minute, occasionally getting the gavel, Madam Speaker, I must use the 5-minute time period today because 1 minute would not do Mr. Payne justice.

Donald was not only a stylish and colorful individual, but he also brightened the House with his presence. He brightened us with his bow ties. He brightened us with his glasses. He brightened us even with his matching socks. He brightened us by using his voice as an instrument to speak up for the people of New Jersey's 10th Congressional District.

That is why he consistently received the John R. Lewis Award for his advocacy as captured right here. Look at him. He is happy. He is at peace. He is living the dream. He is on cloud nine. He is at peace.

We also had a special connection because there are a fair number of people

☐ 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.

H2773

living in New Jersey who are actually from North Carolina, and we had many memorable conversations about mutual friends between votes while sitting in the first and second seat waiting for 1 minutes.

New Jersey, please know that North Carolina stands with you.

Donald Payne was an encourager, and his last words to me were: You are a good man, and I want to help you. He said: Take care, and I will see you soon.

Little did I know that that would be our last conversation. His life and legacy deeply inspired all of us, and I will always cherish the moments we spent together.

Donald and his father served in the people's House for about 35 years, and we are deeply grateful for their service.

When his father passed and Donald assumed office, he once said: I am following a legacy, and I am not backing away from that.

He didn't back away from it. He continued his father's legacy. He continued to set a legacy for his three children and children across the country, and he continued the legacy by making America better.

My heart goes out to his wife, Beatrice, and the Payne family. I extend my deepest condolences to them and to New Jersey's 10th Congressional District. The flowers that now rest in the seat Donald often occupied reflect his inner beauty and radiance.

Madam Speaker, Donald's last floor speech, interestingly, was on housing out of all issues. What a way to end. What a way to remind us all that there is a house of many mansions.

Madam Speaker, I thank Donald for showing us humility, showing us meekness, showing us kindness, brightening this institution, and using his voice to advocate for the American people.

Farewell, my friend, and, yes, I look forward to seeing him soon. He will always be remembered, and we miss him dearly.

I end today with the last words Donald Payne spoke and shared on the floor. On March 22, he ended his final 1-minute speech this way: And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

HONORING GENERAL JACKIE DANIEL "DAN" WOOD

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

Mr. KUSTOFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a west Tennessee native and a true American patriot, the 73rd Adjutant General of Tennessee, Jackie Daniel "Dan" Wood.

Major General Dan Wood passed away peacefully at his home in Tennessee on April 12. Dan, as he was known, was born on Maple Street in Lexington, Tennessee. He attended Lexington City School and Lexington High School where he enjoyed playing basketball.

In 1961, Dan Wood answered the call to serve our Nation and enlisted in the United States Army.

Shortly thereafter, he deployed to Vietnam and bravely answered his call to duty.

Upon his return home, Dan enlisted in the Tennessee Army National Guard. He completed Officer Candidate School, the Tennessee Military Academy, and was commissioned as a second lieutenant in 1966.

General Wood went on to serve as commander of the 4th Battalion, the 117th Infantry, and the 30th Separate Armored Brigade. In 1995, Dan Wood was named as adjutant general by my friend and former Member of the House of Representatives, the late Governor Don Sundquist.

General Wood held this position until his retirement in July 2002.

As adjutant general, Dan oversaw numerous deployments of soldiers and airmen overseas, he ushered the National Guard into the 21st century, and he coordinated the Tennessee National Guard's response to the September 11 terrorist attacks.

General Dan Wood served in the military for more than 40 years. As a proud fourth-generation citizen of Henderson County and a fifth-generation Tennessean, we mourn a son of Tennessee, but we also celebrate a true American hero.

Our thoughts and prayers remain with his wife of 62 years, Janis; his son, Stuart; his daughter, Amy; and three grandchildren.

Dan Wood taught us all what it means to serve your country and to dedicate your life to preserving freedom for generations of Americans.

We truly miss him.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT GENERAL A.C. ROPER

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career and achievements of Lieutenant General A.C. Roper, the first African-American, three-star general in the U.S. Army Reserve, as he celebrates his retirement from 41 years of service in the United States Army.

Lieutenant General Roper's extraordinary career began after he was commissioned in 1983 as a student at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. He has an extensive military education and received master's degrees from both the University of Alabama and the U.S. Army War College.

Throughout his exemplary career, Lieutenant General Roper moved quickly up the ranks and broke down barriers for African Americans serving in the Armed Forces.

On May 14, 2021, he made history as the first African American to become a three-star general in the U.S. Army Reserve.

Most recently, he served as deputy commander of the U.S. Northern Com-

mand and vice commander of the U.S. Element, North American Aerospace Defense Command at Peterson Space Force Base in Colorado. He has received numerous awards and decorations.

Mr. Speaker, I got to know Lieutenant General Roper during his time as the chief of police for Birmingham Police Department. I was immediately impressed by his firm yet compassionate leadership style that commanded the respect of his fellow officers and endeared him to the Birmingham community.

Lieutenant General Roper's reputation has always been one of great purpose and great passion. He is an honorable man, guided by an abiding faith in God and a love of country.

On behalf of a grateful Nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the retirement of Lieutenant General A.C. Roper after 33 years in law enforcement and 41 years of military service.

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING SMALL BUSINESS WINNERS IN ALABAMA'S SEVENTH DISTRICT

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the award-winning small business owners in Alabama's Seventh Congressional District as we celebrate National Small Business Week.

Ms. Jackie Smith is the proud owner and operator of The Coffee Shoppe and Reflections in our hometown of Selma, Alabama. After leaving her job in 2011, Jackie bravely took on the risk of opening up her own small business, turning the site that once was a segregated diner into a beautiful coffee shop in the heart of downtown Selma. For 13 years, The Coffee Shoppe has provided a place for the community to come together, learn about Selma's history, and eat some great food.

Like any businessowner, Jackie has had her fair share of hardships. After the tornado of January 12, 2023, we saw her resilience, and thanks to an investment by the SBA, she was able to open her doors and continue The Coffee Shoppe's great legacy; and, in fact, she opened up another business, Reflections.

This week, Jackie's extraordinary entrepreneurship earned her national recognition as the Small Business Administration's 2024 Phoenix Award winner for outstanding disaster recovery efforts. We congratulate her on her outstanding achievements.

Today, I also recognize SBA's 2024 Small Business Persons of the Year in Alabama: Shanna Ullmann, Timothy Ullmann, and Robert Prescott of Transformation Partners, LLC in Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Beginning in the year 2000, as a statewide training provider, their firm has grown tremendously over the past two decades. Today, they serve numerous clients in the field of higher education, government, military, and corporate America, offering consulting services and employee development programming.

Transformation Partners was hit hard by the COVID-19 pandemic, but once again, thanks to the assistance of the SBA, the firm remained operational and weathered the storm. Now their efforts have earned them national recognition as SBA's 2024 National Small Business Persons of the Year for Alabama.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the outstanding entrepreneurship in Alabama's Seventh Congressional District. Congratulations to all of our winners. I wish them much success in the years ahead.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REBECCA DAWN FOSTER

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the incredible life of Rebecca Dawn Foster.

Rebecca was many things to many people: a beloved daughter, sister, wife, mother, and, most recently, grandmother. Above all else, Rebecca was an amazing human being and devoted Christian who did everything to serve others and leave this world better than she found it.

Rebecca was my friend. Rebecca was born on September 30, 1968, to Wesley and Faye Neil. A native of Fentress County, Tennessee, she graduated from Clarkrange High School, where she competed on the 1983, 1984, and 1985 girls' basketball State championship teams. If she were here, she would tell you that they came that close to winning again in 1986. Memories of those wins sparked joy throughout her entire life.

Rebecca earned a bachelor of science in nursing and later a master of science in nursing informatics from Tennessee Technological University. She had a distinguished 29-year career in healthcare, most recently in the role of chief nursing officer for Cumberland Medical Center in Crossville. In 2019, she graciously agreed to take on a new occupation focused on constituent care rather than patient care as my district director for Tennessee's Sixth Congressional District.

Her dedication to service lives on through her family. Rebecca took enormous pride in her husband, Allen, who serves as mayor of Cumberland County, Tennessee; her daughter, Brooke, who followed in her footsteps in nursing; and her son, Shade, who is a sworn police officer for the city of Crossville. She is also survived by her beloved granddaughter, Asa Wright, and boy let me tell you, Rebecca took such joy from being with Asa. She is also survived by parents, Wesley and Faye Neil; sister, Sharon Reagan; mother-in-law, Edna Foster; daughter-in-law, Haley Foster; and son-in-law, Trevor Wright.

Rebecca had a lifelong passion for singing. She served as music director at Oak Hill Baptist Church for nearly

15 years. In fact, the Sunday before her passing, Rebecca was on stage with her daughter, singing her heart out and worshipping the Lord with the help of the pulpit to keep her balance.

There are simply few among us as special as Rebecca Dawn Foster. She was first diagnosed with cancer in 2023. During the difficult period that followed, many around her were fearful, but she chose to be faithful. Despite the intense treatments she underwent and sometimes-painful side effects that she endured, she continued to work as she was able and did so with a smile on her face. In fact, if you had talked to Rebecca anytime since last July, you were much more likely to find her smiling and showing pictures of her precious little granddaughter, Asa, than talking about her health battle. Her optimism lulled many of us into believing that there were many years ahead that we would get to enjoy our relationships with Rebecca.

The day before her passing, Rebecca shared a page from her prayer devotional on social media. It was titled "Unafraid," and based on the book of Hebrews, chapter 13, verses 5 and 6, which reads in part: "I will never leave you; I will always be by your side." Rebecca never questioned the presence of the Lord. She lived a life as a result. She knew God's plan for her was not to live in fear but to live in faith and to love others while she was here.

Rebecca knew each day and the good things in it are blessings from the Lord above. She kept cheerful faith throughout her painful health struggle. Last week, she went home to Heaven and received her eternal reward. Glory be to God for Rebecca Foster, who came into our lives, and with her talents and vivacious spirit left us forever changed for the better.

CHINESE ELECTRIC VEHICLES ARE A NATIONAL SECURITY THREAT

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to do what I hope is part of the responsibility of a Member of Congress, which is to flag and alert for future threats that are just around the corner. For me, that threat is the potential for thousands of Chinese electric vehicles and connected vehicles coming into the U.S. marketplace.

I am a former CIA officer and a Pentagon official, and I want to flag that the prospect of thousands of Chinese-made connected vehicles coming into the country would give them a huge amount of data, high-fidelity data on things like U.S. military bases, key infrastructure facilities, like bridges and electric grid nodes, secretive locations, individual leaders even, all while China refuses to give reciprocity on that same exact data for American companies operating in China. They know exactly how sensitive the data is that can be collected off of electric and connected vehicles.

Here is the story if you think this is fantasy: In 2021, for the first time, a Chinese-connected vehicle was sold in the European Union; not that long ago, post-COVID. Already, they have nearly 25 percent of the market share in the European Union. These vehicles are much nicer than they used to be. They are underselling every single vehicle on the market there because they are subsidized by the Chinese Government.

I had the opportunity to raise this issue as a national security threat with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army in the past couple of weeks. I wanted to ask them specifically if they think, in their national security capacity, that mapping, radar, cameras, light detection, and Bluetooth-connected software would be a threat on our facilities here and having those kinds of volumes of data.

The Secretary of Defense could not have made it more clear that this would give a potential adversary extremely detailed information for targeting, for counteracting some of our infrastructure, for going after even individual leaders.

Now, we are an open-market society. What is happening right now is these Chinese companies are getting very interested in opening facilities in Mexico and using the USMCA, or what people commonly refer to as NAFTA, to just easily come over our border. We don't have a process in place right now to vet with a national security lens these imports that are coming in, and I have a real problem with that.

I think we need to get better at understanding that the future of threats is not necessarily just tanks and fixed-wing airplanes and all those traditional things. It is data and who controls it. For me, this is an issue that I want to alert not just because I am a Michigander, and, of course, we make American vehicles in Michigan, but as a national security professional.

CONGRATULATING SCOTTSBURG WARRIORS BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM, CLASS 2A STATE CHAMPIONSHIP WINNERS

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to the Scottsburg Warriors boys' basketball team for their remarkable achievement in winning their first-ever Class 2A State championship this year in Indiana.

I am so proud of my hometown team. Having watched the Warriorettes achieve the State championship trophy growing up in Scottsburg in 1989, this victory was extra special.

Their hard work has paid off. Through every practice and game, these young athletes demonstrated the true spirit of teamwork and excellence. Their victory not only brings pride to the Scottsburg community, but the academic achievement and leadership

of these talented young men serves as an inspiration to aspiring athletes across the State.

I commend the coaches, staff, and supporters who have cheered on the players throughout their journey to success. Congratulations, again, to my hometown team.

CONGRATULATING LANESVILLE HIGH SCHOOL-GIRLS' BASKETBALL TEAM ON SECOND CONSECUTIVE CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend congratulations to the Lanesville High School girls' basketball team on their incredible achievement of winning the State championship for a second consecutive year.

Their dedication, teamwork, and determination have propelled them to the pinnacle of success, making their community and school both very proud. This team's journey is a testament to the power of hard work and perseverance.

As they celebrate this historic victory, let us recognize the countless hours of practice, the sacrifices made, and the resilience shown by each member of the team. Their win not only brings honor to Lanesville High School, but their hometown.

On behalf of the entire Ninth District, I congratulate the Lanesville girls' basketball team for their outstanding achievement and wish them continued success in all their future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING BROWNSTOWN BRAVES BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM ON WINNING STATE 3A CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Brownstown Braves boys' basketball team for their outstanding victory in winning the Class 3A State championship this year.

Their successful season is a testament to their hard work and exceptional talents. The Brownstown community is undoubtedly beaming with pride for this achievement. What an exciting time to be part of Indiana basketball, especially southern Indiana basketball.

I commend the coaches, staff, and supporters who provided guidance and unwavering support to these young men. I congratulate the Braves basketball team once more. This is a victory they will never forget. May they continue to strive for greatness in all their future endeavors.

REPRESSION OF FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the escalating repression of First Amendment protected speech and assembly on college campuses across our country.

To all the elected university boards and appointed presidents, it needs to be very clear: Your students' constitutional rights don't end when they enter your campus grounds.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD statements from the ACLU and from Bend the Arc.

[April 26, 2024]

ACLU URGES COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LEADERS TO PROTECT FREE SPEECH AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

NEW YORK.—In response to the anti-war protests happening at colleges across the country, and the disturbing arrests that have followed, the American Civil Liberties Union sent a letter to leaders at both public and private universities. The letter states:

“As you fashion responses to the activism of your students (and faculty and staff), it is essential that you not sacrifice principles of academic freedom and free speech that are core to the educational mission of your respected Institution.”

Authored by ACLU Executive Director Anthony D. Romero and National Legal Director David Cole, the letter offers university leaders five basic guardrails to ensure freedom of speech and academic freedom are protected on campus:

1. They must not single out particular viewpoints for censorship, discipline, or disproportionate punishment.
2. They must protect students from targeted discriminatory harassment and violence, but may not penalize people for taking sides on the war in Gaza, even if expressed in deeply offensive terms.
3. They can announce and enforce reasonable content-neutral time, place, or manner policies on protesting activity, but they must leave ample room for students to express themselves. These rules must be applied consistently and without regard to viewpoint.
4. They must recognize that armed police on campus can endanger students and are a measure of last resort.
5. They must resist the pressures placed on them by politicians seeking to exploit campus tensions.

The letter also informs university leaders of relevant Supreme Court precedent:

“The Supreme Court has forcefully rejected the premise that, ‘because of the acknowledged need for order, First Amendment protections should apply with less force on college campuses than in the community at large.’”

The letter strongly advises university leaders to be “cognizant of the history of law enforcement using inappropriate and excessive force in responding to protests, particularly against communities of color,” and that—as events of the past week have made abundantly clear—arresting peaceful protestors is likely to escalate, not calm, tensions on campus.

The letter also reiterates that violence is never an acceptable protest tactic and that “physically intimidating students by blocking their movements or pursuing them aggressively is unprotected conduct, not protected speech.”

[April 25, 2024]

BEND THE ARC STATEMENT ON CAMPUS PROTESTS

As we celebrate Passover this week, we are seeing Jewish students and faculty showing up Jewishly, joining and helping to lead protests on college campuses across the nation. And we have been watching with increasing concern. Concern for Jewish safety, but also concern for our democracy. [Protest is essential to our movement work and must be protected, and we firmly stand against antisemitism being used as an excuse to threaten free speech and criticism of university and U.S. policy. To be clear, criticism of American policy towards Israel is not inherently antisemitic.]

When protests become popular movements, they bring everyone from everywhere, with all their experiences and talents. They can also bring what afflicts our society, such as antisemitism, anti-Black racism, sexism, and homophobia. These oppressions are not reflective of the movements themselves, though critics would have you believe that they define them. Many have used accusations of antisemitism, real and perceived, to attempt to discredit these protests.

The ability of Jewish students to express their Judaism, their values, and their beliefs across a full range of political views is essential and must be protected. We must not erase them from this story. They are hosting Shabbat services in tents, holding Seder, and are showing up not just for Jewish safety, but for the safety of all people.

Jewish people have long played a role in practicing free speech and protest on campus. These protests are part of our democracy. We proudly remember the movements for Civil Rights, against the Vietnam and Iraq Wars, Occupy, Black Lives Matter, and fights against sexual violence on campus. Unfortunately, these moments also recall the unconstitutional, dangerous, and unnecessary policing of these protests. We recall the images from Kent State in 1970, when the National Guard killed four peaceful, anti-war student protesters (three of whom were Jewish). Today, college administrations are bowing to McCarthy-esque congressional hearings; evicting, suspending, and arresting Jewish and other students; and barring access to places of worship and freedom to partake in Jewish ceremony—all in an obvious attempt to appease the Right.

Many Jews, on campus and otherwise, are experiencing Passover feeling a heightened fear about antisemitism. And we see how student organizers, Jewish and non-Jewish, have powerfully shown up against occurrences of antisemitism, creating safety for Jewish students. Their values and discipline in opposing antisemitism remain in stark contrast to those who claim to fight antisemitism but instead use it to sow division between Jews and our communities, undermine democracy, and fulfill the goals of white nationalism.

And in this critical dialogue about the safety of Jews and everyone in our nation, we must not allow political interests to obscure the meaning we take away from these protests: that U.S. policy must support safety and self-determination for all Palestinians and Israelis, and that next year, we make Seder in peace.

Chag Sameach.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, the ACLU statement says: “As you fashion responses to the activism of your students (and faculty and staff), it is essential that you not sacrifice principles of academic freedom and free speech that are core to the educational mission of your respected institution.”

From Bend the Arc's statement: “Protest is essential to our movement work and must be protected, and we firmly stand against anti-Semitism being used as an excuse to threaten free speech and criticism of university and U.S. policy. To be clear, criticism of American policy towards Israel is not inherently anti-Semitic.”

Mr. Speaker, dissent is a fundamental American value, from the civil rights movement to antiwar protests to the movement for Black lives, immigrant rights, our country has a long history of students leading movements for change and challenging the status

quo that oppresses and normalizes genocide across the world.

I am deeply moved by the courageous young people in more than 100 encampments at colleges across our Nation that are demanding divestment in support of a genocide in Gaza and apartheid Government of Israel.

I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to visit an encampment at the University of Michigan that has public programming. They put it online for families on various issues. The day I went, they were recognizing the anniversary of the Armenian genocide and having someone also speak about the connectivity to the Palestinian Nakba. It was inspiring to see these brave students across races, of all faiths and backgrounds, standing side by side in solidarity to protest for peace. From Jummah prayer to Shabbat, they are coming together in a way I wish my colleagues would welcome.

Sending in militarized police forces and even snipers to stop these students from exercising their First Amendment rights is truly disgusting.

My colleagues are so outraged by students opposing genocide and apartheid, but many of these same Members were completely silent last year when we saw the dramatic increase of threats, literally death threats on historical Black colleges and universities across the country.

□ 1030

This state-sanctioned violence, including the arrests and threatened felony prosecutions of students, can only be seen as an explicit effort to silence students and take away their First Amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, no student—not one—should be met with academic repercussions or police brutality on their own campuses for exercising, peacefully, their rights to free speech and assembly.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues and every headline from mainstream media are more concerned and outraged about these protests than they are about the over 35,000 Palestinians killed in Gaza? Seventy percent of them are women and children.

There are no universities left in Gaza, but no outrage. Multiple mass graves have been uncovered at several locations that Israeli forces have recently withdrawn from. Two hundred bodies were found at al-Shifa Hospital, literally fresh bodies found with their hands tied behind their backs, naked.

Where is the outrage for these war crimes? This is not just me. This is the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

Our government isn't just complicit in this genocide. We are actively participating.

Students are occupying their campuses to peacefully protest for an end to these atrocities and for divestment in this genocide and apartheid. They are even renaming some of the buildings after Palestinian children who

have been killed. These students should be praised for standing up for what they believe in, not vilified, smeared with misinformation campaigns and silence.

I call on these universities to end the repressive tactics, exercise restraint, denounce ongoing police brutality, and stop suppressing the very activism, academic freedom, and thoughtful debate that they seek to inspire in their students.

Mr. Speaker, we don't want to see an apology years later. No. We want to see action today to protect these students. We don't want to have you all, in 10 years, praise the same students for doing what was right. We don't want to see it. We need it now. They deserve it now.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MILTON H. WOODSIDE

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 sadly to honor the life of one of my dear friends and a friend to many in the First Congressional District and all throughout southeast Georgia, Milton H. "Woody" Woodside.

Woody was a beloved resident of Brunswick in Glynn County since 1973. He was born in Clinton, North Carolina. During his early adulthood, he graduated from the Military College of South Carolina, better known as the Citadel, in Charleston, South Carolina. He was so proud of the Citadel. He had many friends that he always visited with and kept in touch with from the Citadel. He always talked about his experiences at the Citadel.

Luckily for us, he moved down to the coast of Georgia, where he served as president of the Brunswick-Golden Isles Chamber of Commerce from 1985 until his retirement in 2019.

He served 23 combined years in the U.S. Army and the Georgia Army National Guard. He also served on the congressional staffs of former Representatives Bo Ginn and Lindsay Thomas.

Woody brought this valuable insight back to our home district, where he served as a past president of the Southeast Georgia Chambers and Developers Council, and he was chairman of the CEDO Region 11 of the Governor's Development Council. He was involved in countless other organizations, including serving on the boards of the Southeast Georgia Health System and the Georgia Chamber of Commerce Executives Association.

For his work, the Georgia Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives awarded Woody with the well-earned Kent Lawrence Professional of the Year Award in 2000.

In addition to receiving countless other awards, one stood out, wrapping up all of his achievements into one. For 9 consecutive years, the Georgia Trend Magazine named Woody a Notable Georgian.

Woody is rightly accredited with also being recognized as Glynn County's best friend for his hard work in serving the community. His instruction and oversight were critical for construction of the Sidney Lanier Bridge and the establishment of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center that is located in Glynco, Georgia.

He was also instrumental in major economic development projects in the community, including the Brunswick Harbor deepening and Gulfstream, and he contributed significantly to the growth and success of our region's tourism industry.

Without a doubt, Woody's actions were noticed and appreciated by others throughout the community.

He was that great guy, touching countless lives and always willing to lend a helping hand. He wasn't one to just talk about a problem. He was the kind of guy who found solutions.

Mr. Speaker, speaking for the entire community, his contributions and his community leadership will forever be remembered. I extend my condolences to his family, Ellen, and to his daughter.

The positive light that Woody brought will forever be cherished. I am so blessed to have called him one of my best friends.

Mr. Speaker, in our lives, there are people and places we remember. I will always remember Woody Woodside.

BLACK APRIL

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked Black April, a day to reflect on the fall of Saigon and the end to democracy in Vietnam. It has been over 49 years since we fought shoulder to shoulder with our Vietnamese allies for freedom and democracy.

After the fall of Saigon, refugees were forced to flee their homes with what they could carry. It is important to recognize the resiliency and strength of the Vietnamese people. I grew up with many Vietnamese Americans, who came to this country and to Orange County for a better life. Today, Orange County is proud to be home, to be the house, of the biggest Vietnamese-American population in the United States.

I join my community back home in honoring the sacrifices of our Vietnamese allies and our own servicemembers who fought for freedom, democracy, and opportunity in Vietnam.

CONGRATULATING THE JAMES MADISON BRASS BAND

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the James Madison Brass Band on their historic achievement at the North American Brass

Band Championships held in Huntsville, Alabama, on April 6.

Under the leadership of their conductor, Professor Kevin Stees, the JMU Brass Band clinched the championship section title, marking a monumental milestone in the band's 24-year history.

Their victory is a testament to the talent and hard work of the students and their conductor.

Competing against seven other top-tier bands, the JMU Brass Band emerged victorious, marking the first time a collegiate band has claimed the highest division of the competition. This accomplishment adds to the band's remarkable record at the North American Brass Band Championships, including 14 podium finishes, underscoring their consistent excellence and resilience.

Moreover, Professor Stees' outstanding leadership has not only brought glory to JMU but also secured him a distinguished place in North American Brass Band Association history as only the second conductor to win in two different sections in the same year.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations to the JMU Brass Band, Professor Kevin Stees, and the entire JMU Dukes community on this remarkable achievement.

HONORING BROADWAY LIONS CLUB

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Broadway Lions Club, which is celebrating their 70th anniversary this year.

The Broadway Lions Club was chartered in 1954 by 20 men in Broadway, all thanks to the sponsorship of the Mt. Jackson and Elkton Lions Club. Although there has been much change over the last 70 years, their mission of serving the community has remained the same.

With 40 active members from the Broadway community, the Lions Club's primary focus is on sight and hearing needs for those in the community and assisting food programs in schools for students in need.

Mr. Speaker, as a fellow Lion, I thank all members of service organizations like the Broadway Lions Club for their outstanding work to make a difference in our community. I congratulate the Broadway Lions Club for their 70 years of service to our community. We look forward to their continued contributions and success for many years to come.

RECOGNIZING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROCKINGHAM COUNTY BASEBALL LEAGUE

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Rockingham County Baseball League's 100th anniversary.

One of the oldest continuous baseball leagues in the country, the Rockingham County Baseball League was founded in June 1924 after J.R. "Polly" Lineweaver, who was a sportswriter for the Daily News Record, spearheaded the efforts.

At the beginning, seven communities joined the league, including Bridgewater, Briery Branch, Broadway, Day-

ton, Keezletown, Linville-Edom, and Spring Creek. They played their first games on June 28, 1924.

By 1938, the league began playing its own championship series each season. While teams have come and gone throughout the years, this league is made up of eight teams today: The Bridgewater Reds, Broadway Bruins, Clover Hill Bucks, Elkton Blue Sox, Grottoes Cardinals, Montezuma Braves, RCBL Shockers, and Stuarts Draft Diamondbacks.

As the league's 100th season begins on May 31, I am proud to honor the Rockingham County Baseball League. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the league for reaching this milestone and wishing the league continued success for years to come.

MARKING NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, as we mark National Small Business Week, it is crucial to confront the stark reality facing America's entrepreneurs under the Biden administration. The administration has imposed regulatory burdens that have escalated to an unprecedented scale, with the cost of Federal regulations soaring to \$1.3 trillion.

The small business community is now saddled with over 267 million man-hours of compliance paperwork, a stark comparison to the regulatory landscape under the Trump administration, where regulatory costs were over 45 times lower.

The economic climate continues to pose significant challenges, with persistent inflation undermining any optimism for relief.

Despite expectations, interest rate cuts remain a distant hope, forcing small businesses to halt expansion and investment plans. Inflation rates have not only been higher than anticipated but have seen recent upward revisions. Additionally, the first quarter GDP report revealed a disheartening 1.6 percent growth rate, falling short of the expected 2.4 percent.

This slowdown in consumer spending is further compounded by a 3.4 percent increase in the personal consumption expenditures price index, signaling the largest inflation surge within a year.

These figures underscore the dire circumstances confronting small businesses. The current administration's relentless regulatory assault, coupled with severe economic headwinds, is not only risking the survival of small businesses but is indicative of a broader disregard for the backbone of our economy.

We must pivot toward policies that alleviate rather than exacerbate these pressures. Our commitment must lie in fostering an environment conducive to the prosperity and growth of small businesses, which are integral to the Nation's economic vitality.

The evidence is clear, and the time for action is now. We owe it to America's entrepreneurs to implement measures that help rather than hinder their potential.

RESCHEDULING OF CANNABIS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration announced the long-awaited rescheduling of cannabis from schedule I to schedule III.

This reschedule eliminates the vestige of the failed war on drugs started by the Nixon administration. Contrary to science, it was used for political purposes against Black Americans, young Americans.

A schedule I controlled substance, which cannabis has been for over 50 years, is one that has no medicinal value and is highly addictive. At the time the Nixon administration made that determination, they knew that that was false. It is not highly addictive, and it has, in fact, medicinal purposes. That has been demonstrated by vote after vote by Americans across the country that recognize that medical cannabis has tremendous therapeutic features.

I could not be more excited or optimistic that we are finally on the home-stretch to end the failed and misguided war on drugs. This action by the Biden administration ties together many of our initiatives, from justice to research to tax fairness, and charts the path for more progress sooner.

□ 1045

One of the overhauls here is the prohibition of the State legal cannabis businesses from banking services. Every day in the United States, there are people with shopping bags full of \$20 bills that they use to pay their State taxes.

Think of it. It is outrageous. It has made these State legal cannabis businesses sitting ducks for robbery, and it severely handicaps their ability to work in a constructive fashion.

Furthermore, what is going to happen with this rescheduling is it is finally going to allow State legal cannabis businesses to fully deduct their business expenses.

Right now, due to a provision known as 280 of the tax code, these businesses are prohibited from deducting legitimate business expenses.

As a result, State legal cannabis businesses pay two, three, maybe four times more than a comparable noncannabis business. It is outrageous. It poses serious problems in terms of their profitability and being able to thrive.

These decisions are going to raise the profile of an issue very important to some of us but which has never gained the attention it deserves or the momentum that it demands.

We have made some progress here in the House. We have passed safe banking seven times with overwhelming bipartisan support, but it never could quite get across the finish line.

This rescheduling by the Biden administration is going to help us change

that, and it is going to help the almost half a million people who work in the industry, the \$40 billion a year of economic activity, eliminate the injustice, and perhaps, most of all, it will usher in a new era of protections because right now, somebody who buys their marijuana from a corner drug dealer in a park, that person has no license to lose. It doesn't check for ID.

Treating marijuana in a thoughtful fashion is going to help us solve the racial injustice that has been evidenced against Black, against young people.

It is going to be able to open up a whole array of cannabis products that will make a big difference in communities across the country.

Today's decision changes all of that, and there is no going back. In this troubled Congress, it will also pave the path for building on our bipartisan Cannabis Caucus, an example where people can come together to work on something that can unite us rather than divide us.

The rescheduling of cannabis is an important step in that direction and will have profound impacts from coast to coast.

HONORING PAUL MARSH

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

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor U.S. Army veteran and former Pima County Supervisor and my friend, Mr. Paul Marsh, for his service to our country, his advocacy for his fellow veterans, and his contributions to southern Arizona. His service in different capacities throughout the years has left a mark on our communities forever.

Paul's journey began when he enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1952, bravely serving in the medical corps during the Korean war until his honorable discharge in 1954.

His commitment to his country did not end there. It continued throughout his life as he has tirelessly advocated for veterans' rights and support services, specifically those which address chronic homelessness among our veterans.

His compassion and dedication to improving the lives of his fellow veterans knows no boundaries. As a founding member of the Arizona Veterans' Memorial Cemetery Foundation in Marana, Paul spent 10 years advocating for a final resting place for our Nation's heroes in Tucson.

Paul understood the importance of having a central location for family members to visit their loved ones and started the Arizona Veterans' Memorial Cemetery.

Despite facing numerous challenges along the way, the Arizona Veterans' Memorial Cemetery broke ground in 2014, thanks in large part to Paul.

A few short years later, I reconnected with Paul when I was with the State of Arizona, and the cemetery needed signage on the I-10.

Paul was determined to see it happen, and I am proud to have played a very small part in that, in his ensuring that there was visibility for the Arizona Veterans' Memorial Cemetery in Marana.

I am grateful to Paul for his own service, his continued advocacy, and his unwavering dedication to his fellow veterans.

Paul, your work will forever inspire us to strive for a better world for all who have served our country.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JACOB DINDINGER

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Jacob Dindinger, one of Arizona's brave first responders who tragically passed away on July 29, 2021. At just 20 years old, Jacob lost his life while serving our community so bravely in Tucson.

He was a graduate of CDO High School in 2019 and earned his EMT certificate in May of 2022 from Pima Community College.

Jacob's dedication to community service shined bright during his time as an EMT for American Medical Response.

Jacob had hoped to follow in the footsteps of his firefighter brother, Bryan, committed to helping others in a time of need.

He is remembered in the community as a loyal, kind, and selfless friend. He remains a true hero in the hearts of our Tucson community.

I recently met Jacob's parents, Jim and Corrine, at an event dedicated to our first responders. It is clear that they are carrying on his legacy of service and sacrifice.

We will never forget Jacob's sacrifice or the ultimate sacrifice of other first responders. His death is a reminder that our first responders risk their lives every time they put on the uniform.

We extend our gratitude for his dedicated service and are eternally thankful for his contributions.

HONORING LOUIS ANTHONY CONTER

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Lieutenant Commander Lou Conter, the last survivor of the USS *Arizona* during the attacks on Pearl Harbor.

At 102 years old, Lou passed away in his home in Grass Valley, California, surrounded by his family on April 1, 2024.

He enlisted at the age of 18 and just two short years later was at the center of the Pearl Harbor attacks on December 7, 1941.

Then quartermaster, Lou was on the deck when the ship was hit. Ultimately, 1,177 of his shipmates from the USS *Arizona* perished that day.

He went on to serve 27 years in the Navy, rising to the rank of lieutenant commander. He spent his life keeping the memories of Pearl Harbor alive, educating others and even doing interviews up until he was 100 years old.

Lieutenant Commander Conter was committed to helping others in times of need and truly loved making a difference in his community.

He leaves behind a daughter, Louann Daley; three sons, Tony, Jim, and Jeff; stepson, Ron; and several grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

We will never forget his sacrifice or the sacrifice of his fellow sailors on the USS *Arizona*. We extend our gratitude for his dedicated service and are eternally thankful for his contributions.

ONGOING SOCIAL SECURITY ISSUES

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is great to be here this morning, and I rise to discuss the ongoing issue of Social Security.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, more than 70 million Americans rely on Social Security, and Social Security is the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty program for children.

It also, Mr. Speaker, is the number one program with regard to disability, and more veterans rely on Social Security disability than they do on the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Speaker HOUCHIN was in the chair before, and part of our rising to speak about Social Security is to make people aware in their districts of how many retirees they actually have.

For example, in New York's 19th, you have 173,667 recipients. More than \$300 million comes into the 17th District in New York monthly for those recipients; 130,000 of which are retirees, 20,000 disabled workers, 8,900 widows, 4,247 spouses, and almost 10,000 children.

What is astounding, Mr. Speaker, is that Congress has done nothing. In fact, what will shock the public is that Congress has not extended the benefits of Social Security in more than 50 years.

Richard Nixon was President of the United States when Congress last acted. Imagine 10,000 baby boomers a day becoming eligible for Social Security. Yet, Congress has done nothing.

More than 70 million Americans rely on Social Security, again, the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty program for children.

Congress continues not to do what our constituents send us here to do; vote. President Biden has put out a plan. We have put out a plan called Social Security 2100 that is detailed and paid for.

This might also surprise you, too, Mr. Speaker, as I know it does many citizens, that the President's called to lift the cap on people making over \$400,000 who pay nothing into Social Security.

Imagine the workers, the more than 170,000 in your district who pay in to Social Security and have done so all throughout their lives, and yet, others pay nothing for the Nation's number

one antipoverty program. That is why this is so important that Congress take action and step up and do the right thing.

With \$300 million coming into New York's 17th District, Mr. Speaker, those are dollars that are spent locally right back in the community.

For all people listening to C-SPAN or people that are guests in our audience, Mr. Speaker, they should be making sure that they are calling their Representatives and making them aware of the fact that this program has not been enhanced.

This is no entitlement. This is an earned benefit that people have paid for and that only the United States Congress can act to change so that these individuals will get relief.

Imagine a cost-of-living increase that hasn't been enhanced in over 50 years. I hope that the American people, and more importantly, this Congress acts on behalf of the people that desperately need our help.

SEC NEW CLIMATE DISCLOSURE RULE

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the Securities and Exchange Commission's new climate disclosure rule.

Since President Biden took office, his agencies have weaponized rulemaking to impose job-crushing regulations. In just 3 years, he has dramatically expanded the Waters of the U.S. rule, issued presidential executive orders, and established a new climate corps.

The new climate disclosure rule requires extensive disclosures on CO₂ and other theoretical climate risks.

□ 1100

These disclosure requirements will have devastating downstream consequences. The rule will likely serve as a gift to activist lawyers looking for reasons to declare open season on industries they oppose.

It is a breathtaking expansion of regulatory power by an unelected agency using power that was not delegated to it by Congress. The SEC should stick to its core mission of regulating financial markets and get out of its newfound hobby of dabbling in climate alarmism.

I applaud the work of my Financial Services Committee colleagues and the Western Caucus on pushing back against this draconian rule, and I hope to see it repealed.

CONGRATULATING CHANCELLOR DOUG KRISTENSEN

Mr. FLOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank Chancellor Doug Kristensen for his 22 years of service to the University of Nebraska at Kearney.

After 14 years in the State legislature, many of those as speaker of our unicameral body, he was named chancellor at UNK and became the longest-

serving chancellor in the university's history.

Chancellor Kristensen, a native of Kearney, has been described as a champion for UNK and rural Nebraska. During his time in the State legislature, he helped shepherd then Kearney State College into the University of Nebraska system. His leadership has been nothing less than transformative.

From new housing to athletic facilities, Kristensen oversaw many of these priorities during his two decades of leadership. One of his most successful achievements was helping grow rural Nebraska's healthcare workforce.

Chancellor Kristensen's work at UNK will have a lasting impact on Nebraska for generations to come.

I congratulate him on an outstanding career, thank him for his service to the State and the university, and wish him the best in his next chapter.

RECOGNIZING LUKE FARRITOR

Mr. FLOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Luke Farritor, a University of Nebraska at Lincoln student who recently won the Vesuvius Challenge grand prize by deciphering passages of text from digital scans of a carbonized scroll. This young man is smart.

Last year, Farritor, a Lincoln native, decided to take on the challenge of deciphering text on papyrus charred into a lump of carbon by the eruption of Mount Vesuvius.

Because the scrolls were carbonized, they are virtually impossible to unroll without destroying them. Farritor created a machine-learning model that senses tiny differences that can reveal ink. Yes, he is that smart.

Along the way, he enlisted help from peers across the globe to pitch in and decipher the burnt scrolls recovered from an ancient library.

Luke and his team ultimately submitted 15 passages containing more than 2,000 characters. The work contained in the passages they recovered hadn't been read since at least 79 A.D.

Congratulations to Luke. His innovative talent has already taken him far. We look forward to seeing what challenge he takes on next.

We hope he stays in Nebraska. We want him to live there.

THANKING METEOROLOGISTS IN NEBRASKA

Mr. FLOOD. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about something that was very destructive last Friday. We had several EF3 and EF2 tornadoes ravage portions of my district, Congressman BACON's district, and Congressman SMITH's district.

The silver lining here is that the meteorologists at the National Weather Service office in Valley, Nebraska, used all of their talents, all of the equipment, and everything in the power of the National Weather Service to identify these tornadoes and get that lifesaving information to the people.

What they did saved lives. We did not lose one person's life in the State of Nebraska. Over 400 homes were destroyed.

I also want to say as a Nebraska broadcaster myself, the men and women of the Nebraska broadcasting companies, in multiple languages, went to work and got Nebraskans the information they needed to take shelter and stay away from these potentially and very obviously dangerous tornadoes.

We ought to be proud of this Federal agency, the National Weather Service. We ought to be proud of what they do. They don't get the credit very often.

I also recognize the broadcasters not just in Nebraska but everywhere in our great country that go to work every day to get people lifesaving information. In this case, you can look at everything that happened. Our emergency alert system worked. Our meteorologists and our TV meteorologists and radio and television folks came together to deliver for the great State.

STANDING UP FOR THE SANCTITY OF WOMEN'S SPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. FISCHBACH). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY. Madam Speaker, on April 18, five brave young girls had the courage to stand up for their rights in Harrison County, West Virginia. These 13-year-old girls showed more guts and courage in their convictions than most grownups.

These student athletes competed in the 2024 Harrison County Middle School Championship track and field meet. These girls from Lincoln Middle School stepped up to the circle for their turn before refusing to throw in the shot put event. They were showing solidarity in protest of the participation of Becky Pepper-Jackson, a 13-year-old boy. Pepper-Jackson won the event by recording a throw of 32 feet. The second-place competitor, who was actually a female, finished with a 29-foot throw.

West Virginia State law bans transgenders—in other words, boys pretending to be girls—from playing on girls' sports teams. However, a recent Federal court ruled the law could not be lawfully applied to Pepper-Jackson.

West Virginia Attorney General Patrick Morrisey quickly stepped up and filed an amicus brief in support of the five athletes and asked the U.S. Supreme Court to weigh in on transgender student-athlete bans for a second time on behalf of the parents who filed a complaint with the local county board of education.

As a result of their protest and appearance at a press conference with West Virginia Attorney General Patrick Morrisey, the five girls were barred from competing in their next track meet and also subject to punitive sprints in practice.

These strong girls should be rewarded, not punished, for standing up for the sanctity of women's sports. Young women should not be forced to compete against young men. No school

in West Virginia, nor anywhere in America, should turn a blind eye to this woke nonsense.

Former college swimmer Riley Gaines, who has been an outspoken critic of trans athletes participating in girls' sports, has weighed in on the issue, writing in a post on X: "These girls stood up for what they believed, and their coach barred them from competing. Insane."

I applaud Riley on for her amazing work advocating for young girls and women in sports.

Now, more than ever, it is important to address the unfairness in our society and the right to peacefully protest as our Constitution allows. These constant assaults on the sanctity of women's sports threaten the future of fair athletic competition in our country. The ramifications of allowing men into women's sports are far greater than simply allowing men to put on a women's uniform.

We have seen numerous examples of stronger men seriously injuring young women and girls in contact sports. Millions of young women are also being exposed to uncomfortable situations in which men are present in women's locker rooms.

Only God can create men and women. It is simply wrong for any parent to think they can or should even try to change the sex of their child. Male athletes who can't win competing against other males who then choose to take advantage of bad laws to steal titles from women are truly a threat to females.

We should be less focused on offending an individual's feelings than protecting the physical safety of our daughters who simply want to compete against other women.

Radical trans policies are out of touch with not only the facts but the pulse of this great country. We must stand up against this nonsense and unlimited overreach on the fringes.

I applaud the five young women in my district for standing up for themselves and being examples of strength as this fight for women's sports goes on.

Madam Speaker, God bless these young ladies.

NATIONAL MYOSITIS MONTH

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

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize May 1 as the beginning of National Myositis Month and commend the outstanding dedication and advocacy of Mr. Richard Galloway, Jr., whose parents are in the balcony today and we welcome, for his unwavering commitment to raising awareness about myositis.

Myositis is comprised of a group of muscle diseases characterized by weakness and inflammation in the muscles. Symptoms include muscle weakness,

pain, and fatigue. While there is currently no cure, there are ongoing research efforts aimed at better understanding the underlying mechanisms of this disease and to develop more effective treatment options.

Mr. Galloway's journey is one marked by resilience and compassion. In January of 2020, he was diagnosed with inclusion body myositis, otherwise known by the acronym IBM, at the Medical University of South Carolina located in Charleston. Despite facing this challenging diagnosis, he has shown remarkable strength and determination in his battle against this debilitating disease.

Beyond his personal journey, Mr. Galloway has been a tireless advocate for myositis awareness. In October of 2023, Mr. Galloway organized the impactful event Crossing the Cooper for Christ, which raised over \$13,000 for The Myositis Association. His dedication to this cause was further underscored when he was invited to lead a session known as Finding Strength Through Faith at an annual patient conference in San Diego, California.

Recognizing this significant contribution, Mr. Galloway was voted onto the board of directors of The Myositis Association at the beginning of 2024. The Myositis Association, a nonprofit organization that was founded in 1993, focuses on improving the lives of those affected by this awful disease through support, education, advocacy, and research.

Mr. Galloway's unwavering dedication to raising awareness about myositis and supporting individuals battling this disease exemplifies the best of the human spirit. His commitment to advocacy and service is an inspiration for all of us, and it is with great admiration and gratitude that I recognize his contributions today.

I also extend my sincere thanks to Mr. Galloway and The Myositis Association for their selfless dedication and tireless efforts in making a difference in the lives of those affected by this awful disease.

THE DANGERS WE FACE AS A FREE DEMOCRACY

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to respond to one of my colleagues, who I think some of you heard, who is supporting what is going on on the college campuses today. She described it as peaceful protest.

Madam Speaker, they are burning buildings. They are tearing up campuses. College presidents are not saying one word. This administration, this President, is not saying one word about it. Teachers, many of whom are tenured, are not saying one word.

This has got to stop. They have got to have consequences. They have got to have sheriffs who are willing to do whatever it takes to stop this damage to our institutions and lawlessness that is taking place all across this country.

The illegal immigration that this administration is condoning and implementing is unheard of in the history of

this Nation. In South Carolina, they are giving illegals driver's licenses and registrations to vote.

It is high time this country wakes up to the dangers that we face as a free democracy, if we can keep it. The first steps are stopping the lawless invasion at the border that, again, is unprecedented in this country.

Laken Riley, the young lady who was killed in Georgia, her only mistake was jogging around the campus.

How many more deaths do we have to have through fentanyl? It is insane what is going on in this country.

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 13 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Holy and eternal God, on the occasion of the 235th anniversary of the appointment of the first Chaplain to Congress, I offer this prayer in thanksgiving to You and to our country's forebears who found it both fit and necessary to open each legislative day since 1789 with prayer.

Repeating the sentiments of George Washington in his first address shared with the House of Representatives on that same day, we offer our fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States, a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes.

While these words may not be our own, like the father of our Nation, we acknowledge and adore the invisible hand which conducts our affairs. We, like President Washington, resort to the benign parent of the human race in humble supplication, since You have been pleased to favor the American people.

Even now, 235 years later, our prayer remains the same. May Your divine blessing be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations, and the wise measures on which the success of this government may depend.

Lord, hear our prayers raised up in the past, still true in this present day,

and understood to be the foundation for our future.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF DON NICHOLAS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of my dear friend, Don Nicholas.

Don was a crucial member of the Texas 25th Congressional District team for over 10 years and dedicated his life to selflessly serving his country.

Time and time again, he stepped up to help those in need, day or night. He never missed a call from a veteran and opened his home up to soldiers every holiday.

Don was a 31-year Army veteran, a man of great faith and a loving husband, father, and grandfather, and always believed the North Dakota State Bison were going to win every game.

America lost a patriot, Texas lost a servant leader, and we all lost a friend. He will be dearly missed by those privileged to know him.

I am honored to celebrate the life and impact that Don had on so many. In God we trust.

EXERCISING FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS

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

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have had guns pulled on me multiple times by law enforcement simply for being a Black man in America, and now I see guns being drawn on peaceful protesters at Columbia University.

When I was 11 years old, I was the victim of police brutality simply for

being Black in America, and now I see that brutality being inflicted on peaceful protesters at Columbia University. For what? Simply exercising their First Amendment rights to peacefully assemble as they protest the collective punishment and murder of civilians in Gaza; 100,000 killed and injured, mostly women and children. They are protesting our taxpayer dollars going to Benjamin Netanyahu to continue this mass murder. That is their right.

They are supposed to push us to stand for what this flag represents. Are we in a police state or is this a democracy? We must stand with our young people and demand justice and freedom for Palestinians and everyone in this world.

CELEBRATING SMALL BUSINESSES ACROSS PENNSYLVANIA'S 15TH DISTRICT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate our small businesses across the Pennsylvania 15th Congressional District, the Commonwealth, and the country. This week we recognize the importance of our small businesses and the role that they play in our communities as part of National Small Business Week.

Small businesses are the cornerstone of communities. They are often the first place you go to for local support. From asking for donations for fundraisers to sponsoring your youth sports teams, it is the local small businesses that answer the call.

More than half of Americans either work for or own a small business, and they create nearly two out of every three jobs in the United States every year. Our small businesses play a central role in building a strong country, and we are so grateful for their contributions to our communities.

Now small businesses need our support. There are many ways you can show your support: by writing a review, telling friends and family about your favorite shop, or interacting with the business on social media.

Mr. Speaker, this week I encourage you all to make the effort to shop small and shop local at your favorite small businesses.

MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS NEED BETTER TRAINING IN NUTRITION

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, food is medicine, and our medical professionals need proper training to screen and treat food insecurity and diet-related diseases.

That is why I have joined together with Representative VERN BUCHANAN on a bipartisan letter to the Accredita-

tion Council for Graduate Medical Education, urging them to incorporate nutrition education into the program requirements for graduate medical education. By doing so, graduate medical programs will be required to adequately prepare physicians in nutrition, improving health outcomes, and saving our healthcare system a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, the idea that our medical professionals should have better training in nutrition isn't a concept we just came up with here in Washington.

When I visit medical students, physicians, nurses, and other medical professionals back home, I hear over and over again how they don't feel adequately prepared to treat food insecurity and diet-related diseases.

I am proud to further a key recommendation in the National Strategy on Hunger, Nutrition, and Health, and ask all my colleagues to support efforts to improve nutrition education for physicians.

HONORING PETE DOBITZ

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, a pretty cool thing happened in my hometown of Dickinson, North Dakota, last week: Pete Dobitz won his 500th career game as our high school baseball coach.

Since 2000, Dickinson High School has won five State championships and has been runners-up three times. If that is not enough, Coach Dobitz spends his summers coaching and running the Babe Ruth baseball team. To be honest, he would have gotten here a little earlier, but he refuses to count the 2004 State championship season because he was deployed, honorably serving the State of North Dakota and our country in the National Guard.

I can't think of anybody more worthy of being able to be addressed on the floor of the House today. I have had the privilege of coaching with him. I have had the privilege of running a baseball program where he ran my Babe Ruth program, and I have the privilege and honor of calling him my friend.

He has touched numerous high school students' lives, both in the classroom and in the ballpark. Here is to another 24 years and 500 wins because he is a fixture in the third-base dugout.

DARK CHAPTER IN FLORIDA HISTORY

(Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, look at this map. Today is a dark day in the State of Florida because we join all of these States that are in dark colors as our draconian 6-week abortion ban goes into effect, gutting access to abortion care in Florida and in the South. It is essentially a

total ban because most women do not know they are pregnant before 6 weeks.

Abortion is a deeply personal medical decision that politicians should not interfere with, and doctors should not have to face criminal prosecution for treating a patient before them.

We don't walk in other people's shoes. There are many reasons for an abortion. It could be birth control failure, rape, incest, or endangering a person's life. Protecting a woman's access to abortion is a freedom that only she should have.

The good news is that in November, Florida voters can defend this fundamental freedom, but until then, a dark cloud hovers over our so-called Sunshine State.

ANTI-SEMITISM HATRED

(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, the violent anti-Semitic hatred on American college campuses is revealing of leftwing bigotry.

Last week, The Wall Street Journal editorialized: "Anti-Israel, anti-Semitic protests at Columbia, Yale, and elsewhere are getting uglier, and it isn't clear the progressives in charge of these institutions are up to the job of enforcing order or protecting Jewish students."

Yesterday, New York was sadly revealing with a corrupt Democrat judge gagging the Republican candidate for President as a corrupt Democrat district attorney proceeded to drop charges on violent supporters of terrorism seeking murder of all Jews. Derailed Democrats smear Republicans and appease murderers of Jews.

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 do not need new border laws; we need to enforce existing laws. Biden shamefully opens the borders to dictators as more 9/11 attacks across America are imminent, as repeatedly warned by the FBI. Thank you Ambassador Motaz Zahran of Egypt for briefing Congress today.

REMEMBERING DONALD PAYNE, JR.

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Don Payne was one of a kind: From his impeccable fashion sense to our mutual love of hats; from his infectious sense of humor to his deep commitment to the people of north New Jersey.

When I came to Congress, I went to Don to tell him that while I was born in North Carolina, I spent my formative years in his district in Newark and

graduated from high school there. He never let me forget it.

I always referred to him as my hometown guy, and he referred to me as his home girl. When I traveled to his district for a family member's funeral, he was insistent to show me around the city. When I couldn't make it to my high school reunion, Don went in my place.

When a member of my staff who was born in Newark needed a copy of her birth certificate, Donald Payne made sure she got it. He was the first Member to come to North Carolina to attend my annual Adams Mad Hatters event. That is who Don was. He was a committed public servant, a loyal friend, and always lending a hand.

To Bea and the triplets, my heart breaks for you, and I am lifting you up in my prayers. To my colleagues, as we mourn this devastating loss, may Donald Payne, Jr.'s memory serve as motivation for us to be better public servants and continue the fight for equality just as Donald Payne, Jr., would have wanted.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

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

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding performance of Hillsborough County Public Schools in Florida's 15th Congressional District.

U.S. News and World Report recently released the 2024 Best High Schools list, which ranked 25,000 high schools throughout the United States based on college preparedness, performance, proficiency, and graduation rates. I am proud to say that some of Hillsborough County's high schools were ranked among the best educational institutions not just in Florida but in the Nation, which is a remarkable achievement.

This honor is a testament to the dedicated students, teachers, and administrators in Hillsborough County. It is clear that our schools are full of individuals who are committed to providing high-quality education initiatives and ensuring that our students are well prepared for the next chapter of life.

I am excited to see what the future holds for our students, the faculty, and our community in Florida's 15th Congressional District.

MEMBER OF CONGRESS AND BANNING PAC MONEY

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have a message for my colleagues today: Don't come to Congress if you want to make a profit.

Americans are frustrated with Congress because too many Members are personally trading stock, because PAC money is drowning out the voice of voters, and because there are more lobbyists around here than legislators.

That is why, today, I am calling on Speaker JOHNSON to bring for a vote, an up-or-down vote, a bipartisan bill to ban Members of Congress from trading stock.

Representative ABIGAIL SPANBERGER and Representative CHIP ROY have been working on this bill since 2020, listening to voices like Unusual Whales, Quiver Quantitative, and Capitol Trades. They understand that we need a vote. Speaker after Speaker keep saying we will have a vote, but we haven't had a vote.

Bring that bill for an up-or-down vote in 2024. Let's ban Members of Congress from trading stock. Then let's ban PAC money, and let's ban Members of Congress from ever becoming lobbyists.

CONGRATULATING PORT NECHES-GROVES FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heart full of pride as we celebrate the remarkable achievement of our very own Port Neches-Groves football team for winning the 2023 5A State championship, the first State football title in 48 years. They have made Texas-14 proud.

I congratulate each of the football players. They displayed unwavering grit and Texas determination throughout the season, overcoming challenges with resilience that led to a State champ title. I congratulate Coach Jeff Joseph and the entire coaching staff for instilling discipline, strategy, and a winning mindset in every player.

I thank the students, faculty, and fans for representing our community with absolute honor and pride. This victory is not just for PN-G but for all of southeast Texas.

I congratulate the Indians. They deserve it. God bless the Port Neches-Groves Indians, and God bless Texas.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my personal congratulations to all the local entrepreneurs, the communities they support, and the Nevada Small Business Administration at their annual awards luncheon celebrating National Small Business Week.

From restaurants to wrestling gyms, these small businesses are the life of our local economy. As our community grows beyond the reputation as the entertainment capital of the world, one

thing will always remain true: We are a people-driven economy.

Investing in our economy to make it more resilient and diverse requires investing in the people who keep it running. I thank all the small business owners, their employees, and hard-working families who make our community strong. Happy Small Business Week.

RECOGNIZING SBA'S STORIED PAST AND EVEN STRONGER FUTURE

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, happy Small Business Week. Today, I rise to recognize the Small Business Administration's support and advocacy for businesses and communities as they sustain and strengthen the backbone of the American economy.

I especially thank SBA New Mexico District Director John Garcia. Through financing, information, and guidance, our small-business community benefits daily from the resources and support that Mr. Garcia and his team provide.

Last year, SBA marked its 70th anniversary. Nationally, there are 30 million small businesses. In New Mexico, 95 percent of our businesses are small businesses—162,000 strong. Our small businesses employ 340,000 individuals, and we are growing at a rapid rate, with 7,270 new businesses opening during the March 2021–2022 period.

From green chili farmers to independent bookstores to small manufacturing plants, our small businesses line our Main Streets and bring economic vitality to our communities.

This Small Business Week, I recognize SBA's storied past and the even stronger future we will create.

HONORING NELSON CRUZ, SR.

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

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Nelson Cruz, Sr., for his work encouraging the artistic and cultural expressions of generations over a 60-year career at La Voz Hispana.

Founded by the Cruz family, La Voz Hispana is more than a music store. It is a testament to the vibrancy of Chicago's Latin American cultural community.

From its humble beginnings selling records to its evolution into a cherished neighborhood institution offering instruments and lessons, La Voz Hispana has been a source of inspiration for so many.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my great honor to commend Nelson Cruz, Sr., for his contributions to our community and to wish him an enriching and joyful retirement.

“May the melodies of La Voz Hispana continue resounding in our hearts for many years to come.” “Que las melodias de La Voz Hispana sigan resonando en nuestros corazones por muchos años mas.”

I thank and congratulate Nelson.

HONORING CHARLES AND BARBARA WHITE

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I humbly rise to acknowledge and honor a remarkable couple, Apostle Dr. Charles White, Jr., and Elect Lady Barbara White, on the golden anniversary of their ministry.

Along with their loved ones, parishioners, and friends in a room decorated in gold, they celebrated 50 years in the ministry throughout their 55-year marriage.

Despite facing challenges, such as prostate cancer and Parkinson's, they have continued to serve with unwavering faith and determination, reaching out to those in need and delivering hope to countless lives.

Greene County has been blessed with their ministry, and we are so grateful for their positive impact.

I thank the Lord for blessing us with such compassionate and caring souls as Apostle Charles and Elect Lady Barbara White.

VANDALISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM, NOT PROTESTS, ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

(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, what we are seeing on college campuses throughout the country isn't First Amendment-protected protesting or free speech. It is vandalism, assault, breaking and entering, and anti-Semitism.

We have seen pro-Hamas sympathizers set up no-go zones for Jewish students and faculty, physically blocking them from entering their universities, where they have units and where they have paid their dues, the whole works.

We have seen pro-Hamas sympathizers send a UCLA student to the emergency room after beating her unconscious just because she is Jewish. What is this, 1939?

We have seen pro-Hamas sympathizers break into and occupy university buildings, break windows, spray-paint, and rename a building “Intifada Hall,” as seen on Humboldt's campus up in northern California.

We have seen pro-Hamas sympathizers assault police officers and even take a Columbia University janitor as a hostage.

The law is clear: Destroying property, blocking traffic, assault, and tak-

ing a hostage are illegal. Elite university students at Yale, Columbia, and UCLA should know better.

Furthermore, history has made it clear: If your group is creating no-go zones for Jewish people or actively attacking students who disagree with you or students just because they are Jewish, you are in the wrong.

These are not protesters.

DENOUNCING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1137, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1112) denouncing the Biden administration's immigration policies, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YAKYM). Pursuant to House Resolution 1137, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1112

Whereas President Joe Biden and Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas have created the worst border security crisis in the Nation's history;

Whereas President Biden, beginning on day one of his administration, systematically dismantled effective border security measures and interior immigration enforcement;

Whereas the Biden administration's open-borders policies have incentivized 9,500,000 illegal aliens from all around the world, including criminal aliens and suspected terrorists, to arrive at the southwest border;

Whereas the Biden administration has allowed at least 6,400,000 illegal aliens from the southwest border to travel to American communities;

Whereas current immigration law allows for the United States to enter into asylum cooperative agreements with other countries to allow for the removal of certain aliens seeking asylum in the United States;

Whereas asylum cooperative agreements provide the United States with another tool to reduce the incentives for illegal immigration;

Whereas asylum cooperative agreements increase cooperation with United States allies in the Western Hemisphere and around the world and promote shared responsibility;

Whereas the previous administration announced asylum cooperative agreements with El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras;

Whereas the Biden administration suspended and terminated these asylum cooperative agreements as part of its open-borders agenda that has encouraged mass illegal immigration to the southwest border;

Whereas the border wall aids the Border Patrol in its mission to “detect and prevent the illegal entry of individuals into the United States”;

Whereas the Biden administration stopped the previous administration's southwest border wall construction;

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act mandates that the Secretary of Homeland Security detain inadmissible aliens arriving at the border who express an intention to apply for asylum or fear of persecution;

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act mandates that the Secretary of Homeland Security detain, during removal proceedings, aliens who arrive at the border and are found to be inadmissible;

Whereas the Biden administration has purposely violated United States immigration law by refusing to detain inadmissible aliens arriving at the border;

Whereas the Biden administration's purposeful violation of the mandatory detention statutes of the Immigration and Nationality Act has resulted in the mass release of millions of illegal aliens into United States communities;

Whereas the Biden administration could expand expedited removal to more quickly remove illegal aliens at the border and screen more illegal aliens for asylum eligibility instead of mass releasing them into the United States;

Whereas, when implemented by the Trump administration, the Migrant Protection Protocols helped reduce illegal immigration;

Whereas, despite its effectiveness and despite the advice of career Department of Homeland Security officials not to do so, the Biden administration terminated the Migrant Protection Protocols;

Whereas the Biden administration has purposely violated United States immigration law by abusing discretionary case-by-case and other parole authorities to mass parole illegal aliens who would otherwise have no legal basis to enter and remain in the United States;

Whereas the Biden administration issued multiple memoranda limiting circumstances under which immigration enforcement actions can be taken against illegal aliens;

Whereas these memoranda are the basis for lower numbers of criminal alien removals from the United States;

Whereas additional criminal aliens remain on American streets, free to offend and victimize more Americans, because of the Biden administration's lack of immigration enforcement;

Whereas these memoranda are the basis for policies directing Federal Government attorneys in immigration court to not pursue removal cases against illegal aliens;

Whereas the Biden administration's open-borders policies signal to illegal aliens that when they come to the United States they will be released and will not be removed;

Whereas the Biden administration's open-borders policies encourage illegal aliens to come to the United States and allow illegal and other criminal aliens to remain in the country;

Whereas the illegal alien who viciously allegedly murdered 22-year-old Athens, Georgia, nursing student Laken Riley is a beneficiary of the Biden administration's open-borders policies;

Whereas, during the State of the Union speech, President Biden described Laken Riley's illegal alien alleged murderer as "an illegal";

Whereas, two days later, after pressure from open-borders advocates, President Biden noted in a television interview that he felt "regret" for using the word "illegal" to describe Laken Riley's illegal alien alleged murderer;

Whereas, during that interview, President Biden claimed that illegal aliens like Laken Riley's alleged murderer "built the country";

Whereas Laken Riley's illegal alien alleged murderer should not have been released by the Biden administration into the United States;

Whereas Laken Riley's illegal alien alleged murderer should have been arrested and detained by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement after he committed crimes in the United States; and

Whereas Laken Riley's illegal alien alleged murderer is but one of countless illegal alien criminals and terrorists the Biden adminis-

tration has released into the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms the Biden administration has taken executive actions that created the current border crisis, including—

(A) ending the Migrant Protection Protocols;

(B) terminating asylum cooperative agreements with Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador;

(C) abusing parole authority;

(D) stopping the previous administration's southwest border wall construction;

(E) issuing memoranda limiting immigration enforcement;

(F) removing fewer criminal aliens from the United States; and

(G) purposely violating statutes that require the detention of inadmissible aliens;

(2) denounces the Biden administration's open-borders policies, which allowed Laken Riley's illegal alien alleged murderer to enter the United States and ensured he would not be removed until it was too late—if at all;

(3) condemns the public safety crisis caused by the Biden administration's open-borders policies;

(4) urges the Biden administration to rescind its open-borders policies; and

(5) implodes the Biden administration to implement policies that end his administration's border crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 1112.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, in January, the Border Patrol chief in the Del Rio sector told House Republicans: I am standing in front of an open fire hydrant with a bucket. I don't need more buckets. I need somebody to shut off the hydrant.

President Trump did exactly that. His remain in Mexico policy had slowed illegal immigration to a trickle. The border wall was nearing completion with only construction gaps remaining to be closed.

ICE was actively enforcing court-ordered deportations, sending a strong signal around the world that illegal migrants would end up right back where they started, so they stopped coming.

On Inauguration Day, Mr. Biden reversed all of these successful policies, the first of more than 60 actions he has

subsequently taken to undermine our immigration laws and open our border to the world.

The result has been the largest illegal mass migration in history. Since that day, over 4.6 million illegal migrants have been released into this country deliberately. While the Border Patrol has been overwhelmed, another 1.8 million known got-aways illegally entered, as well.

That is a total of 6.4 million illegals added to our population, larger than the entire State of Missouri, our 18th largest State with eight congressional districts. That is just in 3 years.

The impact has been devastating. Schools have been overwhelmed as classrooms are packed with non-English-speaking students. Hospitals have been forced to shift millions of dollars of care from Americans to illegals. In Yuma, Americans are very often sent to Tucson for maternity care because local beds are now taken by illegals.

The social safety net has been shredded by the deliberative admission of millions of impoverished illegals demanding free food, clothing, and shelter.

The number of terrorist suspects the Border Patrol has encountered has ballooned exponentially.

□ 1230

Law enforcement officials are warning that among the 1.8 million got-aways, mostly single, military-age men, there is likely a dangerous fifth column, which could soon launch devastating attacks within our borders.

Fentanyl brought in through the open border is killing hundreds of Americans every day. Democrats' sanctuary policies hamstring attempts to deport criminal illegal aliens. Worst of all, the admission of untold thousands of the most vicious gang members on the planet are now producing a terrible butcher's bill of murders and assaults on Americans.

This resolution speaks for Americans who have had enough, and it condemns these policies. I am afraid that is really all that we can do until the American people rise up and demand an administration and a Congress willing to restore our borders and to put Americans first.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this country is facing real problems. There is an erosion of trust in our government and institutions.

The right to bodily autonomy is under attack across the Nation. The State of Maryland needs assistance in rebuilding the Francis Scott Key Bridge so that the Port of Baltimore, whose economic impact touches communities across the country, can reopen. Our immigration system cannot function because Congress has failed to reform it for over 30 years.

Instead of responding to these problems, House Republicans are wasting our time, yet again, on another meaningless immigration resolution.

At Donald Trump's direction, they refuse to work toward solutions for our broken immigration system, so instead, all they have to offer is a bunch of empty rhetoric.

This resolution, like the others we have considered in recent months, will do nothing to solve the situation at the border.

Not a single dollar will go to help our law enforcement agents at the border as a result of this resolution.

Not a single person will be denied unlawful entry to this country as a result of this resolution. Not a single community will be made safer as a result of this resolution.

This resolution is nothing more than a highlight reel of the dubious talking points of immigration that we have heard over and over from Republicans since President Biden was sworn into office.

It is the same legislating by press release that we have become accustomed to in this historically unproductive Congress.

The resolution itself is simply a rehash of the resolution we passed a few weeks ago. Republicans are so out of ideas that it even has the same exact title and much of the same content as the last resolution.

That resolution listed all the ways that President Biden supposedly could secure the border and essentially asks the administration to reverse every policy it has implemented on immigration, even though we know that doing so would not be effective.

Today's resolution simply lists most of those policies again, and this time it just condemns the administration. What a waste of time.

It is important to remember how we got here. Earlier this Congress, House Republicans passed their partisan, cruel, and unworkable border bill, H.R. 2.

Republicans spent a year saying that H.R. 2 is the only way to secure the border, even though they know that it cannot become law, having failed twice to pass the Senate, receiving just 32 votes earlier this year.

Then they insisted that the price of helping to protect Ukraine against Russian aggression was enacting harsh border enforcement legislation.

Senate Republicans even managed to convince some Democrats to agree on a very harsh border bill in the Senate, a bill that Minority Leader MCCONNELL called the toughest border bill in 30 years, but Republicans could not take "yes" for an answer.

Donald Trump said that he didn't want to do anything that might actually help at the border in an election year because he wants immigration as a campaign issue. Other Republicans quickly agreed.

Folding to the cult of Donald Trump, Speaker Johnson declared the bill dead

on arrival in the House with the rest of the Republican Conference quickly falling in line.

Republicans showed clearly what Democrats have been saying over and over again, that they don't want to do anything that would really help address our broken immigration system. They clearly have given up.

Instead of solving the problem, Republicans merely want to continue to weaponize the border as a political issue for the election year with pointless votes on meaningless resolutions that accomplish nothing and are full of misleading information.

Let's review the facts once again. The resolution complains that the Biden administration is not removing enough people.

However, the administration is removing people at a very significant pace and in ways that I am concerned may present some due process violations.

Since the end of title 42 last May, the Biden administration has removed or returned over 630,000 individuals and members of family units, just since last May.

This is more than the number of people removed or returned in all of fiscal year 2019 under the Trump administration.

The resolution also alleges that the Biden administration is violating the mandatory detention statutes by not detaining enough people.

However, no administration, including the Trump administration, has ever been able to comply with those statutes because no Congress has ever appropriated the extraordinary levels of funding such compliance would require.

To detain everyone that the law requires to be held in mandatory detention would require Congress to appropriate over \$35 billion a year, a number 10 times higher than what Congress appropriated this year or then-President Trump ever requested for detention.

When Democrats have proposed giving DHS the resources it needs to do its job, the Republicans have consistently said "no".

We need to work together to address our broken immigration system. Enforcement alone cannot fix it. We know this because an enforcement-only approach has largely failed for three decades.

We need to update our immigration system so that it meets the needs of our country. We need a balanced, bipartisan approach that expands lawful pathways.

This will help relieve pressure on the border and allow people to come to this country in an orderly and efficient way, but Republicans don't want to engage in real legislating that might actually solve problems and deliver meaningful reform.

They want to continue to demagogue and fearmonger with meaningless resolutions containing nothing but empty rhetoric designed to score cheap political points.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman who says that enforcement won't fix it that enforcement did fix it under the Trump administration.

His policies produced the most secure borders we have had in our lifetimes. It was this President who reversed those policies and initiated this mass illegal migration that we are now suffering.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES), the author of this resolution.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding time. I thank Chairman JIM JORDAN and the Judiciary Committee for bringing this to the floor. I thank Speaker JOHNSON and Leader SCALISE for bringing this to everybody's attention.

I live it every day. People talk about it. My district is half of the southern border. The facts are this: The border is as bad as it has ever been, and it wasn't always this way.

Under President Trump, the border was secure. Under President Trump, remain in Mexico worked. Under President Trump, the PACER program worked. Under President Trump, other countries respected the United States, and under President Trump, Americans were put first, not last.

Now, what does that mean? I have quickly realized that it is only President Trump that can solve this problem.

This body has no interest in solving this border crisis. They just want to talk about the problem and not actually solve the problem.

Meanwhile, the issue is: I live the problem, right. High-speed chases come through my town every single day. Our schools go into lockdown every single day.

Yesterday, there were 7,000 people that came into this country illegally. Last month, there were 219,000 people that came into this country illegally.

We are on pace for 2.5 million people to enter this country illegally, and the Biden administration does nothing. The Senate and Congress has done nothing. It has been all words. It has been all talk.

This resolution does one simple thing. Put your vote where your words are. If you truly believe in securing the border, you will vote "yes" on this resolution. If you don't care about the people who live along the border, if you don't care about the people that are dying from fentanyl, it is very simple, vote against the resolution. The American people deserve to know who is going to be with them and who is not going to be with them.

Right now, more than ever, this crisis is spreading. It is growing. On December 20, there were 10,000 people under the bridge in Eagle Pass. Who was there? I was the only Member of Congress to show up.

Three weeks later, we had over 60 Members of Congress show up in Eagle Pass, and guess what? That bridge was completely cleared out. What does that mean? That means showing up matters, not just in Washington but throughout our country.

Two years ago, there were thousands of Haitians under a bridge in Del Rio. All of a sudden, that went away. Why did that go away? Because the Biden administration started doing one simple thing that the Trump administration had done for so long.

This is the secret sauce. You deport people that are here illegally, period. You do that, and the problem goes away.

What you have is an administration that wants this. This crisis is absolutely created by the administration, it is fueled by the administration, and the administration has become addicted to the funding that it is doing to drive these places.

Oh, by the way, this doesn't just impact my community, which is half of the southern border, Americans all over the country are dying from fentanyl.

Americans all over the country are feeling this influx of people that are here illegally, and all of a sudden, you have people from Denver and New York and Chicago going: Wait a second. What about me? What about our roads? I am a U.S. citizen. What about my children? What about my future?

For some reason, the Biden administration has put America last in this equation, and it needs to stop.

That stops by us. Let's vote on it today. Where are you at? Are you with America? Are you with people that enter this country illegally?

I have met many of these folks. I was in Del Rio 3 weeks ago. There was a family that walked up to the bridge, a beautiful young lady with two beautiful children. She walks up to the bridge, and in Spanish, she says: I was told to come here for a better life.

Guess what? I have been blessed to be born in the United States of America. That family was not. Guess what? As sad as that situation is, she does not qualify for asylum.

There needs to be a different route. The asylum route that is happening is a dead end. These people do not qualify for asylum, nor will they ever qualify for asylum, so they need to stop entering our country illegally, and the American families that live here need to be put first above everything else.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman of three things that he seems to have forgotten.

One, just since the end of title 42 last May, the Biden administration has removed or returned over 630,000 individuals and members of family units.

This is more than the number of people removed or returned in all of fiscal year 2019 under the Trump administration.

I would also remind the gentleman that this legislation does nothing. It simply denounces the Biden administration. It does nothing. It has no operable clause. It is pure propaganda for political reasons. It does nothing to solve the immigration problem.

Third, I would remind the gentleman that the Senate negotiated a very strong immigration bill approved by Senator LANKFORD, the second-most conservative Member of the Senate. MITCH MCCONNELL said it was the strongest immigration bill he had ever seen. The Senate was willing to pass it until former President Trump said, don't pass it because I would rather have an election issue than solve the problem.

The fault for the immigration problem now is President Trump's for preventing the Senate from passing that bill and the Republicans' fault for going along with him politically.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this absurd and pointless resolution.

I will say that I actually agree with the previous speaker across the aisle, my friend across the aisle, when he said that this body wants to do absolutely nothing that actually solves the situation at the border. I agree with my friend across the aisle that this body, controlled by the Republican majority, has no interest in doing a single thing.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we keep voting on resolutions that do nothing. They are pointless, they are absurd, and they are a tired recycling of the same talking points that we hear every day from the majority.

Frankly, the majority is not trying to hide it. Whole sections of today's resolution, including its title and 12 of the 32 whereas clauses are copied and pasted from the other grievance-airing resolution that we considered in March, so these aren't even new.

These are the same things that we are voting on over and over again because there aren't actual solutions that Republicans are willing to move forward on that would fix the immigration system.

□ 1245

Likewise, 2 weeks ago, we voted on a pointless rehashing of H.R. 2, the Republicans' extreme, cruel, and unworkable immigration bill that is going nowhere fast.

What are we doing here, Mr. Speaker? Why does the majority insist on wasting our time with these bills filled with nothing but empty rhetoric designed to try and weaponize the issue of immigration instead of solving it?

What we should be doing is talking about how to create a bipartisan, workable immigration system that allows Americans to reunite with their families, allows American businesses and

universities to attract the best and the brightest, and create a workable process so that people wouldn't be forced to go to the border as the only way here. We should be talking about the fact that immigrants are good for our country and good for our economy. That is what the majority of Americans believe, despite all of the rhetoric from the other side.

One in four American doctors were born abroad, and roughly 45 percent of Fortune 500 companies were founded by immigrants or children of immigrants. Seventy percent of agricultural workers are immigrants. Immigrants feed us, they heal us, and they help ensure that the country remains an economic powerhouse.

We could be here on the floor embracing the positive impacts of immigrants rather than demonizing them, finding ways to allow people to work more quickly to fill the shortages that we have in our labor sector.

The Congressional Budget Office recently announced that new immigrants will add \$1 trillion in previously unexpected revenue to our country's GDP between 2023 and 2034. Similarly, the Department of Health and Human Services found that over a 15-year period, asylees and refugees alone contributed nearly \$124 billion more in revenue than they received in services from the government. Documented and undocumented immigrants pay tens of billions of dollars in taxes every single year.

Instead, what are we doing here on the floor? The same tired rhetoric that we hear every single week. The majority insists on demonizing immigrants and the border.

It is true that we desperately need to fix a broken immigration system that hasn't been updated in over 30 years, but we cannot do that, we cannot solve that problem just through harsh enforcement measures alone. We have been trying that approach for 30 years under different Presidents, and every time it fails.

The truth is that the immigration system is all connected. People are coming to the border because the legal immigration system has not been updated in three decades, and they cannot find another pathway to come under.

The wait time for some legal permanent residents to bring their families into this country is over a century long, a century to bring your own family to this country. Employers are begging us to modernize the employment-based immigration system, because the limits on high-tech visas were set when floppy disks were the height of technology, and people cannot hire the people they need. The small number of immigration judges that we have are absolutely crushed under a massive backlog of asylum cases so extensive that it is now taking people over 8 years to get a hearing.

Under these circumstances, it should not surprise anyone that some desperate people see coming to the border

as their only option, especially when they are fleeing for their lives from countries that cannot or will not protect them. If they are willing to face the dangers of the journey and deal with unscrupulous actors like cartels to get to safety here, even the most draconian of policies will not deter them.

That is why, despite what you hear from the other side, even when former President Trump implemented the policies that this resolution holds up as the cure to all of our problems, encounters at the border actually went up, not down. They didn't work.

Instead of talking about these failed policies, we could be discussing the countless, real, bipartisan solutions that passed when Democrats held the House majority, solutions like the Dream and Promise Act, the Farm Workforce Modernization Act, bills that would fix real gaps in the immigration system, provide lawful status to people who have been contributing to our communities across the country for decades, and actually make improvements that would relieve pressure on the border. We could be trying to pass the kinds of investments that would actually increase the number of immigration judges and asylum officers that would help speed up the process and make it work effectively.

Will any of those things make it to the floor in this Congress under a Republican majority whose only goal is to keep this issue out there as an election issue, just as former President Trump told them to do? No, we are just going to spend our time debating pointless resolutions that do not a single thing to fix the real situation of a broken immigration system.

We are going to keep debating non-binding resolutions filled to the brim with mistruths and disinformation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can one day get back to actually governing in this House, but I fear that today is not that day.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman seems to confuse legal immigrants who obey all of our laws and do everything our country asks of them with illegal immigrants whose first act is to disobey our laws.

Legal immigration is a boon to our Nation, but that is not what we are addressing here. There is no point to legal immigration if we are going to allow every immigrant who wants to do so to illegally enter our country.

The people I found who are the angriest about this crisis are the legal immigrants who came to this country obeying our laws, respecting our sovereignty, and doing everything our country asked of them, while this administration allows 6.5 million illegal immigrants to cut in line in front of them.

The ranking member would gaslight us by claiming that there were more

removals under Biden than under Trump. Here are the actual numbers. Under Trump, ICE removed 935,000 illegal aliens; under Biden, 274,000. The criminal numbers are even more disturbing. This past year, Mr. Biden removed 60 percent fewer criminal illegal aliens than Trump did in 2019.

In other words, despite massive increases in illegal migration, we have seen a massive decrease in criminal removals. We are seeing the results every day in murders and assaults on American streets and at empty chairs at America's family dinner tables.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, since day one in office, President Biden has chosen illegals over American citizens. We are now approaching 10 million illegal entries from individuals from all over the world, many parts of the world where they are our enemies such as China, Russia, Iran, and others. We don't know who they are, we don't know what they are about, we don't know why they are here, but a lot of it is not good.

Because of the President's efforts, we now live in one of the most dangerous points in American history. Make no doubt about it: His FBI Director says he has never seen so many elevated threats to our national security in his entire career. That was his Christopher Wray.

Innocent Americans, like Laken Riley, have been senselessly murdered by illegal immigrants. Law enforcement officers, like Christopher Gadd, have been killed by illegal immigrants. I won't go through the list of one after another after another good, law-abiding, loving Americans who are dead. They are not with us. Their families grieve. Most Americans grieve.

Students have been kicked out of their schools to house illegal immigrants and have to learn remotely. Cities and towns across America have cut public safety and education budgets as well to cover the welfare of illegal immigrants, because in many cities and towns we are paying for their housing, we are paying for their clothing, we are paying for their travel, and we are giving them debit cards. We are paying for so many things, including healthcare, that some good Americans don't even have as we speak here and debate this right now.

It is the Biden border agenda. It is what he is about. When you allow millions of unvetted people into our country, you have a reason. When you don't know where they are going, what they are doing, what they are about, you have a reason. When you actually hinder law enforcement's ability to apprehend, detain, and deport, which is the answer, you have a reason. You are making America less safe.

He can fix this crisis today. Today, as we speak, he can fix it. It took him 1 day to undo and rescind every effective Trump border policy that we had, and

it could take him less than 1 day to reinstate them.

America needs to have borders. America needs to be safe. Every day that goes by without doing so will only result in more lives lost. Mr. Speaker, that is what we are debating today. Do we want more individuals to die because of this policy?

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, there are more drugs and human trafficking at the hands of cartels at our border and more threats to our national security. Every day this President allows this crisis to continue, it becomes apparent to me—and this is harsh, but I believe it is true—the chaos is intentional. He is seeking to change the very fabric, the very structure, the America that we know to forever to hold on to his own political power. That must be condemned in the strongest possible terms.

No, this isn't a waste of time. No matter how many times it takes, no how many times we have to say it, we will not succumb, we will not give up, and we will not stop, because we are fighting for the United States of America, and it is worth it.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and I urge its passage.

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

All the Members on the other side forget several things. They forget that we had the strongest border bill that might have gone a long way toward solving this problem that the Senate was willing to pass, but President Trump said don't pass. He said in so many words: I don't want a solution; I want a campaign issue.

They forget that the President has asked for a lot more money so that instead of someone coming in and claiming asylum—maybe he deserves it; maybe he doesn't—and getting a date in court 5 years later and then disappearing, you would have enough judges to give him a date in a couple of weeks and either grant him asylum if he is entitled to it or deport him swiftly if he is not entitled to it.

The Republicans won't vote the money and they won't vote the bill that would solve or go a long way toward solving the problem.

They also forget that this resolution doesn't do anything. All it does is denounce Biden. That is all they have for this Congress, resolution after resolution denouncing Biden, and H.R. 2, which is so impossible that it got only 32 votes in the Senate, a Senate where there are 49 Republican Senators.

They don't want to solve the problem. They just want to talk about it. That is all they are doing about it now. It is total nonsense and not worthy of the time of this body.

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

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

I would remind the gentleman who says that the President has asked for more money, when I was at the border last year in Yuma, I spoke with a group of Border Patrol agents, line agents. That is the only time in my life that Federal employees said: Don't send us any more money.

□ 1300

They said that because they felt that the administration would simply use that money to process more illegals into the country even faster.

This is a deliberate policy of this administration, and it won't change until this administration is changed.

As for the Senate bill the gentleman has referenced multiple times, let me remind him that the bill would not have ended Biden's open-border policies. It would have institutionalized them.

Current law gives the President full authority to secure the border. Trump proved that. Current law requires asylum claimants to be detained. Trump did that.

This bill would have left future Presidents powerless to secure the border until illegal immigration reaches 4,000 a day, 1.5 million a year, and would have required they be released into our country. That is the Democrats' idea of immigration reform: a guaranteed 4,000 illegal immigrants being released into our country every day. That is what they call a tough border bill.

H.R. 2, which was the genuine border security bill, got 46 votes in the Senate last year and Democrats' support in the House just a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle are spending a great deal of time arguing against a piece of legislation they claim has no purpose, is meaningless, and only denounces the policies of the Biden administration.

The policies of the Biden administration are due denouncing. There is little question that if this were a fire, then the executive would send the fire department. If it were a hurricane, the executive would send FEMA, but because this is a crisis of this President's making, he has chosen not to offer any response but to allow the crisis to continue.

I remind my colleagues across the aisle that, yes, sure, the immigration system is broken. I wasn't here to break it. A couple of my colleagues have been here long enough to fix it several times over.

The law as it relates to securing our border is clear: We are the legislature. We adopted the law. The President and the executive branch have the responsibility to execute the law.

Instead, he has surrendered the southern border to drug cartels that

are not only trafficking deadly drugs, synthetic opioids, and fentanyl but also trafficking human lives.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are like some sort of delusional Wizard of Oz: Pay no attention to the crisis at the border. Pay no attention to the chaos in our cities. Pay no attention to the students taken out of schools so that cities like New York can shelter immigrants and migrants that they welcome. Don't pay attention to any of it. Look over there to Donald Trump. Don't look behind the curtain.

That is because, Mr. Speaker, you will find that this President, with the stroke of a pen, could reestablish the executive orders and take the emergency action necessary to secure our border, protect our citizens, and save lives.

Instead, this President has allowed a crisis, and it is worth denouncing over and over again because it has caused chaos, led to crime and the loss of lives, and fueled instability in our communities.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MOLINARO. We know this as New Yorkers because, despite the protestation otherwise, the State of New York has opened its arms. Then, when thousands upon thousands of migrants find their way to the city of New York and are relocated to other parts like upstate New York, which I represent, the State starts to complain.

Enough is enough. The President needs to wake up and take this crisis seriously. It is not progressive. It is cruel, and he must take action. Yes, his current policies are worth denouncing.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentlemen and gentlewomen on the other side of the aisle that when you talk about various victims of migrant crime, the FBI statistics show that the percentage of crime committed by migrants is lower than the percentage of crime committed by native-born Americans. Migrants, legal and illegal, seem to be more law-abiding, on average, than native-born Americans. So, to use a specific example to say that this is the fault of the immigration policy is nonsense.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee for yielding.

I would like to pose a rhetorical question to the gentleman: Where is the wall? Where is the wall that has been talked about now for a decade-plus?

I ask because others have had the same message, and here they come. Where is the wall?

Our friends on the other side of the aisle seem to fill their legislative agen-

da with platitudes, promises, broken promises, and "I am going to get it done." The American people don't need "I am going to get it done."

What the American people need is to ensure that we have added more Border Patrol officers, which we have done under the Biden administration's plans. We will be doing that for Customs and Border Patrol. We will be doing that under the Biden effort. In addition, we will be doing more training and more recruitment.

We know that a wall, no matter how much you do, is always going to be overcome—not like the song, "We Shall Overcome," when we do want to overcome in a better life and in a better world.

This is just a lot of talk. Mr. Speaker, I came to say that here is another resolution. There is no action in this resolution. It is a lot of talk.

As you remember, Mr. Speaker, how we got here was a bill that was so crushing that Republicans in the Senate could not vote for it, and that was H.R. 2. The resolution condemns many of the same policy choices on immigration, and they asked to be reversed in the last resolution. That is how bad it is. They want to reverse their own work.

Republicans now claim that no legislation is needed. Isn't that ridiculous, Mr. Speaker? They now have a bill that says that the other bills were not needed, don't listen to us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against this senseless, do-nothing resolution. Let's come together and support President Biden's leadership on immigration reform.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, we just heard that immigrants are less likely to break the law than native-born Americans. Tell that to the angel families whose family tables have empty chairs because of the very policy that this bill condemns.

Put aside the fact that illegal aliens shouldn't be in this country to commit crimes in the first place because when the Federation for American Immigration Reform looked at reimbursement requests from the States for the cost of locking up illegal aliens, they found that illegals are 231 percent more likely to be jailed for crimes in California, 440 percent more likely in New Jersey, and 60 percent more likely in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YAKYM).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, which denounces the Biden administration's failed border policies, and I do so because of this chart next to me.

I have sat here and listened to the debate of who is responsible and why. Let's look at the facts and the data. This chart shows southwestern border crossing encounters over the first 38

months of the last six Presidential terms. It doesn't say whose line it is, but if you guessed the Biden administration is the red one at the top with nearly six times the number of illegal border crossings, then you would be correct, Mr. Speaker.

The seeds of this crisis were planted on day one when 64 executive orders were signed by President Biden that undermined border security and encouraged illegal immigration. What followed has been an unprecedented surge of illegal immigration.

Instead of acknowledging this failure, we get denial. Biden administration officials wrote off the crisis as "cyclical" and "seasonal" right about here, 11 months into his term.

Biden administration officials continued to insist that the border crisis was just part of the normal "ebbs and flows" at 35 months into his Presidency.

President Biden only finally admitted that the border is "not secure" all the way up there at the top, right at the 36-month mark.

What changed, Mr. Speaker, from "ebbs and flows" to just 2 weeks later that the border is "not secure"?

Mr. Speaker, there were no laws that changed during that time, just the will to enforce them.

The Biden administration created this crisis at the border with the stroke of a pen and these 64 executive orders, and, Mr. Speaker, he can end it with the stroke of a pen.

Be that as it may, there is no leadership. Instead, Biden administration officials treat border policy like a hot potato because it is politically thankless, and it shows.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. GONZALES, for introducing this resolution that methodically and thoroughly documents the Biden administration's border failures, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. Speaker, whatever complaints House Republicans may have with the Biden administration's immigration policies, this resolution will do absolutely nothing to address them.

They have had plenty of opportunities to work with Democrats on bipartisan solutions to reform our broken immigration system, and they have walked away time and again. Most recently, they rejected a bipartisan border deal negotiated by one of the most conservative Republicans in the Senate because Donald Trump told them to. He and they would rather preserve the issue for the upcoming election than actually work to solve problems.

So, here we are again, for the third time already this year, with a meaningless, nonbinding resolution that talks tough and accomplishes nothing. What better way to sum up this Republican Congress?

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to oppose this meaningless resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to understand that this policy is deliberate. If you voted for this administration, then this is exactly what you voted for. If you are surprised by that, then you weren't paying any attention because this is exactly what the Democrats promised to do. This is exactly what they have done, and this is exactly what they have defended for the last 3 years in this House.

The laws didn't change 3 years ago; the Presidency changed. An administration that enforced the most secure borders in our lifetimes was replaced by one that deliberately opened them to the world.

Last year, House Republicans passed legislation that will make it easier for future Presidents like Donald Trump to enforce our immigration laws and harder for Presidents like Joe Biden to undermine those laws, but that will require a new Senate and a new President.

The cold, hard truth is that this growing crisis cannot be fixed by bills that Senate Democrats won't pass and that Biden won't sign or enforce if they are signed.

This crisis can be fixed only by replacing this entire administration and their enablers and abettors in Congress with those who are devoted to securing our borders, restoring our sovereignty, defending our people, and enforcing the rule of law. That can only be done by the American people at the ballot box.

Until then, at every opportunity, we will decry and condemn these policies that are bringing such suffering and such harm upon our great Nation. Let us pray there is still time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1137, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. 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.

□ 1315

ANTISEMITISM AWARENESS ACT OF 2023

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 6090) to provide for the consideration of a definition of antisemitism set forth by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance for the enforcement of Federal anti-discrimination laws concerning edu-

cation programs or activities, 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 1173, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6090

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 "Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.), prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance;

(2) while such title does not cover discrimination based solely on religion, individuals who face discrimination based on actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics do not lose protection under such title for also being members of a group that share a common religion;

(3) discrimination against Jews may give rise to a violation of such title when the discrimination is based on race, color, or national origin, which can include discrimination based on actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics;

(4) it is the policy of the United States to enforce such title against prohibited forms of discrimination rooted in antisemitism as vigorously as against all other forms of discrimination prohibited by such title; and

(5) as noted in the U.S. National Strategy to Counter Antisemitism issued by the White House on May 25, 2023, it is critical to—

(A) increase awareness and understanding of antisemitism, including its threat to America;

(B) improve safety and security for Jewish communities;

(C) reverse the normalization of antisemitism and counter antisemitic discrimination; and

(D) expand communication and collaboration between communities.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Antisemitism is on the rise in the United States and is impacting Jewish students in K-12 schools, colleges, and universities.

(2) The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (referred to in this Act as the "IHRA") Working Definition of Antisemitism is a vital tool which helps individuals understand and identify the various manifestations of antisemitism.

(3) On December 11, 2019, Executive Order 13899 extended protections against discrimination under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to individuals subjected to antisemitism on college and university campuses and tasked Federal agencies to consider the IHRA Working Definition of Antisemitism when enforcing title VI of such Act.

(4) Since 2018, the Department of Education has used the IHRA Working Definition of Antisemitism when investigating violations of that title VI.

(5) The use of alternative definitions of antisemitism impairs enforcement efforts by adding multiple standards and may fail to identify many of the modern manifestations of antisemitism.

(6) The White House released the first-ever United States National Strategy to Counter Antisemitism on May 25, 2023, making clear

that the fight against this hate is a national, bipartisan priority that must be successfully conducted through a whole-of-government-and-society approach.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the term “definition of antisemitism”—

(1) means the definition of antisemitism adopted on May 26, 2016, by the IHRA, of which the United States is a member, which definition has been adopted by the Department of State; and

(2) includes the “[c]ontemporary examples of antisemitism” identified in the IHRA definition.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

In reviewing, investigating, or deciding whether there has been a violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) on the basis of race, color, or national origin, based on an individual’s actual or perceived shared Jewish ancestry or Jewish ethnic characteristics, the Department of Education shall take into consideration the definition of antisemitism as part of the Department’s assessment of whether the practice was motivated by antisemitic intent.

SEC. 6. OTHER RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) GENERAL RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) to expand the authority of the Secretary of Education;

(2) to alter the standards pursuant to which the Department of Education makes a determination that harassing conduct amounts to actionable discrimination; or

(3) to diminish or infringe upon the rights protected under any other provision of law that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to diminish or infringe upon any right protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution of 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 the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLINTOCK. 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 H.R. 6090.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6090 is designed to combat the deeply disturbing trend of anti-Semitic harassment in schools, colleges, and universities across the country. We are seeing it unfold right now on our television screens.

Anti-Semitic harassment on these university campuses is, unfortunately, not a completely new phenomenon. As early as 2005, the U.S. Commission on

Civil Rights warned that campus anti-Semitism had become a serious problem.

In 2013, a Pew Research Center survey of Jewish Americans found that experience with anti-Semitism was more prevalent among young adults in higher education.

In 2014, a Brandeis Center-Trinity College study found that anti-Semitism was particularly pervasive on college campuses, with 54 percent of Jewish students on 55 campuses having reported that they experienced or witnessed anti-Semitism during the 2013–2014 academic year.

In 2021, the Louis Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law conducted a survey of Jewish fraternity and sorority students, finding that most have felt unsafe at some point while on campus and in virtual campus settings. These fears are justified. The catalog of anti-Semitic harassment in America’s top institutions of higher learning is there for everybody to see. Those incidents have increased sharply following the October 7, 2023, terrorist attacks in Israel perpetrated by Hamas and its allied groups.

In late October 2023, at Cooper Union in New York, visibly Jewish students were forced to shelter inside a library as pro-Palestinian protesters tried to gain entry, banging on doors and windows, with the purpose of terrifying them.

On October 26, 2023, anti-Israel protesters assaulted multiple Jewish students at Tulane University in New Orleans.

On November 3, 2023, a Harvard law student and other anti-Israel protesters physically and verbally attacked a first-year Israeli student at the Harvard Business School while he pleaded with them to stop.

From October 7 until mid-January of 2024, the Department of Education has launched 51 investigations into complaints alleging discrimination based on actual or perceived shared ancestry in K–12 schools and colleges and universities.

From January 16, 2024, until today, the Department has launched over 45 investigations into schools and colleges. These investigations overwhelmingly concern anti-Semitic conduct in these schools.

In fact, on April 23, 2024, the Education Department launched an investigation into Columbia University, and we all know what is happening there right now. Hundreds of anti-Israel protesters have occupied Columbia University’s west lawn and erected dozens of tents, disrupting campus life and creating a hostile environment for Columbia’s Jewish students. Hundreds of pro-Hamas students were arrested for trespassing after repeated warnings to vacate the area, only to be released and returned to Columbia.

A rabbi at Columbia’s Orthodox Union Jewish Learning Initiative has advised Jewish students to leave campus because the university has shown that it cannot keep them safe.

Columbia revoked the campus access of a Jewish professor who has been critical of school administrators because the university said it couldn’t ensure his safety.

Speaker JOHNSON, Chairwoman FOXX, and Republican members of the New York delegation went to Columbia University last week and, while addressing the campus, were greeted by anti-Israel chants of: “From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free.”

What that calls for actually is the eradication of the Jewish people. We all know that expression is abhorrent in our society and, yet, it is going on, it seems now, hourly on our college campuses.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. The surge in the ancient bigotry of anti-Semitism over the years, especially since October 7, must not continue. It is long past time that Congress act to protect Jewish Americans from the scourge of anti-Semitism on campuses around our country.

The Antisemitism Awareness Act expresses the sense of Congress that discrimination against Jews may violate title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 when it is based on race, color, or national origin, which can include discrimination based on actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics.

The bill requires the Department of Education to take into account the 2016 International Holocaust Remembrance Act’s definition of anti-Semitism as part of its assessment of whether anti-Semitic discrimination has occurred. The IHRA definition provides a consistent framework for the Department of Education schools, colleges, and universities to apply to police anti-Semitic discrimination and harassment.

The IHRA’s definition is widely accepted and a vital tool for identifying and addressing discriminatory conduct that is motivated by anti-Semitism. It has been adopted by at least 31 States. This bill is exactly the type of legislation needed to protect Jewish Americans from harassment and attacks for simply being who they are.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I devoted much of my life to combating anti-Semitism, and I am as attuned as anyone to threats and bigotry aimed at Jewish people. I will take lectures from no one about the need for vigorous efforts to fight anti-Semitism on campus or anywhere else.

I am also a deeply committed Zionist who firmly believes in Israel’s right to exist as a homeland for the Jewish people. However, as someone who is also a longtime champion of protecting freedom of speech, I must oppose this misguided bill.

While there is much in the bill I agree with, its core provision would put a thumb on the scale in favor of

one particular definition of anti-Semitism to the exclusion of all others, to be used when the Department of Education assesses claims of anti-Semitism on campus.

This definition adopted by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, or IHRA, includes “contemporary examples of anti-Semitism.” The problem is that these examples may include protected speech in some contexts, particularly with respect to criticism of the State of Israel.

To be clear, I vehemently disagree with the sentiments toward Israel expressed in those examples, and too often criticism of Israel does, in fact, take the form of virulent anti-Semitism.

Many Jewish students no longer feel safe on campus, and some colleges have not done nearly enough to protect them. However, while this definition and its examples may have useful applications in certain contexts, by effectively codifying them into title VI, this bill threatens to chill constitutionally protected speech. Speech that is critical of Israel alone does not constitute unlawful discrimination. By encompassing purely political speech about Israel into title VI’s ambit, the bill sweeps too broadly.

As the ACLU notes, if this legislation were to become law, colleges and universities that want to avoid title VI investigations or the potential loss of Federal funding could end up suppressing protected speech that is criticizing Israel or supporting Palestinians.

Moreover, it could result in students and faculty self-censoring their political speech. Even the IHRA definition’s lead author, Kenneth Stern, opposes codifying the definition that he wrote, the IHRA definition, for this reason.

Vigorous enforcement of the Federal civil rights law does not depend on defining terms like “anti-Semitism” or “racism.” In fact, codifying one definition of anti-Semitism to the exclusion of all other possible definitions could actually undermine Federal civil rights law because anti-Semitism, like other forms of bigotry, evolves over time, and future conduct that comes to be widely understood as anti-Semitic may no longer meet the statutory definition.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot ignore the context in which this legislation is being rushed to the floor in a cynical attempt to exploit, for political gain, the deep divisions currently on display at college campuses across the country.

Much of this activity, whether you agree with the sentiments expressed at these protests or not, constitutes legally protected speech and expression. Some participants, shamefully, have exhibited anti-Semitic conduct, and the Department of Education will rightfully investigate them, consulting the IHRA definition and other relevant definitions in the process. They do not need this legislation to help them with their inquiries.

Some students have even crossed the line into vandalism, destruction of private property, and willful disruption of campus life. They too will face legal consequences, and nothing in this bill will affect that. There is no excuse for bigotry, threats, or violence directed at anyone, anywhere, and it is imperative that we confront the scourge of anti-Semitism. Congress can help, but this legislation is not the answer.

Instead of engaging in political theatrics that do not do anything concrete to stop anti-Semitism on campus, we need to put our money where our mouth is. Last year, the Biden administration outlined a comprehensive national strategy to counter anti-Semitism, the cornerstone of which was increasing enforcement actions by the Office of Civil Rights at the Department of Education.

President Biden’s budget called for a 27 percent increase in funding for that office. If my Republican colleagues are serious about fighting anti-Semitism, they would have fully funded that request. Instead, they bragged about proposing to slash funding by 25 percent, funding to enforce the laws against anti-Semitism on campus. They bragged about proposing to slash funding by 25 percent and ultimately insisted that funding be kept flat despite the marked increase in anti-Semitism complaints. If my Republican colleagues are serious about anti-Semitism, we would be considering legislation to codify the national strategy today instead of fiddling with definitions.

If my Republican colleagues were serious about anti-Semitism, they would have spoken up after neo-Nazis in Charlottesville chanted: “Jews will not replace us.”

If my Republican colleagues were serious about anti-Semitism, they would have spoken up when President Trump declared that there were “very fine people on both sides” of that rally.

Additionally, just last week, former President Trump downplayed what happened in Charlottesville, calling it a “peanut” compared to recent campus protests of the Israel-Gaza war, and we heard crickets from the Republicans.

We hear nothing from our Republican colleagues when some conservatives repeated anti-Semitic tropes about George Soros or others.

I say to my Republican friends: For too long, your selective silence on these matters has been deafening. If you mean what you say here today and if you believe that the threats and vitriol that Jewish students face on college campuses is unjust and that combatting anti-Semitism is more than a convenient talking point in your politically motivated crusade against institutions of higher education, then I beseech you: Please move beyond pointless gestures and posturing and actually help us protect Jewish students. Fully fund the administration’s efforts to counter anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination. Our Nation’s students deserve no less.

By contrast, this legislation threatens freedom of speech, one of our most cherished values, while doing nothing to combat anti-Semitism.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge Members to oppose the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the gentleman turn on his television and watch what is going on right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER), the author of this bill.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I respond to my colleague from New York and his misguided remarks.

In 2018, the gentleman was a cosponsor of the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act, which adopted the very definition that he just objected to. As a cosponsor of H.R. 5924, the definition that would be adopted is: “Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.”

He was a cosponsor of that bill.

H.R. 6090, which I introduced, which has 59 cosponsors, adopts the IHRA working definition and its contemporary examples. The definition is: “Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.”

It is the same definition, and, yet, now, somehow he is opposed to it.

Fundamentally, some of my colleagues on the left are allowing electoral politics to get in the way of doing what is right.

□ 1330

The gentleman from New York is a graduate of Columbia University, and yet couldn’t muster the courage to take the subway north to stop by and call out the anti-Semitism that is running rampant at Columbia University. It is exactly why this bill is necessary today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Antisemitism Awareness Act, and I thank my colleague, Congressman JOSH GOTTHEIMER from New Jersey, for his courage in leading on this issue.

In every generation, the Jewish people have been scapegoated, harassed, evicted from their homeland, and murdered. Many of us remember the Holocaust as the most recent large-scale instance of this, but it was hardly the first in the Jewish people’s long history of persecution.

Prior to October 7, it may have seemed like we were making progress

in fighting anti-Semitism, especially in the United States. A prime example: Jewish students weren't afraid to attend classes on their college campuses.

And yet today, we hear calls for *intifada* ring out on school grounds. We see Jewish students being physically prevented from going to class, rioters chanting "death to Israel" and "death to America," and so much more.

In the U.S., Jews account for only 2.4 percent of the population, and globally they make up 0.2 percent of the world's population. The Jewish people need our support now. They need action now. They need to know they have a place in our country now.

They cannot fight anti-Semitism alone, and they shouldn't have to either.

The Antisemitism Awareness Act requires the Department of Education to use the IHRA working definition of anti-Semitism and its contemporary examples when enforcing title VI violations of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Codifying a single definition of anti-Semitism will help the Department of Education and school administrators, who have been feckless, clearly identify instances of anti-Semitism and protect the safety of all students, including Jewish students.

Now, some opponents may try to make the argument that this imposes restrictions on our constitutional right to free speech. It is not true.

First of all, a constitutional protection is in the bill. It clearly states: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to diminish or infringe upon any right protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

Additionally, speech is already protected under the Civil Rights Act, but when the speech turns into harassment or other prohibited action and the action is motivated by anti-Semitism, that is when it becomes illegal conduct.

Right now, without a clear definition of anti-Semitism, the Department of Education and college administrators are having trouble discerning whether conduct is anti-Semitic or not, whether the activity we are seeing crosses the line to anti-Semitic harassment.

Other opponents to the bill say they would rather see a different bill tackling this.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAWLER. That is no reason, and no "political cover" to vote against another helpful measure.

I ask my colleagues who would prefer other solutions to consider the good it will do for the Jewish students and, yes, keep pushing for more change in the future. We need to hold these institutions accountable.

My bill has bipartisan support: 59 cosponsors, dozens of Jewish advocacy groups, including the ADL, the AJC,

and Agudath Israel. It is absurd to oppose this on the grounds that it somehow limits free speech.

Calling for death to Jews is not protected speech. It is anti-Semitic, and the fact that we have some of the highest-ranking Jewish officials in America refusing to defend the Jewish community because of politics is a disgrace, it is shameful, and it is pathetic.

Anyone who votes against this bill because they would rather put political expediency and electoral politics ahead of anything else has no business being a Member of Congress.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, never again is now, and we must act. That is our responsibility.

I would remind everyone, when you cosponsor a bill that accomplishes the same thing, nothing has changed, and yet now we need to backtrack all because of politics.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's remarks are slanderous.

First of all, the bill that I cosponsored 2 years ago was a different bill. It did not exclude—let me read from this bill: "The use of alternative definitions of anti-Semitism impairs enforcement efforts by adding multiple standards and may fail to identify many of the modern manifestations of anti-Semitism."

That is nonsense, and it was not in the bill that was, I think, about 7 or 8 years ago. The two bills are different.

Second, I oppose this bill because it infringes on freedom of speech, and there are Jewish groups, such as Reconstructionist Judaism, J Street and T'ruah that oppose this bill for the same reason, and they are not anti-Semitic. There are Jewish groups that support the bill. There are Jewish groups that oppose the bill.

I have been a supporter of Israel and of Zionism, and an opponent of anti-Semitism all my life. I have been active in Zionist organizations ever since I was in high school, and to say that anyone who votes against this bill is supporting anti-Semitism is a disgrace.

There are differences of opinion that occur on this floor from time to time, honest differences. Someone who opposes this bill may think that it infringes on freedom of speech. Someone who opposes this bill may note that the author of the IHRA definition that this would enshrine in law said don't codify it. The author, Kenneth Stern, said this is a good working definition that may indicate anti-Semitism. So are the other two, but it should not be codified into law because that could make, depending on the circumstances, free speech illegal. The author of the IHRA definition said that.

There may be legitimate differences of opinion between those who support

this bill and those who oppose this bill, but to say that anyone who opposes this bill supports anti-Semitism is a disgraceful slander.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in support of the Antisemitism Awareness Act.

We all know that since Hamas' brutal and barbaric attack on Israel on October 7, 2023, we have seen an absolute explosion of anti-Semitic attacks and violence now, especially on our college and university campuses.

There is no doubt that the free exchange of ideas is a crucial pillar of our freedom, but there is also no doubt that the conversations must be grounded in truth and respect for one another.

Leadership at institutions of higher learning across our Nation have allowed these anti-Israel protests and anti-Semitic protests to descend into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, they have failed to support Jewish students. Such hatred has no place in our society.

Mr. Speaker, by clearly defining anti-Semitism, the Antisemitism Awareness Act will help the Department of Education better enforce Federal anti-discrimination laws.

This bill will, for the first time, codify protection for Jewish students who are and have been subject to anti-Semitic harassment, intimidation, and violence. It is imperative that all students feel safe on their campuses.

As such, I urge this body to pass this critical legislation and do what university leaders will not do and that is condemn these acts of hatred and support Jewish students across the country.

I am proud to join my colleague, Mr. LAWLER, in supporting this legislation, and I look forward to voting for it today.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan bill, the Antisemitism Awareness Act, to ensure that we are standing up to the Jew hatred that is spreading like wildfire on campuses across our country. I am proud to lead this legislation with my friend and fellow Problem Solvers Caucus member, Congressman MIKE LAWLER from New York.

As we are voting today in real time, our country's universities are experiencing a tidal wave of anti-Semitism. Protesters have targeted Jewish students, haranguing them with awful Jew-hating insults and cheering on Hamas, a barbaric, foreign terrorist organization that murdered Americans on October 7 and still hold five living Americans hostage, including my constituent, Edan Alexander. I met with hostage families just this morning.

I saw these protests up close, like many Americans did, at Columbia earlier this month. I have heard the sickening Jew-hating, anti-Semitic comments comparing Zionists to Nazis, promising a redux of October 7 a thousand times over, and calling for “resistance by any means necessary” and intifada revolution. Intifada is used to call for a violent uprising against Israel and Jewish people.

These protests embolden Hamas, America’s enemy and Iranian-backed terrorist. In fact, they have put out a statement lauding professors as the leaders of the future. That is what our enemies said about the pro-Hamas protesters at these universities.

Let me clear up any confusion since I am a huge champion myself of free speech. This bill protects the First Amendment. It allows criticism of Israel. I ensured that. It was critical to me. It doesn’t allow calls for the destruction or elimination of the Jewish state, but it certainly allows criticism of Israel.

Even more, it reminds us that our universities have a title VI obligation to stamp out harassment on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot stand idly by as protesters call for the death of Jews on college campuses and across the country. This bill will require the Department of Education to use the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance or IHRA definition of anti-Semitism when carrying out title VI investigations.

IHRA’s anti-Semitism definition is the most widely recognized in the world. It is used by 36 countries. It condemns traditional hatred and the ugly, modern anti-Semitism that we are seeing on college campuses.

There shouldn’t be anything controversial about this bill. As was mentioned when it was first introduced in 2018, 50 Democrats and Republicans co-sponsored this legislation, including Members who are still in this body.

Right now, the Department of Education has 137 active title VI investigations, some of which have been open for years.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, the bill will give investigators a clear framework to evaluate anti-Semitism and finally hold harassers accountable.

Don’t just take my word for it. Thirty of our Nation’s leading Jewish groups back this bill. Under the last three administrations, the State Department has used the IHRA definition to monitor anti-Semitism worldwide. This bill takes a commonsense step to formalize the IHRA definition for our education systems. Again, three administrations accepted this definition of anti-Semitism.

When I was at Columbia University last week, I told the administrators

that we need deeds, not words to protect Jewish students.

Mr. Speaker, I am making the same ask of my colleagues. This bill is a critical step we can take to stand against hate. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in supporting this legislation and stand strong against anti-Semitism with no excuses, no claims of commas that they don’t like. Standing strong today against hate and anti-Semitism is what our country should stand for.

□ 1345

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I would never question those who oppose this legislation’s beliefs, their ideology, their religious faith. I do, however, question the motive.

We are in a moment of choosing, and there are not two legitimate sides to this issue. The erection of encampments on college campuses isn’t an expression of speech, it is a direct threat to Jewish students on college campuses.

Those who spew hate and ignorance and anti-Semitism in multiple horrid forms aren’t simply expressing a constitutional right; it is an infringement on the rights of Jewish students. Those who conduct themselves in this way are wrong.

They harass Jewish students who are innocently attempting simply to study. I know it and I have seen it firsthand, as I have visited students at Cornell and Binghamton in upstate New York. These students who think that they are simply extending their freedom of speech aren’t understanding the hate, ignorance, and violence that is emboldened by it. They are wrong to feel entitled that they can simply occupy buildings and public spaces and damage public property. They are wrong.

Congress should not only establish a firm commitment to the basic definition of anti-Semitism, but it ought to speak with clarity that this is wrong. Perhaps if we had said that decades ago, we wouldn’t see the escalation that we are seeing today.

Perhaps if college presidents simply accepted responsibility for the safety and security of their Jewish students, we wouldn’t see the violence we have today, we wouldn’t need law enforcement on college campuses to protect students. My God, we don’t and should never need that kind of enforcement to protect the rights of innocent students: not in tents, not occupying buildings, not threatening hate, violence, or ignorance. We shouldn’t need that kind of enforcement to ensure Jewish students can simply be Jewish students.

For that reason, I not only support the bill, I encourage my colleagues to do the same. Speak with clarity.

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

Mr. Speaker, every bit of conduct that Mr. MOLINARO described is loath-

some, as he says, but that does not mean that we ought to pass a bill that threatens freedom of speech.

This bill will do nothing to help stamp out anti-Semitism on campuses or anywhere else, but it will threaten free speech for the reasons I stated before.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my chairman, and I also found the remarks that were directed at you to be reprehensible. I know you and I know your commitment to fair play and the First Amendment.

However, I have questions about this bill, and that is why I am here to listen to the debate. I don’t know if Mr. LAWLER wishes to respond, but there is another bill, Representative MANNING and Representative SMITH’s bill. It is bipartisan. It has, I think, 15 Members of each party on it. I have been trying to get on it, but they are doing this crazy balancing act that eliminates certain people.

I yield to Mr. LAWLER to ask if he would support H.R. 7921 and work with Mr. SMITH to get that brought to the floor.

Mr. LAWLER. Sure. I think any legislation that we can bring forward to combat anti-Semitism is critical, and I think Ms. MANNING and Mr. SMITH have done a great job working to bring a piece of legislation forward. I have introduced a number. This is but one of them.

I think the objective is to clearly define anti-Semitism and force accountability on these administrators and make sure the Department of Education has the teeth to enforce the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his support for that, I think it is very important. I think it is a more inclusive bill, a broader bill. It takes in not just the problems at the universities but also takes on problems in the communities at large.

There has been anti-Semitism for over 2,000 years. The Jews have a homeland. Before they had a homeland, they didn’t have that sense of security anywhere where they were. It has been threatened so many times and so many places over the years, and it should not be taken from them.

I was concerned, and Mr. NADLER made the point, that in 2017 in Charlottesville there were national socialist movements, Vanguard America groups, traditional workers parties, Klan members, all kind of rightwing anti-Semitic crowds, racist skinheads that were in Charlottesville. They marched around saying: “Jews will not replace us.”

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. President Trump said there are good people on both sides.

Well, there are good people on both sides in Columbia, but there were not good people on both sides in Charlottesville.

That anti-Semitism needs to be addressed and has not been addressed by my friends on the other side, although Mr. SMITH has addressed it and there are others, so I don't want to paint a broad brush. There have been so many instances in history that have come not from these Palestinian supporters, but from skinheads, Neo-Nazis, and Klansmen, and that needs to be addressed. I think Mr. SMITH's and Ms. MANNING's bill addresses it. I hope that comes to the floor and we do a comprehensive attack on anti-Semitism.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I first thank Mr. LAWLER for his very, very passionate and articulate defense of our Jewish brethren. It was very, very moving, and I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago, my first human rights trip as a Congressman was to the Soviet Union to defend Jews against pernicious anti-Semitism. I never thought, however, that the anti-Semitic hate that I saw in Moscow and Leningrad could ever happen here, but it has. It is happening, and it is escalating.

The bigotry, intolerance, prejudice, and unbridled hatred for Jews and the Nation of Israel exploding on American college campuses today is absolutely disgraceful. It is morally impermissible and illegal that Jewish students are the targets of anti-Semitic hate and violence.

In both word and deed, Hamas is a terrorist organization that commits mass murder of Jews and seeks the evisceration of Israel. Don't believe it? Remember the horrific violence of October 7 and the ongoing ordeal of the hostages, or just read the Hamas Charter of 1988, the blueprint for genocide against Jews, a modern-day Nazi-like final solution.

As co-chair of the House Bipartisan Task Force for Combating Anti-Semitism, I thank my good friends and colleagues, MIKE LAWLER and JOSH GOTTHEIMER, for authoring the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act.

This important legislation will codify the IHRA working definition of anti-Semitism into title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the landmark anti-discrimination law. Schools that receive Federal funds must comply with title VI, and this bill will clarify that the Hamas hatred infecting our campuses must be dealt with as anti-Semitic discrimination that violates civil rights.

Special thanks, Mr. Speaker, to the police, who at great risk to their own personal safety are trying to mitigate the threats to Jewish students.

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

Again, anti-Semitism is a terrible thing. Hamas is a genocidal organiza-

tion which wants to kill all Jews, not just the State of Israel. There is no question about that. There is no question we have to fight anti-Semitism. There is no question the Manning bill is a good step in that direction. There is no question we ought to give the Office for Civil Rights the 25 percent increase the President has requested to enforce title VI on college campuses where there has been no question there has been vile anti-Semitism.

That, however, does not mean we should pass this bill. This bill enshrines the IHRA definition, and I would remind you that the IHRA definition's chief author, Kenneth Stern said: Don't codify it in law because if codified into law, it would be destructive of free speech. The author of the IHRA definition said that.

The bill also specifically excludes the Jerusalem and Nexus definitions. There is no good reason for that. All three definitions give examples of things that may be seen as anti-Semitism, that may indicate anti-Semitism. None of them should be codified into law, as this bill would do for one of them.

I don't know why one and not the other two, but this bill would enshrine one of them into law against the will of its own author, who said this is my best definition, but don't enshrine it into law, or, rather, don't codify it into law because if it is made law, it could infringe free expression, and that is why not only the ACLU, but J Street, T'ruah, the Reconstructionist Jewish Movement, and a dozen other Jewish groups oppose this law, not because they support anti-Semitism—they obviously don't—but because they both oppose anti-Semitism and support freedom of speech, and those of us who oppose anti-Semitism and support freedom of speech ought to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee of the House.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, America's colleges and universities are experiencing an explosion in anti-Semitism, including explicit support for terrorism. That these taxpayer-funded institutions have become forums for promoting terrorism is unacceptable.

Campus life has become a daily trial of intimidation and harassment for America's Jewish students. Two months ago, nine brave Jewish students described for the Education Committee how their schools have become hostile environments that include death threats and physical attacks.

At numerous schools, unlawful encampments now disrupt learning and endanger students. At Columbia, a campus rabbi warned Jewish students to leave campus. A Jewish Yale student was stabbed in the eye. The Anti-Semitism Awareness Act would provide a needed tool to help better determine anti-Semitic intent, which in turn would help ensure the safety of Jewish students.

I commend Representative LAWLER for this bipartisan, bicameral bill, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Calls for the destruction of Israel, our dearest and closest ally, are wrong. Attacks on Jewish students on college campuses are wrong, as well. I thank Representative LAWLER and Representative GOTTHEIMER for this fine piece of legislation, and I thank the chairman of the Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The only way you stop this is to take action, and the Judiciary Committee started that yesterday. We sent a letter both to Secretary Blinken and Secretary Mayorkas asking three simple questions: Are the students, are the people engaged in this activity, this wrong activity, this radical activity on campuses against Jewish students, are they here on a visa? If they are, is the State Department taking actions to revoke that visa? If the State Department is taking those actions, is the Department of Homeland Security looking to remove these individuals?

Pretty basic questions, pretty important questions I think the Congress has the right to know about and the American people have a right to know about if we are ever going to stop the egregious activity going on. In order to stop it, you have to take action.

We are a legislative body. We have a piece of legislation that begins that process. Let's pass this legislation, and then let's do the oversight to get the answers to those questions so the bad guys doing this stuff on college campuses can't do it on a visa.

Remember, at Columbia, 55 percent of the student body is here on a visa.

Maybe the American people have a right to know the answers to those three questions. We posed them yesterday to Secretary Mayorkas and Secretary Blinken. Let's hope we get an answer soon. Let's hope the Biden administration steps up and starts taking action to stop what is going on.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act.

The pro-Hamas protests we are seeing now play out on TV that are taking place on college campuses are living proof of what happens when we tolerate hate and ignorance.

I recently spoke with the aunt of a 4-year-old girl who saw her parents and siblings murdered on October 7 by Hamas, and she was held hostage for 51 days, a 4-year-old held hostage after

seeing her parents killed in front of her.

That is the behavior that anti-Semitic college students are tolerating? It is disgusting, and it is criminal. They are learning it from those at the very top. We had a hearing not too long ago where college presidents refused to state that calling for the genocide of Jews was against their code of conduct.

Jewish students should feel safe on campus and deserve to be treated with dignity and respect. All students do. The Department of Education needs to use every tool at its disposal to provide Jewish students with a safe environment to learn.

Our laws should clearly reflect that discrimination includes the indisputable anti-Semitic rhetoric calling for violence against Jews. There are far too many inexcusable examples from this year alone, and this must stop. It cannot go on.

□ 1400

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN).

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

Mr. Speaker, the events unfolding at our country's colleges and universities are devastating. For years, we have taught Americans and committed ourselves to "never again." Yet, we are watching the rot of anti-Semitism stain our American colleges and universities. We must reject the spoil of anti-Semitism and adopt a clear definition of what anti-Semitism is to better position college administrators and officials to respond to the terror these so-called protesters are bringing to Jewish students.

Many of these are not pro-Palestinian protests. They are ill-informed mobs who believe that Hamas, a terrorist organization, is somehow good for the people of Gaza. That couldn't be further from the truth. Hamas continues to use innocent lives as human shields and intentionally positions civilians in the middle of combat zones while using their tunnels to protect their own military leaders and fighters.

Is this what our Nation's students want to support?

To my colleagues across the aisle who have chosen to praise these anti-Semitism protests, is that what you stand for?

School administrators cannot straddle both sides of the fence here. We would not tolerate this sort of behavior toward any other group of students, and we must not start when the target is again on America's Jewish students.

All students deserve a safe learning environment, and by adopting this definition of anti-Semitism, our college campuses are more empowered to uphold and protect safe environments for Jewish students.

Congress must be clear. America stands with Israel, and we stand with Jewish students across every college campus in America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to stand with Jewish students and vote in favor of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support meaningful action to combat anti-Semitism. Unfortunately, that is not the legislation before us. We risk threatening freedom of speech while providing no new tools that the Department of Education does not already have to investigate claims of anti-Semitism.

The White House has developed a strong blueprint for countering anti-Semitism, and there is already legislation to implement these policies. We should be working together to pass that legislation and to provide our civil rights enforcement agencies with the resources they need to address anti-Semitism wherever it occurs.

This legislation is a distraction from the important work ahead of us to protect our students and all those who face discrimination. Not only is it a distraction, but it also threatens freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, you cannot fight anti-Semitism if you cannot define it. The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance offers us a clear and widely accepted definition rooted in the tragedy of the ages. After that horrific crime against humanity, the civilized nations of the world took a sacred oath: Never again.

To support that oath, these united nations restored the Jewish state to its historic homelands. That state is now under attack at home and abroad, and with this act, America stands with our Jewish brethren at home and abroad.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.R. 6090—Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2023.

In light of recent events across the globe and here in the United States, where anti-Semitic attacks and hate crimes have risen, this bipartisan bill is an attempt to codify the definition of "antisemitism"

Specifically, this bill would require the Department of Education to take the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism into account when determining if an action or practice that violates Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was motivated by antisemitic intent.

The IHRA defines antisemitism as the following:

"Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities."

In its list of examples of anti-Semitic conduct, the IHRA includes "[d]enying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor," and "[d]rawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis."

While there is both support and opposition for this bill it is important to highlight the issues and concerns.

Namely, there is a concern that this bill will undermine free speech by codifying a singular definition of antisemitism.

Notably, however, the bill language provides a provision to explicitly protect against infringement of the First Amendment.

Additionally, while the Department of Education already utilizes this definition of "antisemitism" in its enforcement of Title VI civil rights claims, there is a concern that forcing the Department of Education to "consider" a particular definition of antisemitism does nothing to protect houses of worship, check antisemitic threats, or otherwise keep students safe on campus.

Rather, improving civil rights enforcement should be the real key to fighting antisemitism.

In May 2023, the Biden Administration created a "U.S. National Strategy to Counter Antisemitism," a cornerstone of which is increasing enforcement actions by the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR).

Since the October 7 attacks on Israel, OCR has seen a dramatic rise in discrimination claims.

President Biden's budget called for a 27 percent increase in funding to OCR, but funding remained level for FY 2024.

Last year, House Republicans pushed to cut funds for federal civil rights enforcement on college campuses by 25 percent.

Ultimately, however, House Republicans refused to increase OCR's funding.

Instead, they have fought adequately funding OCR to meet the surge in anti-Semitism complaints because, in the political hierarchy governing their culture war priorities, undermining LGBTQ civil rights is more important than protecting Jewish students from discrimination.

I think we can all agree that the recent rise in antisemitism in the U.S. is a real problem, yet sadly House Republicans mostly ignored it.

Thus, it is important to highlight that any support for this bill should also include corresponding support for the agency tasked with investigating claims of harassment and hate.

Supporting such a measure while stripping away the tools to effectively carry out its duties is short-sided.

In particularly, as we celebrate Jewish American Heritage Month this May, I must reiterate my condemnation to the rise of antisemitism—and call on my fellow elected officials,

faith leaders, and civil society leaders to continue to condemn and combat antisemitism, and to identify and educate others on the contributions of the Jewish American community.

And so, as we celebrate the Jewish American community's contributions this month, we too must honor their resilience in the face of a long and painful history of persecution.

Indeed, as stated by President Biden in his Proclamation on Jewish American Heritage Month, 2024—we must all “remember that the power lies within each of us to rise together against hate, to see each other as fellow human beings, and to ensure that the Jewish community is afforded the safety, security, and dignity they deserve as they continue to shine their light in America and around the world.”

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address my intended vote on H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act.

This bill would require the Department of Education to utilize the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism when interpreting whether an action or practice violates the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

To be clear: I condemn antisemitism in all its forms and stand with the Jewish community as they mourn the losses sustained in the October 7 terrorist attack by Hamas and the subsequent increase in antisemitic incidents in the U.S. and around the world.

But requiring the Department of Education to use the IHRA definition would stifle free speech and curtail legitimate criticisms of the Israeli government's actions.

I concur with J Street, which noted: “On its own, the IHRA Working Definition, coupled with its contemporary examples, is broad and can label legitimate political speech and critique of Israel as inherently antisemitic. We are concerned that this concerted campaign to require the use of the IHRA definition and its examples by law and regulation creates significant opportunities for abuse and politicization, including by future MAGA-aligned administrations.”

This bill violates First Amendment rights to share and debate ideas and express peaceful dissent. It is too broad and could lead to colleges and universities banning student groups that aim to provide safe refuge, community, and space to discuss issues that are important to them based on the opinion or statement of one student.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, while I was unable to attend today's vote series, had I been able to attend, I would have proudly voted yes on H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act, which I am a cosponsor of. This legislation is an important step to protecting the American Jewish community, particularly in light of the alarming rise in antisemitic incidents across the country. The State Department has used the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) Definition since 2010, while the Department of Education has considered the IHRA definition of antisemitism since 2019 when reviewing, investigating, or deciding whether there has been a violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This legislation would make the IHRA definition the official policy of federal agencies, and I urge Congress to swiftly pass it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 6090 is postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1042. An act to prohibit the importation into the United States of unirradiated low-enriched uranium that is produced in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2116. An act to require the Secretary of Commerce to produce a report that provides recommendations to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of Department of Commerce programs related to supply chain resilience and manufacturing and industrial innovation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-398, as amended by Public Law 108-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, and in consultation with the Chairs of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, announces the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission:

The Honorable Carte P. Goodwin of West Virginia for a term beginning January 1, 2023 and expiring December 31, 2025.

MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 2925) to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, 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 1173, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, 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. 2925

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 “Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024”.

SEC. 2. USE OF MINING CLAIMS FOR ANCILLARY ACTIVITIES.

Section 10101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) SECURITY OF TENURE.—

“(1) CLAIMANT RIGHTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF OPERATIONS.—In this paragraph, the term ‘operations’ means—

“(i) with respect to a locatable mineral, any activity or work carried out in connection with—

“(I) prospecting;

“(II) exploration;

“(III) discovery and assessment;

“(IV) development;

“(V) extraction; or

“(VI) processing;

“(ii) the reclamation of an area disturbed by an activity described in clause (i); and

“(iii) any activity reasonably incident to an activity described in clause (i) or (ii), regardless of whether that incidental activity is carried out on a mining claim, including the construction and maintenance of any road, transmission line, pipeline, or any other necessary infrastructure or means of access on public land for a support facility.

“(B) RIGHTS TO USE, OCCUPATION, AND OPERATIONS.—A claimant shall have the right to use and occupy to conduct operations on public land, with or without the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit, if—

“(i) the claimant makes a timely payment of—

“(I) the location fee required by section 10102; and

“(II) the claim maintenance fee required by subsection (a); or

“(ii) in the case of a claimant who qualifies for a waiver of the claim maintenance fee under subsection (d)—

“(I) the claimant makes a timely payment of the location fee required by section 10102; and

“(II) the claimant complies with the required assessment work under the general mining laws.

“(2) FULFILLMENT OF FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.—A claimant that fulfills the requirements of this section and section 10102 shall be deemed to satisfy any requirements under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) for the payment of fair market value to the United States for the use of public land and resources pursuant to the general mining laws.

“(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection—

“(A) diminishes any right (including a right of entry, use, or occupancy) of a claimant;

“(B) creates or increases any right (including a right of exploration, entry, use, or occupancy) of a claimant on lands that are not open to location under the general mining laws;

“(C) modifies any provision of law or any prior administrative action withdrawing lands from location or entry;

“(D) limits the right of the Federal Government to regulate mining and mining-related activities (including requiring claim validity examinations to establish the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit) in areas withdrawn from mining (including under—

“(i) the general mining laws;

“(ii) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

“(iii) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.);

“(iv) sections 100731 through 100737 of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘Mining in the Parks Act’);

“(v) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); or

“(vi) division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘National Historic Preservation Act’); or

“(E) restores any right (including a right of entry, use, or occupancy, or right to conduct operations) of a claimant that existed prior to the date that the lands were closed to or withdrawn

from location under the general mining laws and that has been extinguished by such closure or withdrawal.”.

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 Natural Resources, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. 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 H.R. 2925.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024.

In May 2022, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed a lower decision revoking an approved mine plan for the Rosemont Copper Mine Project in Arizona. Commonly called the Rosemont decision, this determination upended decades of regulatory precedent and specific U.S. Forest Service regulations that allow approvals of operations on or off a mining claim so long as these operations meet environmental and regulatory standards.

If allowed to stand, the Rosemont decision would require the discovery and determination of a valid mineral deposit, meaning that operators must prove the existence of a commercially developable deposit on a claim before a plan of operations can be approved.

However, operators' plans of operations must include the intended uses of the surface of the mining claim, including those for waste rock placements, mills, offices, and roads. The mining plan of operations is key in determining the economic feasibility of a mining site, which in turn factors into the basis of determining which mineral deposits are commercially developable and, therefore, valid.

In short, the court's ruling puts the cart before the horse and fails to reflect the actual process of how one develops a mine. This bill would restore status quo as it existed before the misguided Rosemont decision and clarify that mine operators can continue to operate on Federal lands as they have for decades.

According to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, “It is the policy of the United States that . . . the public lands be managed in a manner which recognizes the Nation's need for domestic sources of minerals.” The Rosemont decision blatantly disregards this statement.

With mineral demand expected to grow exponentially in the coming decades, Congress must safeguard and defend the country's ability to access our own resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2925, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong but respectful opposition to H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act, as it has been named here, the fifth bill this week brought to you by our friends across the aisle, the GOP, who, unfortunately, this week seem to stand for guns, oil, and pollution.

My home State of New Mexico has a wealth of minerals, many of which are critical to the clean energy transition. We also have a very long history of mining. Mining, of course, has created thousands of jobs, supported economies across the Southwest and the country, and, of course, is an important part of our economies and communities. It has also left a toxic legacy of pollution in its wake.

As we move to the clean energy future, we cannot repeat the shortsightedness and injustices of the past. The Mining Law of 1872—let me say that again, 1872—a 150-year-old law that was signed into law by President Ulysses S. Grant after the Civil War, is still the law that governs mining on public lands to this day.

It gives mining companies rights over public lands that all other industries could only dream of. It makes mining the top priority use of our public lands and gives companies the right to develop any valid mining claim, no matter if that land is a sacred site, a beloved local recreation spot, the headwaters of a critical watershed, or a priority area for other kinds of development—not even if it would pollute a nearby community's water supply.

The Mining Act of 1872—not the bill before us but the one that is currently in effect—contains no environmental or community protections, does not require Tribal consultation, and does not charge companies a cent—not one—in royalties for the minerals that they extract on our public lands. Oil, gas, and coal don't even have that good of a deal.

Mr. Speaker, you heard that right. These mining companies, many of which are foreign-owned at this point, don't pay a cent back to the American people for the royalties of those publicly owned minerals. Not even Big Oil has a deal that good.

We cannot build a sustainable mining future for the United States on such a flawed foundation. This is a law from when the government was helping out prospectors, when it was chasing man's destiny, and we didn't care if we destroyed everything in our wake.

Wake up. It is the year 2024. We don't have to manage our public lands using

laws from the 1870s. Many of us agree that the mining law is badly in need of reform. Republicans, Democrats, Tribal leaders, local leaders, environmental advocates, even members of the mining industry themselves think that it is insufficient. What is astounding about the bill that is on the floor today, the so-called Mining Regulatory Clarity Act, is that it doesn't clarify the situation at all. In fact, it chooses to take us in the opposite direction, to before the 1870s. This bill removes the one frail safeguard that we have in that mining law of 1872. Under current law, a mining claim is valid only if it contains valuable minerals. Miners get the rights to the land only if there is something they can show to be mined there.

□ 1415

Under this bill, any American or, frankly, any American subsidiary of a foreign company, including those that are located in adversarial countries, can put four stakes in the ground on open public lands and pay less than \$10 an acre per year to have exclusive rights to that land forever.

This bill would create a free-for-all on our public lands. It would enable our public lands to be given away, not just to the highest bidder but to the first person who got there.

Mining companies—or really anyone with any motive—could lock up any public lands to conduct whatever mining-related activities they want, from destroying sacred sites to building a power plant to encroaching on recreational areas.

What if the public wanted to use the land for recreation? What if it was an important site for cultural reasons? What if we wanted to put renewable energy on that land?

Too bad. Under this bill, the mining industry can use it for whatever it wants, including to dump toxic waste.

Now, some of my colleagues say that this is just codifying the existing practice, but let me tell you, that is not true.

As bad as the mining law is already, and we are talking about the one from the 1870s, it at least allows for the invalidating of claims when the claimant can't show or prove that the lands actually contain a valuable mineral, but this bill doesn't do that.

We have seen that in Ranking Member GRIJALVA's backyard where the proposed Rosemont mine wanted to dump toxic waste on public land. It wasn't allowed because the mine's land claim was invalid.

Now, here is the thing: When the company lost its case in court, it immediately—and when I say immediately, I mean the same day. That company announced that it found an alternative waste site on private lands. Wow.

Clearly, there was not an imminent need. The company simply would have preferred to put its dumpsite on land that was basically for free from the American people.

Let's be honest about what this bill is. It is essentially stripping away the only safeguards we have in a deeply flawed, very old mining law to give away more giveaways to corporate polluters.

On behalf of Ranking Member GRIJALVA, whom our prayers and our thoughts are with today, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Pima County Board of Supervisors in support of responsible mining and in opposition to this bill.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE,
PIMA COUNTY GOVERNMENTAL CENTER,
Tucson, AZ, May 23, 2023.

Hon. Congressman RAÚL GRIJALVA,
House of Representatives,
Tucson, AZ.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRIJALVA: On May 16, 2023, the Pima County Board of Supervisors approved the attached Resolution 2023-12 opposing the Permitting for Mining Needs Act (H.R. 209) and the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act (S. 1281), and supporting meaningful mining reform. Since then, we became aware of H.R. 2925, which is identical to S. 1281. All three of these bills contain similar language intended to legislatively reverse decisions by the U.S. District Court for Arizona and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which halted the construction of the proposed Rosemont mine on the eastern slopes of the Santa Rita Mountains, within the Coronado National Forest. Located south of Tucson, within Pima County, this mountain range provides disproportionately high amounts of water for runoff and ground water recharge for the greater Tucson basin, is recognized worldwide for its biodiversity, is culturally important to a number of tribes, and serves as a respite for Southern Arizonans. The ruling confirmed that the Forest Service should have required proof that the mining company's unpatented mining claims were valid before permitting the mining company to dump waste rock and tailings on public land.

All three bills contain language that would allow those with mining claims to "use, occupy and conduct operations on public land, with or without the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit." In addition, those with claims could carry out mining activities on other federal lands absent of claims. This legislation prioritizes mining over other equally important interests and is likely to result in significant unintended consequences. This legislation would remove the ability of federal land management agencies to balance the need for other equally important uses of public land. Furthermore, this legislation is not needed. The mining industry still has the ability to gain access to public land via land exchanges, special use permits, and other permitted means. However, because these actions are discretionary, they allow for an informed and balanced approach to managing a multitude of uses across public lands.

This legislation also has a number of unintended consequences that are alarming for the State of Arizona and Pima County. Not only would these bills increase the ability for nuisance claims on Federal land that could block other necessary federal projects and increase destructive speculation without mineral extraction, our understanding is that they could also impact split estate lands. Split estate lands are lands where the surface is owned separately from the subsurface mineral rights. In Arizona, this is a common occurrence. For instance, the surface can be owned privately, by a local government like Pima County, or managed in trust by the Arizona State Land Department; whereas the subsurface mineral rights

are publically owned and managed by the Federal Government. Mining companies or others can make claim to these subsurface minerals, the exploration and development of which can significantly impair the rights of the surface owner to use the surface for its intended purposes.

As the Bureau of Land Management explains on their website:

"When the surface rights to a piece of land and the subsurface rights (such as the rights to develop minerals) are owned by different parties, the mineral rights often take precedence over other rights."

In addition, the legislation essentially makes mill site claims moot, which were one way that mines could gain access to federal land for waste and tailings in areas that specifically did not have mineral value. Congressional or administrative mineral withdrawals would also be substantially impacted, or complicated. Valid unpatented mining claims are protected or excluded from withdrawals, but this legislation makes moot the concept of "validity."

What is needed is comprehensive and meaningful mining reform, not these short-sighted changes that provide the mining industry with exclusive rights to public land.

Please know that Pima County is not anti-mining. The copper mines in Pima County have contributed significantly to national and international copper supplies. Pima County has a good relationship with our two largest copper producers, Freeport-McMoRan and ASARCO, and in particular has taken actions to support expansion of existing mining operations in the area southwest of Tucson. This area is less biologically diverse and more suitable for development, according to the County's comprehensive Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Section 10 permit, both of which were developed based on the best available science and informed by extensive public input. This area also has significant copper reserves for future development. Pima County has also worked cooperatively with two copper mining companies that proposed reopening an underground mine on Mt. Lemmon, north of Tucson, both of which voluntary offered to comply with the County's Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan and related conservation guidelines.

In summary, Pima County strongly opposes S. 1281, H.R. 2925 and H.R. 209 and the damaging intended and unintended consequences to the public health, safety and welfare of our community. In addition, we continue to seek comprehensive mining reform akin to the comprehensive, science-based and community informed conservation planning undertaken by our local community in partnership with Federal agencies.

Sincerely,

JAN LESHER,
Pima County Administrator.

Attachment:

RESOLUTION OF THE PIMA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OPPOSING THE PERMITTING FOR MINING NEEDS ACT AND THE MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT, AND SUPPORTING MEANINGFUL MINING REFORM

Whereas, Pima County and the Pima County Board of Supervisors have long advocated for meaningful reform of the 1872 Mining Law, acknowledging that mining is necessary and should occur in places and with methods that protect the health, safety, and welfare of our County's residents; and

Whereas, on January 2, 2023, the "Permitting for Mining Needs Act of 2023" was introduced as H.R. 209 in the United States House of Representatives; and

Whereas, on April 25, 2023, the "Mining Regulatory Clarity Act" was introduced as S. 1281 in the United States Senate; and

Whereas, both Acts do not provide meaningful mining reform and instead would make it easier for mining companies to gain access to federal lands at the expense of all other uses such as recreation, tourism, conservation, watershed protection, climate mitigation, traditional uses by Tribal Nations, cultural and historic preservation, healthy forest management, and other uses that contribute significantly to the local, state, and national economies; and

Whereas, both Acts would allow mining companies to ". . . use, occupy, and conduct operations on public land, with or without the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit." This includes dumping waste and tailings on federal land without the need to prove valid mining claims, as well as on federal land absent of claims; and

Whereas, both Acts would authorize actions where mining companies secure rights on our federal public lands through unpatented mining claims without proving that the claims are valid, actions that have occurred for too many years; and

Whereas, both Acts are intended to legislatively reverse recent decisions by the United States District Court for the District of Arizona ("District Court") in 2019 and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ("Ninth Circuit") in 2022 halting the construction of the proposed Rosemont Mine on the eastern slopes of the Santa Rita Mountains, located in Pima County, and the dumping of waste rock and tailings on 2,500 acres of unpatented mining claims in the National Forest; and

Whereas, the District Court's ruling, which the Ninth Circuit later affirmed, confirmed a long-standing concern, raised by Pima County since the beginning of the Rosemont Mine federal review process in 2006, that Federal agencies such as the U.S. Forest Service failed to consider whether Rosemont held valid unpatented mining claims; and

Whereas, the District Court's ruling confirmed that the Forest Service needs to consider reasonable alternatives when reviewing mining proposals, providing the opportunity for a more balanced approach to public lands management.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved That:

1. The Pima County Board of Supervisors opposes the Permitting for Mining Needs Act and the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act, as well as any similar legislation that attempts to allow mining projects on public lands in areas without mining claims and in areas with unproven mining claims, and supports meaningful mining reform;

2. The Pima County Board of Supervisors calls on Arizona's Congressional delegation to oppose the Permitting for Mining Needs Act and the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act;

3. The Pima County Board of Supervisors directs the County Administrator and the County's Federal lobbyists to take the necessary measures to communicate Pima County's opposition to the Permitting for Mining Needs Act and the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act;

4. The Pima County Board of Supervisors directs that communications to our Congressional delegation emphasize Pima County's support for meaningful mining reform and our record of supporting mining projects in Pima County that adhere to local health, safety, and conservation guidelines;

5. The Pima County Board of Supervisors opposes piece-meal legislation that does not address the issue of mining reform comprehensively; and

6. The Pima County Board of Supervisors affirms support for the rulings by the District Court and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which is consistent with past resolutions and actions of the Pima County Board of Supervisors.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, it is not just the mining industry that gets

to have free rein on these lands from other uses.

One of the things that is important to understand about the language in this bill is that any actor with a few dollars to spare could lock up these public lands and just sit on them until somebody buys them out.

That means anyone who wants to use the land, and that could be for recreation, renewable energy, transmission, or even for another mining claim, would be blocked out so long as somebody was sitting on that claim. Again, this bill takes away the only requirement to show an interest in actually mining the land and just rewards the first person to make a claim.

This bill is not only a giveaway to the mining industry; it is literally a giveaway of our public lands. It is completely mystifying because this isn't even what the American people want.

Our friends across the aisle continue to push for an agenda that the American people haven't even asked for. They voted to cut veterans' benefits, to raise healthcare costs, and to enrich and provide these corporate giveaways, just like in this bill. Where is this coming from? I ask my friends: Where is this coming from?

I urge my colleagues to vote against this toxic polluter giveaway, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

With all due respect to my friend from New Mexico, I greatly appreciate her passion to protect this administration, to protect an administration that is having an attack on American mining, on American energy that is causing prices to increase, for inflation to go up, and it is causing us to be more dependent on our adversaries like China for minerals and elements, like Russia, OPEC, Venezuela, all of the above, Iran, for our energy. I understand that she is passionate about that, and I respect her passion.

When we talk about an old, archaic mining law that Ulysses S. Grant signed into law in 1872, I am reminded of something our Founders did long before that.

In 1787, they passed or established our Constitution that says that there is separation of powers, that the legislative branch legislates and that the executive branch enforces.

Now, almost 250 years later, we have got an administrative branch, and thanks to the administrative state in the Administrative Powers Act, we have bureaucrats that think their job is to legislate.

We are not changing the law, the mining law. We are pushing back on rules that are being pushed out by an administration that thinks it is their job to legislate.

I will remind my friends across the aisle that 2 years ago, they controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House. They had an opportunity to change the mining law, and they didn't

do it. We are not changing the mining law. We are pushing back on overreaching regulations from the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the chair of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2925, the bipartisan, bicameral Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2023, offered by my good friend from Nevada, Representative AMODEI. I thank Representative AMODEI for introducing this legislation.

Nevada and Minnesota are both mineral-rich States, and they are both States that the Biden administration has targeted as part of their antimining agenda.

The bill before us is simple. It codifies what is known as the Rosemont fix. It restores the longstanding interpretation of the Mining Law of 1872, along with agency regulations governing hardrock mining policy on our Federal lands.

In May of 2022, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit upended decades of said law when it affirmed a lower court decision revoking an approved mine plan for the Rosemont Copper mine project.

The decision limited the ability of the Forest Service to approve necessary mining support facilities and activity, which is necessary for mining operations. This decision from the Ninth Circuit put virtually every new domestic mining project in jeopardy.

During our legislative hearing earlier this year, an official from the Biden administration argued that it won't be necessary to codify the Rosemont fix into law simply because of an existing solicitor's opinion from last year that he argued addressed the issue at hand.

However, this same witness also admitted the obvious. The solicitor's opinion can be rescinded or changed with the stroke of a pen. The solicitor's opinion is an administrative action that can be undone or changed at the whim of this or any future administration.

We all know the durability of administrative actions. These actions are law of the land for 4, maybe 8 years in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, considering domestic mining projects are multidecade investments, why would a mining company ever decide to invest billions of dollars in a project when they are only guaranteed 4 or perhaps 8 years of regulatory clarity? That is why the bicameral, bipartisan Mining Regulatory Clarity Act is necessary.

The only way to fix the Rosemont decision is to codify the fix in law. This legislation, contrary to what some of my colleagues will argue, won't radically change or create new domestic mining policy. It simply builds regulatory certainty and reinstates the longstanding interpretation of the Mining Law of 1872 and longstanding agen-

cy regulations that were the law of the land before 2022.

We are all well aware of the Biden administration's ambitious goals to transition to renewable energy and other technologies that rely on critical and rare earth minerals.

Mr. Speaker, if we can't mine these minerals domestically, thanks, in part, to the Rosemont decision blocking new domestic mines, where does the administration expect these minerals to come from? The only answer I can think of is adversarial nations like China.

Continued lack of clarity on the Rosemont decision is not a benefit to the American people but a benefit to the Chinese Communist Party.

The answer is pretty clear. You can either support domestic mining with the strictest environmental and labor standards here in the United States and across the world, or you can support Chinese Communist Party-controlled mineral supplies that have zero environmental standards, zero labor standards, and they use child and forced slave labor. That is a fact.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

I deeply appreciate my friends across the aisle for their clarification of their intent, but unfortunately, we can't go forward based on intent. We actually have to go forward based on the bill that they introduced and are asking us to vote on.

I am going to do a little reading from your bill to help clarify for the American people what this bill actually says.

First of all, it addresses security of tenure. For folks that aren't familiar with this kind of jargon, that means ownership, who gets to hold the rights to this land.

Then it defines the kinds of operations that would be tied to this tenure. So let me read them to you. This is what it says in the bill: "Prospecting, exploration, discovery and assessment, development, extraction, or processing." It also goes on to clarify that you can do any activity that is found to be reasonably incident to an activity described in another clause of this bill.

It goes on to say right here in the bill, words on the page, and this is what we were asked to vote on: The "Rights to Use, Occupation and Operations"—which we have already laid out is basically anything you want to do on the land—"A claimant shall have the right to use and occupy to conduct operations on public land, with or without the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit. . . ."

Yo. This is a giveaway of our public lands. You can say whatever you want on the floor, but the bill that we are voting on literally says: Whatever you want to do on that land, as long as you pay the fee of \$10, you show up, and you

make the claim, it is yours. This is a giveaway of public lands. It guts the only safeguard from our Mining Law of 1872.

I want to just make that clarification, and in a moment, we will get more into Rosemont, but I do want to take the opportunity to yield to my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico for yielding, and I thank her for also actually reading the bill. Sometimes the truth matters in these debates.

We have to take many things with a grain of salt. We have been lectured about national security from folks who just last week voted to deny aid to Ukraine. The pro-Putin caucus is actually lecturing us about national security. You have to take it all with a grain of salt or maybe with a glass of vodka in this particular case.

In regard to this bill, the mining industry says they need this bill to provide regulatory clarity. Well, if it is clarity our colleagues across the aisle are seeking, this bill certainly delivers it because in the name of regulatory clarity, they would let any mining company do, essentially, whatever they want in any open area of public lands.

We have our long-outdated Mining Law of 1872 that already gives more rights to miners than any other public land users by far.

Under current law, as long as they have four stakes in the ground and keep up with their nominal annual fees, any open public lands are theirs for the taking.

Of course, for our colleagues across the aisle, that is not enough. For the mining industry, it is never enough.

□ 1430

Under this bill, the land that they are after wouldn't even need to have valuable minerals for miners to hold a valid mining claim. Under this bill, they actually don't even need to have a mining claim at all. This bill would allow any activity even slightly related to prospecting, exploration, discovery and assessment, development, extraction, or processing of minerals, regardless of whether that activity is carried out on a mining claim. It also waives any payment of fair market value for the use of public lands and resources for mining-related activities.

My colleagues say they are interested in clarity. Let's be very clear what all of this means. If a mining corporation decided to build a large-scale power plant directly outside a national park to support their claim, they could do it under this bill. That same mining corporation could build a polluting processing plant right next to the power plant and suck the aquifers dry to support their mine, under this bill.

They could build a network of pipelines and roads or anything else the mining company decides is "necessary

infrastructure" across grazing areas or priority areas for renewable energy development or anything else they want.

They could also permanently bury sacred sites near their mining claim. They could bury it in toxic waste under this bill. None of these tangential activities would have to go through the usual evaluation of public lands use because they would be given the same priority rights the mining industry already enjoys on public lands.

If all of that wasn't enough, under this bill, the mining industry, or, frankly, any bad actor with a handful of dollars, could effectively block any other use of our public lands, like recreation, like natural carbon storage, access to traditional and cultural resources, renewable energy projects, or any number of other important uses.

This bill says that anyone—and I do mean anyone—could do any so-called mining-related activities on or off a mining claim for a mere \$10 per acre per year.

This entire bill is one of the most egregious giveaways of our public lands and resources most of us have ever seen, and that is saying something because we have seen a lot of proposed giveaways from our friends across the aisle. Our public lands would become the mining industry's playground or dumping grounds as they see fit.

There are other important uses for our public lands. Our public lands and waters should also be considered for solar, for wind, and for geothermal resources. This bill threatens to hand absolute control to mining companies and would jeopardize the crucial role public lands can play in responsible, renewable energy production, among other important uses.

Our public lands serve as substantial carbon sinks, aiding both communities and ecosystems in adapting to the challenges brought on by the climate crisis that our friends ignore and deny.

These lands should not belong to the mining industry and other exploitive actors. They should belong to all Americans.

Our public lands deserve our protection. We need real reform of this antiquated mining law from 1872 to put other uses of our public lands on equal footing with the mining industry. We need to prioritize Tribal sovereignty, community input, and environmental protection to give Americans a fair return for their public minerals.

The good news is, that bill already exists, and I am a proud cosponsor of ranking member Grijalva's Clean Energy Minerals Reform Act. It would do all of those important things. That is the bill we should be considering today. Instead, we have the bill before us that would double down on the mining law of 1872's worst ideas.

This is the wrong move for a modern, sustainable mining industry, it is the wrong move for America, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

As I talked earlier about the Constitution and how it is the legislature that makes the laws, it is not through an administrative rule and it is also not by court decision, not the third branch of government that gets to make the laws. It is Congress that gets to make the laws.

When the Court has stepped in and made a ruling that creates uncertainty, it is causing mines not to be developed in the United States. Mining companies don't know if they can get a permit. If they cannot get a permit, they have to prove that there is material there before they get a chance to develop the permit. We need this legislative fix that only Congress can provide, to provide clarity and certainty so that we can develop these mineral resources here in the United States, which simply isn't happening today.

I will remind my friends across the aisle that under the law that this bill would codify, operators must still, as they have for decades, submit a mine plan of operations to the BLM or Forest Service for approval before building a new mine under the authorities that we would be giving them in this legislation.

The Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service both have strict time-bound requirements on what a claimant must do to maintain a claim and what they can do with a claim on Federal land to conduct mining.

If a claim holder does not meet these requirements, BLM or the Forest Service has the power to enforce compliance or immediately suspend the claimant from the area.

Now, while my friends across the aisle are doubling down on this administration's attack on American mining and energy development, while they are cheering on the Ninth Circuit, Republicans are taking action.

Mining is not happening in the United States because of the impediments that my friends across the aisle are causing.

Where is mining taking place? It is happening in China. If you go back just to 1995 and take one mineral that is critical to the lower-carbon energy sector that my friends talk about so much, you can't do that without copper. In 1995, the United States produced over three times more copper than China. If you look at 2020, China is producing about 10 times more copper than we are.

This is one metal. We could repeat this chart for critical elements and for other metals. If you look at it for steel, we produced more steel than China in 1995. They produce 12 times more steel than we do today.

When these renewable energy projects take place, when mandates are put out there to build electric vehicles, where are these materials coming from? We don't have the processing capacity anymore either. We have got two copper smelters. China has got over 50.

China controls 60 percent of global production, an estimated 90 percent of

processing, and over 75 percent of manufacturing of critical minerals. In terms of individual minerals, China refines 72 percent of global-refined cobalt, 98 percent of global gallium, and 85 percent of global-refined rare-earth elements.

China also currently dominates the world's electric battery market, producing about 90 percent of the raw materials and 77 percent of global EV battery manufacturing capacity.

Disallowing domestic mining will only drive both our allies and ourselves into further reliance on China. We are disallowing mining at the same time we are putting mandates out there for people to drive electric vehicles.

By breaking even the first link in the Chinese global supply chain, we will be able to send strong market signals to American companies looking to invest in domestic mining and processing ventures. That is what H.R. 2925 would do.

The Republican ideas are pro-American and pro-American supply chain. They are using the resources that God has blessed us with. If we don't pass this bill, we are just going to be more reliant on China, and we are going to see less development in the U.S.

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

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

I want to take on some of these arguments to make sure that folks understand the broader context in which American mining and manufacturing occurs.

First of all, we just heard some claims that these mining companies can't figure out how to get their mines permitted. Well, I hate to inform my colleagues across the aisle, but most of our companies these days are multibillion-dollar, multinational companies that spend literally millions of dollars a year to lobby Federal, State, and local entities and to employ folks to navigate these processes. These are not entities that are struggling to figure out processes.

Secondly, the United States has not disallowed mining. There are many mines in operation. If my friends across the aisle would like to visit New Mexico, I can take you to one of the largest copper mines in North America. There is lots of mining happening in the United States.

It is true that up until the 1990s, we were a net exporter of critical minerals here in the United States. What caused American production to tank was not laws and regulations; it was global commodity prices, just like oil and gas. What happens when there is international competition is that local entities cannot compete because of competitiveness on the global commodities market.

We are all for American competition. We are all for Made in America. That is why our President, of course, has led, and the Democratic Congress passed, three major bills for a renaissance of

American manufacturing and our economy: The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, the American Chips and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act, which are making the largest single investment in reshoring American jobs in modern history. That is the reality of what is happening on the ground.

I want to take the opportunity to yield to my dear friend and my sister from New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEDGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEDGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, America was blessed by our creator with natural beauty and an abundance of natural resources, from grazing to farmlands to minerals, fossil fuels, solar, and wind so we could feed our families and fuel our progress.

We owe the American people, and, most importantly, our children and grandchildren, a duty to protect those resources so they are available for future generations and Americans are not left with public lands that have been degraded, mines that have been depleted, and profits sent off to foreign corporations. Yes, there are profits sent to China because they own some of those mines.

H.R. 2925 would make it harder to protect the lands that make this country beautiful. Worst of all, it favors the biggest mining corporations and even allows foreign corporations to take American resources for free.

There is a long history of bad actors exploiting, misusing, and abusing their mining claims, especially those corporations with ties to foreign adversarial nations.

H.R. 2925 would give away our Federal lands to these bad actors. Why would Republicans work on a bipartisan basis to ban China from mining American data with TikTok but then be okay with China mining American natural resources for free? Why?

Under the Republicans' proposal, Chinese corporations with the money could put four sticks in the ground, pay a fee, and then claim that land for mining without even proving the existence of these important minerals.

I also point out, in response to my esteemed colleague, that there is mining going on. As noted earlier, we have the Chino mine in New Mexico. It produces copper. It has been producing copper for generations, in fact, for hundreds of years.

Guess what. It is an American company. Freeport-McMoRan is an American company. It is international, but it is American.

We want to do that. We want to make sure that American companies are the ones mining American resources. These are public resources.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would bar companies from adversarial nations, including

China, from conducting mining activities on our public lands. They shouldn't be allowed to exploit American resources and pollute our public lands and to take those resources back to China for free.

Let's make sure the profits stay here, the resources stay here, and the innovation stays here. Why wouldn't my Republican colleagues support that kind of amendment?

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of this amendment immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEDGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in pushing back against China owning our resources and voting for this and making sure American companies are the ones owning our resources. I hope they will vote for the motion to recommit.

□ 1445

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

Mr. Speaker, I find it very rich that my friends across the aisle are bringing China into the equation now. The simple fact is that, under this administration and under this court ruling, nobody is going to be mining in the United States. They know China is not going to mine anything here under their policies, but also no American companies are going to be able to develop mines under their policies.

At the same time, they are pushing this electrification of everything and electric vehicles. They approved billions and billions of dollars in the so-called Inflation Reduction Act. That is hard to say because we all know it drove inflation higher. In that bill, the IRA, they approved billions of dollars to invest in things that require metals and critical minerals.

The question was asked in the opening statement: Who wants this? Who wants mining in the United States?

I think the answer is everybody wants what comes from mining except my friends across the aisle. They don't want it in their backyard. They want their cake, and they want to be able to eat it, too. They want to have all these metals and critical elements that can be used to make and manufacture the things that they think are going to save the planet, but they just don't want it to happen here in the U.S., where we have the strictest mining laws, the strictest labor laws, and the strictest safety laws. We do things right here. We recover mines correctly.

What they want to do is have all their electric cars, solar farms, windmills, and transmission lines and magically get this material from somewhere else.

There are mines. There are still mines all across this country, but the

fact is they are not even coming close to meeting the demands that we have. Even though we have everything we need in the U.S., it is just in the ground.

Reaching net zero emissions by 2050 would require more copper than has been produced over the entire course of human history. That is the challenge we face under Democratic policy: a demand for more copper than we have mined in human history between now and 2050 if we were going to get to net zero emissions.

How are we going to do that if we don't use the elements and minerals that God has blessed us with here in our country? The simple answer is that we are going to have to rely on somebody else to supply that. Guess who the number one supplier of nearly every one of those metals and elements is in the world today? It is China. That is the simple fact.

We can make a decision to either support H.R. 2925 and support American minerals and resources, or we can leave the status quo under the Rosemont court ruling and rely more on China and others, even Russia. We have talked about nuclear power, which could be a great contributor to zero emission energy. Most of our uranium now comes from Russia.

So whom do we want to rely on? Where do we want that wealth to go when Americans spend their money on energy and minerals? I would rather it stay here in America supporting American mining, supporting American jobs, and supporting American processing and manufacturing.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that we do have mining in our backyards. As the gentlewoman from New Mexico and I both noted, we have multiple mines in New Mexico. What we don't want are mines poisoning our watersheds and destroying sacred sites irrevocably. What we fear and what we know, based on the language that is in the bill that we will be voting on and that we are debating today, is that that would be the outcome of what they are trying to pass.

I also want to clarify for the record that we actually had Secretary Deb Haaland this morning in front of our committee. She stated this morning that the Biden administration has approved 40 new mines or mining modification permits just since President Biden took office, including 5 critical minerals mines, so the assertion that we heard this afternoon that there has been no new mining is just false.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there is another side to this story, as well. My colleagues can

try to frame it that they are okay with it in their backyard because they have some of it there, but for the future, they don't want any more of it in their backyard.

I am from Arkansas. We have about 10 percent of our landmass as Federal lands, but when you go out West, Federal lands can account for as much as 86 percent of the land area in certain States and can account for 75 percent of our Nation's metals production.

When you look at that, Mr. Speaker, more than one-half of federally owned public lands are already either restricted or banned to mining operations due to withdrawals under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, the Antiquities Act, and specific congressional actions.

If land hasn't been withdrawn from operation under the mining law, such as the land outside the Grand Canyon, then no new mining claims can be staked.

So, I am asking, how much is enough? How much of our land do we have to lock up and say that you can't have access, can't manage it, can't produce energy off of it, and can't mine on it?

It seems as if, as time goes on, the answer is all of it. We want to lock all of it up. We want to be reliant on somebody else who is doing a lot more damage to the environment somewhere on the planet than we do here in the U.S. when we mine in a very environmentally friendly manner and sustainably with the highest levels of standards.

Mr. Speaker, we can try to frame this any way you want to, but when we are having to import so much of our metals and critical minerals when they are right here in the ground in the United States, then that is a "not in my backyard" policy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to address the specific example that was just brought forward about a mining exclusion in the Grand Canyon because I believe that the exclusion that we are talking about was to mine uranium in the Grand Canyon.

Now, I ask the American people: Is that what you would like to see?

In New Mexico, we know the legacy of uranium mining. Our communities are dying from it, the mining communities whose water has been poisoned for generations and those who have been impacted by the materials that were built from that uranium.

That is why Congresswoman LEGER FERNANDEZ has been leading an effort that is bipartisan and bicameral with our colleagues from New Mexico to get a RECA amendment passed in this Chamber so that we can help address those communities.

That is why we should not be mining uranium in the Grand Canyon.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to assert my firm belief that we should not be mining uranium in the Grand Canyon.

Nobody was ever proposing to mine uranium in the Grand Canyon, but a favorite talking point of my colleagues across the aisle is to say that these evil mining companies are going to be mining uranium in the Grand Canyon.

It is as if there is going to be this big excavator reaching over the side, digging out and making the Grand Canyon even more grand. The uranium deposits are well outside the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park. They are in land north of the Grand Canyon between the boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park and the State of Utah.

It is an easy talking point to say that we are going to ban mining in the Grand Canyon. Guess what, Mr. Speaker? I don't know anybody who wants to mine in the Grand Canyon.

I do want to reiterate and push back on the assertion that the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act is unnecessary and that mining companies should have to prove the existence of a valid claim before beginning any operations.

A 2020 Department of the Interior solicitor's opinion stated: "As a practical matter, requiring the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit before allowing any reasonably incident mining uses, including the removal of any minerals, puts the cart before the horse, since such uses and removal are necessary to make a discovery. If entering open lands to explore for and develop minerals is considered 'unauthorized' unless or until miners have proven a discovery of a valuable mineral deposit, they could not, as a practical matter, ever discover a valuable mineral deposit and all mining would effectively be prohibited. Such an outcome was clearly not the intent of Congress, in no small part because such an interpretation would also leave many, if not most, miners legally in trespass." That all came from that solicitor's opinion.

It is clear that H.R. 2925 is a legislative fix that only Congress can provide. It is needed to provide clarity and certainty in the United States' ability to responsibly mine materials essential to our national security and to make us economically competitive.

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of H.R. 2925 would like to argue that this bill is a surgical fix to a problem created by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' decision on the Rosemont Copper Mine. If this is surgery, then like the mining law of 1872, it is surgery with an ax, not a scalpel. If that evokes an image for you of our post-Civil War surgical maneuvers, then that is what this bill

does because it takes away guardrails to protect our communities.

Let's clarify. In 2022, a panel of the Ninth Circuit Court ruled that the proposed Rosemont mine in southern Arizona could not use invalid mining claims to permanently bury Colorado's thousands of acres of national forests in mining waste, including sites that were sacred to multiple Tribes. The court ruled that it was not a valid mining claim to do this.

The requirement that mining claims must contain valuable minerals for the claim to be valid is a core tenet of the mining law. It is the one, as we have said, fragile guardrail that we have in this antiquated law.

For over 150 years, the mining law of 1872 has given mining precedence over all other uses and values of our public lands. This imbalance of power has left a toxic trail of pollution, destruction, and desecration of sacred sites, and it continues to impact our communities today.

We urgently need to reform the mining law. Instead, the bill that is being put forward here today would make things worse and take us back. It is such a breathtaking giveaway of our public lands that former Department of the Interior Solicitor John Leshy said that it should be called the mining charity act because of the giveaways for these mining companies rather than the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act.

This bill allows anyone to put a stake in the ground in any open public land and pay less than \$10 a year to make a claim to those rights forever. Our public land managers have long said that once there is a mining claim in place, they cannot say no to anything mining related on that land.

If this bill becomes law, then the mining industry would be free to pick and choose which of our public lands to lock away and then permanently bury, destroy watersheds, or pollute our communities, to do whatever it wants on those lands that it has tied up. The unintended consequences of this bill go far beyond mining and could hurt our communities irrevocably.

I want to reiterate that this bill empowers anyone with a few dollars, including foreign companies in adversarial nations, to blanket our public lands in untouchable mining claims and block other uses of this land. This bill will create chaos, not clarity, on our public lands.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2925. Contrary to the misconceptions that I have heard regarding the bill, this legislation does not grant mining companies free license to do whatever they want on Federal lands. It does not exempt mining activity from NEPA or any

other environmental review. It does not allow companies to subvert governmental authority or oversight. It simply restates over a century of mining law and decades of regulatory practice.

In passing this bill, we will reaffirm American miners' rights to operate under the law, just as they have done for decades, to provide the essential materials we depend on every day.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman AMODEI for his work to bring H.R. 2925 to the floor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, 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.

Motion to Recommit

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Leger Fernandez of New Mexico moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2925 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Ms. Leger Fernandez moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2925 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. BARRING ADVERSARIAL NATIONS FROM OPERATING ON PUBLIC LAND.

Section 10101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) BARRING ADVERSARIAL NATIONS FROM OPERATING ON PUBLIC LAND.—A mining claimant shall be barred from the right to use, occupy, and conduct operations on public land if the Secretary of the Interior finds the claimant has a parent company that is incorporated in, located in, or controlled by an adversarial nation.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1500

ALASKA'S RIGHT TO PRODUCE
ACT OF 2023

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call

up the bill (H.R. 6285) to ratify and approve all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the establishment and administration of the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program, 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. SELF). Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 118-477 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6285

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 “Alaska’s Right to Produce Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) *Congress provided clear authorization and direction that the Secretary of the Interior “shall establish and administer a competitive oil and gas program for the leasing, development, production, and transportation of oil and gas in and from the Coastal Plain” in section 20001 of Public Law 115-97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note) (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act);*

(2) *the timely administration of the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program is required and in the national and public interest;*

(3) *the Department of the Interior’s cancelling of the leases for the covered Coastal Plain lease tracts represents a major decision of economic and political significance that Congress did not delegate to the Secretary;*

(4) *the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.) requires that the Bureau of Land Management—*

(A) *allow for the exploration, development, and production of petroleum products in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska; and*

(B) *balance, to the extent consistent with that Act, the protection of ecological and cultural values in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska; and*

(5) *the proposed rule of the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Management and Protection of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska” (88 Fed. Reg. 62025 (September 8, 2023)) fails to reflect the intent of Congress for the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.).*

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COASTAL PLAIN.**—*The term “Coastal Plain” has the meaning given the term in section 20001(a) of Public Law 115-97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note).*

(2) **COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM.**—*The term “Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program” means the program established under section 20001(b)(2)(A) of Public Law 115-97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note).*

(3) **COVERED COASTAL PLAIN LEASE TRACT.**—*The term “covered Coastal Plain lease tract” means any of tracts 16, 17, 24, 26, 27, and 30 as listed in exhibit B of the document published by the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Amendment to the Detailed Statement of Sale” and dated December 18, 2020 (relating to oil and gas leasing within the Coastal Plain Alaska).*

(4) **RECORD OF DECISION.**—The term “Record of Decision” means the record of decision described in the notice of availability of the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Notice of Availability of the Record of Decision for the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program, Alaska” (85 Fed. Reg. 51754 (August 21, 2020)).

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF ORDERS.

(a) **MORATORIUM ON OIL AND GAS LEASING.**—Any order or action by the President or the Secretary that has the effect of placing a moratorium on or otherwise suspending or pausing oil and gas leasing in the Coastal Plain shall have no force or effect.

(b) **APPROVAL AND RATIFICATION OF EXISTING DOCUMENTATION AND AUTHORIZATIONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Congress—

(1) ratifies and approves all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law, as described in the Record of Decision, necessary for the establishment and administration of the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program; and

(2) directs the Secretary, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the heads of other as applicable Federal departments and agencies to process, reinstate, or continue to maintain such authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders described in paragraph (1).

(c) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAW.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders described in subsection (b)(1) shall be considered to satisfy the requirements of—

(1) section 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3142);

(2) section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c));

(3) section 20001 of Public Law 115–97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note);

(4) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(5) subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 5. COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM.

(a) **REISSUANCE OF CANCELED LEASES.**—

(1) **ACCEPTANCE OF BIDS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, without modification or delay—

(A) accept the highest valid bid for each covered Coastal Plain lease tract for which a valid bid was received on January 6, 2021, pursuant to the requirement to hold the first lease sale in the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program; and

(B) provide the appropriate lease form to each winning bidder under subparagraph (A) to execute and return to the Secretary.

(2) **LEASE ISSUANCE.**—On receipt of an executed lease form under paragraph (1)(B) and payment in accordance with that lease of the rental for the first year, the balance of the bonus bid (unless deferred), and any required bond or security from the high bidder, the Secretary shall promptly issue to the high bidder a fully executed lease, in accordance with—

(A) the applicable regulations, as in effect on January 6, 2021; and

(B) the terms and conditions of the Record of Decision.

(b) **REQUIREMENT FOR FUTURE LEASES.**—

(1) **SECOND LEASE SALE.**—Not later than December 22, 2024, the Secretary shall conduct the second lease sale required by section 20001(c)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of Public Law 115–97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note) in accordance with the Record of Decision.

(2) **EXCEPTIONS FOR CANCELING A LEASE.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President and the Secretary may not cancel a lease issued under the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program if the Secretary has previously opened bids for such a lease or disclosed the high bidder for any tract that was included in a lease sale under the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program unless the lessee is in violation of the terms of the lease and fails to cure the violation after a reasonable period of time.

(c) **APPLICABILITY OF PRIOR RECORD OF DECISION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and with respect to reissuing leases under subsection (a), the Record of Decision shall be considered to satisfy the requirements of—

(1) section 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3142);

(2) section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c));

(3) section 20001 of Public Law 115–97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note);

(4) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–205; 16 U.S.C. 1533); and

(5) subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) **WITHDRAWAL OF SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—The Director of the Bureau of Land Management—

(1) shall withdraw the notice of availability entitled “Notice of Availability of the Draft Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement” (88 Fed. Reg. 62104 (September 8, 2023)); and

(2) may not take any action to finalize, implement, or enforce the supplemental environmental impact statement described in paragraph (1).

(e) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—

(1) **JUDICIAL PRECLUSION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in paragraph (2), no court shall have jurisdiction to review any action taken by the Secretary, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, a State administrative agency, an Indian Tribe, or any other Federal agency acting pursuant to Federal law that grants an authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval described in section 4(b) for the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program, whether issued prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, and including any lawsuit or any other action pending in a court as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **FORUM EXCLUSIVITY.**—The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any claim regarding—

(A) the validity of this section; or

(B) the scope of authority conferred by this section.

(3) **RIGHT TO PETITION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a lease holder may obtain a review of an alleged failure by an agency to act in accordance with section 20001 of Public Law 115–97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note) or with any law pertaining to the grant of an authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval related to the lease holder’s lease by filing a written petition with a court of competent jurisdiction seeking an order under subparagraph (B).

(B) **DEADLINES.**—If a court of competent jurisdiction finds that an agency has failed to act in accordance with section 20001 of Public Law 115–97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note) or with any law pertaining to the grant of an authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval related to the lease holder’s lease, the court shall set a schedule and deadline for the agency to act as soon as practicable, which shall not exceed 90 days from the date on which the order of the court is issued, unless the court determines a longer time period is necessary to comply with applicable law.

SEC. 6. NULLIFICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL AGENCY ACTIONS.

(a) **NPRA RULE.**—The final rule based on the proposed rule of the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Management and Protection of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska” (88 Fed. Reg. 62025 (September 8, 2023)) shall have no force or effect.

(b) **EXECUTIVE ORDER 13990.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4 of Executive Order 13990 (86 Fed. Reg. 7037; relating to protecting public health and the environment and restoring science to tackle the climate crisis) shall have no force or effect.

(2) **FUNDING.**—No Federal funds may be obligated or expended to carry out section 4 of the Executive Order described in paragraph (1).

(c) **SECRETARIAL ORDER 3401.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Secretarial Order 3401 (relating to the Comprehensive Analysis and Temporary Halt on all Activities in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Relating to the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program), issued by the Secretary on June 1, 2021, shall have no force or effect.

(2) **FUNDING.**—No Federal funds may be obligated or expended to carry out the Secretarial Order described in paragraph (1).

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 Natural Resources, or their respective designees.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 118–477, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. 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 H.R. 6285.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6285, Alaska’s Right to Produce Act.

H.R. 6285, introduced by Congressman STAUBER, would block the Biden administration’s attacks on Alaska, its North Slope communities, and their elected indigenous leaders.

Last September, the Biden administration announced two decisions that would disenfranchise Alaskan and North Slope communities.

First, the administration announced it was rescinding energy leases in the 1002 Area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or ANWR.

When it passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Congress approved and mandated the Department of the Interior for commercial leasing, exploration, development, and production in the 1002 Area. Production in the 1002 Area would be limited to roughly 2,000 acres out of the 19-million-acre refuge. This is just a tiny postage stamp when looking at the big picture.

Specifically, the law required the Department to conduct two lease sales in ANWR, the first by December 2021 and the second by December 2024. The Trump administration held the first lease sale, but the Biden administration immediately halted it and canceled the leases without warning last September.

Again, this was a law passed by Congress. Congress mandated lease sales in the 1002 Area with the goal of improving energy security and generating revenue for our country, the State of Alaska, and local communities on the North Slope. The funds these energy projects generate are necessary to support public projects and basic amenities, like roads and modern water and sewer systems, which have only recently arrived on the North Slope within the last 40 years. These amenities are ubiquitous to the lower 48, but the infrastructure is still being developed up in the North Slope.

In a hearing on these issues in September, Nagruk Harcharek, president of The Voice of the Arctic Inupiat, testified on the importance of energy production to quality of life for Alaskans living on the North Slope: “We can quantify the powerful impact of these projects by observing the increase of life expectancy on the North Slope. In 1969, before our people had any land rights and no economic prospects as a result, life expectancy was just 34 years. By 1980, our average life expectancy was 65, roughly equivalent with Libya and lower than North Korea. Today, our people can expect to live to an average of 77 years. This increase, the most dramatic in the United States, can be directly connected to the proliferation of a basic economy, modern infrastructure, and services supported by resource development projects.”

While the administration canceled the ANWR leases, it also issued a proposed rulemaking for the management of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, or NPR-A. This rulemaking, the final version of which was announced 2 weeks ago, would lock up 13 million acres out of the 23 million acres that comprise the petroleum reserve and make it more challenging to conduct exploration and production activities in the rest of the petroleum reserve.

To make matters worse, meaningful engagement with local governments, Alaska Native corporations, federally recognized Tribes, and Tribal nonprofits across the North Slope of Alaska was severely lacking throughout the rulemaking process. It was utterly

nonexistent before the rule was proposed. Additionally, an affront to the communities on the North Slope, the rule was proposed during the whaling season and overlapped with the ANWR comment period.

When pressed to provide more time to comment during a virtual meeting, Department officials explained that they couldn't extend the comment period further because of the Congressional Review Act.

These actions and the utter lack of meaningful engagement and input were planned by the entire Alaska delegation, along with every elected official, local governments, Alaska Native corporations, federally recognized Tribes, and Tribal nonprofits across the North Slope of Alaska.

Again, I thank Congressman STAUBER for his work on this bill to repeal these disastrous actions by the Biden administration and for listening to the voices of Alaskans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 6285, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, instead of dealing with the real problems facing Americans every day, we are back on the House floor talking about the GOP agenda—guns, oil, and polluters. It is a relentless mission to wreak havoc on our planet and communities, but before we go into the merits of this bill, here is a dose of reality.

Last year, as our Republican friends turned a blind eye, the global climate surpassed 2 degrees Celsius, a threshold that ought to be taken quite seriously. For the first time in recorded history, we passed this threshold, and that made it the hottest year on record.

Experts have determined that a 2-degree rise in global temperatures will inarguably cause dangerous and cascading effects on humans and our planet. That hasn't stopped my colleagues across the aisle. It is as if the majority is playing a dangerous game of chicken with our environment, betting against Mother Nature.

In the disaster department, 2023 was a showcase of calamity. We tallied up a staggering \$63 billion in weather-related catastrophes. This includes 19 severe storms, 2 tropical cyclones, 4 floods, a winter weather event, a drought, and a wildfire event. It is as if Republicans were sitting on the front row with the popcorn in their hands, leaning over to ask their oil and gas buddies what they needed in addition to all the other giveaways they have received from the Republican majority.

There is actually even more. In a display of unparalleled negligence, 2023 also came with 10 oil tanker spills because apparently the GOP agenda is also: Spill, baby, spill, and let the taxpayer foot the bill.

We are not even talking yet about pipeline leaks. Every day in America, some aspect of this spiderweb of fossil

fuel infrastructure is exploding, bursting, leaking, spilling. Last fall, there were almost 1.1 million gallons of crude oil released into the Gulf of Mexico, yet my friends across the aisle don't ever legislate about that or do oversight about that. Republican Members don't talk about it or acknowledge it. One has to wonder if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle even care about it.

Here we are again with an effort to expand our Nation's carbon footprint and expose our coastal communities to future disasters and oil spills. Not only does this bill grant access to one of our most ecologically sensitive and difficult regions to productively drill, but it reverses significant strides by the Biden administration to protect lands that Tribal nations have occupied and held sacred since time immemorial.

The Arctic refuge is one of the last truly wild places left in America, and the urgency to preserve the Arctic refuge transcends environmental concerns. It is a rallying cry against irreversible devastation and destruction, things that would fundamentally change and ruin this unique, fragile, and wild place.

The coastal plain, which is the heart of the Porcupine caribou herd's calving grounds, hosts nearly 200 migratory bird species annually. Equally vital, the 9,000-strong Gwich'in Nation, whose subsistence and culture depend on the caribou herd, resides along the migratory route. This means that development in this area would disrupt not only biodiversity, but it would be an assault on their indigenous livelihoods and traditions.

We have already seen how that plays out. In Nuiqsut, the Alaska Native village nearest to the Willow oil and gas project, 70 percent of households rely on subsistence resources for more than half of their diet. With the new Willow development, hunters are being forced to travel farther and farther to find resources and avoid hunting grounds that are now dominated by the fossil fuel industry. Rolling back NPR-A protections would make matters even worse.

In the Bering Sea, which is home to many unique marine ecosystems and rich in indigenous cultures, sea ice is melting earlier and freezing later. This threatens access to subsistence hunting and fishing grounds. Any increased vessel traffic related to oil and gas development would further stress and create risk for an already vulnerable ecosystem.

Exploiting these sensitive areas is equivalent to sacrificing those on the front lines of the climate crisis as martyrs in order to temporarily quench the insatiable thirst of Big Oil for money.

Let's get one more thing clear. The drilling that would be green-lighted in this bill would not make us energy independent. The United States is already the number one producer of oil and gas in the world. We are exporting record amounts of fossil fuel, but consumers still get hit with price shocks

anytime OPEC decides to raise prices or Russia starts a war in Europe because oil and gas are global commodities.

Fossil fuel dependence is not true energy independence because you are always on the roller coaster. You are always subject to the whims of some cartel, somebody gaming the global commodity market, some explosion, some international event.

If we want energy independence, we need a transition to clean energy, which is cheaper, safer, and generated entirely here at home, instead of being at the mercy of global price shocks like oil and gas.

The Republican agenda is predictable, repetitive, and dangerous. They need to stop putting polluters over people.

Enough is enough. We can no longer exploit our frontline communities and delicate ecosystems to pad the pockets of the fossil fuel industries and its GOP cronies.

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

□ 1515

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the lead sponsor of this bill.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6285, Alaska's Right to Produce Act.

From Minnesota to Alaska, President Biden has repeatedly prevented the responsible production of America's abundant natural resources.

In Minnesota's Eighth District, which I am proud to represent, the Biden administration banned mining, locking up the world's largest untapped copper-nickel mine in the world.

Now he has turned his focus to the great State of Alaska, where he has made multiple moves to block energy development on Alaska's North Slope.

Last fall, the Biden administration first announced their plans to cancel the remaining oil and gas lease sales in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and limit energy development within the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. I will repeat that, National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. And within the last 2 weeks, the Biden administration finalized this devastating blow to the Alaska communities.

To quote from the testimony of Charles Lampe, the president of Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation in response to these actions, "We are a small community that suffers as the Federal winds blow and feel the Biden administration is working to effectively erase us from the land that we have inhabited for hundreds of years."

These actions have only further reinforced my view that Biden's energy and mining policy can be summed up as "anywhere but America, any worker but American."

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration has levied more sanctions

against the great State of Alaska than they have Iran. The Biden administration has put 63 sanctions against energy production in Alaska, more than Iran. In fact, they are taking off sanctions from Iran. This administration has taken off sanctions from Iran.

They are punishing the great State of Alaska. It is uncalled for. Not only does this decision run counter to the wishes of Alaska's Tribes and other hardworking Alaskans who stood to benefit from the jobs, opportunities, and revenue that the responsible production of these resources would create, but it will further cement our reliance on Iran, Russia, China, and Venezuela for the energy and natural resources on which we all rely.

Mr. Speaker, how does that make any sense?

As our adversaries become more and more hostile, shouldn't the President be doing everything in his power to make American energy independent once again?

Energy security is national security.

At a time when American families are struggling under the weight of record-high inflation and energy prices due to Biden policies, shouldn't the President be doing everything he can to support domestic energy projects that will create jobs and lower costs?

As the chairman of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee, I am proud to introduce the Alaska's Right to Produce Act to allow Alaskans to develop their God-given natural resources. I introduced this common-sense legislation with Alaska's Representative MARY PELTOLA, a Democrat, and Alaska's two Senators, and I thank them for their leadership on this critical issue.

The Alaskans on the North Slope support this legislation, Mr. Speaker. They support it because the oil and gas revenues allow them to build schools and hospitals, pay for their police, pay for their fire service, have libraries, have the fundamental parts of our communities that we all have and all deserve.

The only way they can sustain that, Mr. Speaker, is allowing things like this to go forward. Alaskans should be proud to ethically and responsibly resource this. Again, there were 63 sanctions against the great State. You have got to be kidding me. As my co-chair of the Tennis Caucus would agree, John McEnroe, "You have got to be kidding me." It is unbelievable. The great people of Alaska deserve better than what this administration is forcing upon them.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate my colleague's love of tennis, our mutual love of tennis and his sense of humor. I have less appreciation when he draws tortured analogies to international sanctions and national security issues. It is just hard to take that kind of sanctimony seriously from somebody who just last week voted, along with the majority of the House Republican Conference, to hand Ukraine over to Vladimir Putin.

As I often say in these debates, you have to take a lot of this political theater with a grain of salt, in this case, with a glass of vodka.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alaska (Mrs. PELTOLA).

Mrs. PELTOLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the honorable Mr. STAUBER, for his work on this measure.

I rise today to speak about Alaska's Right to Produce Act and how I will be voting.

This bill unintentionally pits two of Alaska's most important industries, energy and fisheries, against one another. Alaska faces an energy crisis, which is more than slightly ironic since our State has vast energy resources. Alaska pays some of the highest prices in the country for the petroleum we need to heat our homes through winter and the fuel that we need to transport ourselves and our goods.

Everyone knows Alaska is rich in oil and gas, but we also have great wind energy potential in the Cook Inlet, geothermal exploration in the Aleutians, and expanding hydropower in the southeast.

However, many Alaskans live in extremely rural areas that rely on diesel and biomass to heat our homes through harsh winters. Those fuels are more expensive and contribute to air pollution in regions like Fairbanks, which has some of the worst air quality in the Nation.

While some would love to jump straight from diesel to wind, that is unrealistic in Alaska. What we can do is use natural gas as a bridge fuel to move more people to cleaner-burning energy and reduced air pollution.

That is why I believe Alaskans should be able to develop and transport the natural gas we have available on our North Slope for our use throughout the State. I genuinely support an all-of-the-above approach on energy.

Alaskans can't afford to be picky about where energy comes from. My personal energy bills are over \$1,000 a month, a reality that many of my lower 48 colleagues do not fully understand.

I was the only Democrat to support this legislation at markup, and I still support the bill's intent. Alaska needs to develop energy for our use and economic well-being.

However, this bill would nullify the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area. This resilience area was created at the request of Alaska Native Tribes in the region. It empowers the people who have lived there for thousands of years to exercise their self-determination and be equal voices on policy decisions facing the Northern Bering Sea.

Let me be clear: This bill never intended to target the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area. That is why I proposed an amendment that would have removed this resilience area from the final bill text. That is

also why today I introduced a clean version of the Alaska's Right to Produce Act that doesn't impact the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area.

Alaska's Right to Produce aims to ensure my State can continue to develop its onshore oil and gas resources in areas like the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska.

It is a reserve, not a refuge. It was set aside for oil and gas development, not permanent preservation. Even as recently as the Obama administration, companies were encouraged to develop in the National Petroleum Reserve as opposed to other parts of Alaska.

On the other hand, the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area is necessary to help manage the impacts of climate change on our Arctic environments, including increased vessel traffic, moving fish stocks, marine debris, and increased military activity.

We saw recently why the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area needs to remain in place. NOAA developed the Northern Bering Sea Effects of Trawling Survey, an experiment to see the impacts of commercial bottom trawling in an area of the Bering Sea where it is currently banned.

In their opposition to this project, the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience intertribal advisory council said that NOAA's plan perfectly illustrated the two reasons why the area was established in the first place: the history of the Bering Sea Tribes not being involved in policy discussions and decisions, and the threat of bottom trawling moving into the Northern Bering Sea ecosystem.

By nullifying this area, we are breaking our promise to the Tribes and directly harming fishing communities. Alaskans face many challenges and threats to our unique ways of life. We are on the brink of being forced to import natural gas from a foreign country, and our fishermen are in the midst of an economic free fall, coupled with depleted fish stocks.

Unfortunately, the way this bill was written puts energy development against fisheries, and for that reason I will be voting "present" today.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and my good friend, Mr. STAUBER, for this bill.

Let's just call it what it is. It is not a big secret that the Biden administration hates American energy. Since day one, they have waged a complete and all-out war on domestic production.

If you take yourself back to 2019, then-candidate Biden said he would kill fossil fuels. I think they made good on that promise, and this is another example of that.

In September 2023, the administration canceled existing oil and gas leases in the Coastal Plain of Alaska, violating statutorily mandated lease sales and suspending operations crucial

to Alaska's economy. These actions were taken despite bipartisan opposition in Alaska as we just heard from our colleague across the aisle.

H.R. 6285, a House Energy Action Team initiative, would reverse Biden's harmful anti-Alaska policies by reinstating mandated ANWR oil and gas leases and prohibiting a leasing moratorium in the Coastal Plain, and nullifying executive orders by the President.

Just last week, the administration denied permission for the development of the Ambler Road, once again, superseding ongoing conversations at the State level.

Alaskans should be able to decide what they want to develop, not the administration, but Alaskans who know Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the RSC HEAT staff for their work on this legislation and Representative STAUBER.

Let me just respond to something that we have heard about Ukraine, about Russia, about the administration. Let me remind all Americans, Mr. Speaker, that it was this President in 2021 who refused to continue and to enhance the sanctions on the Nord Stream pipeline that would have helped all of Europe. It would have helped the Ukrainians more than anything.

If you want to talk about being strong and standing up to Russia, let's take ourselves back to that point where this administration failed to do that, and instead handed Putin a huge gift and decided to declare an all-out war on American energy. This is just yet another example of that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on the HEAT team.

I will also point out to the American people that the Biden administration is the gift that keeps on giving to Putin. Not only would they not put sanctions on the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, now they have put sanctions on U.S. pipelines.

They have put a pause on LNG gas exports. Our friends in Europe, Germany, and Poland would love to have our LNG. They would love to have U.S. LNG, but guess what? We have got a lot of it, but we can't send it there because this President not only won't restrict Russia, he restricts American producers and allows Putin to continue to fund his war machine by selling gas to Europe.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a master class in deflection. I think perhaps the fact that a majority of the Republican Conference voted to hand Ukraine to Russia last week has touched a nerve as people have begun to consider the reality of that.

Going back and trying to deflect to a pipeline from many years ago that no longer even functions, because it was

blown up, certainly doesn't change the fact that last week when we had a chance to vote for critical lifeline military support for Ukraine as it fights for its survival against Russia, a significant majority of my colleagues across the aisle voted "no."

They voted with Vladimir Putin and so congratulations on the deflection. Moscow Marge couldn't have done it any better. It might even make the highlight reel on RT tonight.

I don't watch that network, but I just have to wonder if maybe there wouldn't be coverage of some of these things that we are hearing from across the aisle.

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

□ 1530

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

I love the way my colleague across the aisle operates. He talks about deflecting when what he is doing is deflecting. He is trying to deflect from the issue in Alaska—where, once again, the Biden administration has failed miserably—by talking about Ukraine.

I don't know if the gentleman has checked the voting record, but I voted to support Ukraine. It is regrettable that we have to send more foreign aid, more military equipment to support countries that are fighting against evil regimes like Putin, like Iran because of bad foreign policy, and a lot of it has to do with energy policy.

I would prefer not to have to vote to send more military aid to our allies and our friends who are fighting for freedom and democracy, but this President and his administration has put us in a weakened place on the world stage, and, unfortunately, we have to take votes like that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN).

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Alaska Right to Produce Act, and I thank my colleagues PETE STAUBER and AUGUST PFLUGER for the work with RSC's House Energy Action Team to put the legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, it has been noted here that we talk certain ways but vote others. I think nothing is more evident than what we just saw just a few minutes ago where the gentlewoman from Alaska supported the bill but is going to vote "present."

You are either with Alaska or you are not. The Republicans are with Alaska. I just want to note for the record that we are going to vote to support Alaska.

This legislation is only necessary because of the disastrous policymaking coming out of the Biden administration. It is hard to believe today that the national average for a gallon of gas in 2020 was just over \$2. Under President Trump, the United States was well on our way not only to being energy independent, but energy dominant.

Where do we and our allies get our oil from when we are not producing it ourselves? We get it from Russia, Venezuela, and other bad actors around the globe.

Let's be clear: Halting domestic production of oil and gas does absolutely nothing to lower our dependence on oil and gas, as the climate lobby wants you to believe. It just increases our dependence on people like Vladimir Putin.

I don't want the United States to rely on anything from Vladimir Putin. The solution is so simple: Use the resources under our own feet. The Alaska Right to Produce Act reverses the damaging policies from Joe Biden to unleash our domestic energy potential.

Alaska has been blessed with tremendous oil and natural gas deposits, and the people of Alaska are incredibly supportive of utilizing those resources.

This bill empowers the Native Alaskan communities and residents of the State to profit from the resources under their own soil. In a future where America is energy dominant, the only loser is Vladimir Putin, and others like him.

It helps our allies when we can provide them with oil and gas so that they are not reliant on Putin, either. It helps our own people by lowering costs and providing cleaner, more affordable energy sources, and it helps Alaska reap the benefits of the resources in their land.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HERN. It is just common sense, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this essential legislation.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also appreciate Mr. HERN's leadership on the RSC and the establishment of the HEAT team and the efforts that they have been putting into making sure we are energy independent here in America.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is getting almost comical. I have now heard yet another speech pretending to oppose Vladimir Putin and Russia less than a week after the gentleman who just spoke voted to hand Ukraine over to Putin, voted "no" on essential military aid to our Ukrainian allies who are fighting for their very existence against this terrible war of aggression by Vladimir Putin made possible and financed, of course, by the fossil fuel industry in Russia, which American oil and gas companies truly helped to develop.

You just have to wonder if there is not a lot of damage control underway right now across the aisle. Maybe folks realize just how reckless and dangerous that vote against Ukraine was last week, that vote that a majority, solid majority of my Republican friends

took right along with Moscow Marge and the rest of the pro-Putin caucus.

I am going to keep bringing this up each time I hear one of these anti-Ukraine voters pretend to care about Ukraine or pretend to oppose Vladimir Putin and Russia because last week they had a chance to actually show their colors, and we saw their colors.

There is another way in which they are really doing a great favor to Vladimir Putin and Russia, and it is by opposing the clean energy transition at every turn and in every possible way. Vladimir Putin's worst nightmare is to break the fossil fuel paradigm that made him rich and powerful, that enabled him to have all this influence and leverage over Europe because a clean energy economy would make him irrelevant. It would make him a lot less powerful.

Go ahead and keep helping Vladimir Putin with your votes, with your energy policy, but we are going to stand for a clean energy transition, and we are going to support Ukraine.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), the chairman of the Western Caucus.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee for allowing me to join in this conversation in support of the Alaska's Right to Produce Act.

Alaska truly is blessed with abundant natural resources that could empower American energy and mineral dominance. Alaskan oil and gas production cannot be taken lightly. It is home to our Nation's fourth largest oil reserve and third largest gas reserve. It is so unfortunate that the President has made the political choice to lock up millions of acres where these resources could be utilized.

The list of attacks on Alaskan energy production from this administration is long. Just 2 weeks ago, he added perhaps the most egregious example yet, when the Department of the Interior announced new restrictions on oil and gas development in the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska. These actions are not only detrimental to American energy production but also limit the future opportunities for prosperity in rural communities in Alaska that depend on energy projects.

When you look at what Alaska wants, the result is clear. The majority of Tribal communities and Alaskan residents support resource development. Why? Because these projects bring in unprecedented income and development to communities that desperately want and need it.

As chairman of the Western Caucus, I have been advocating for energy production across the United States of America. High domestic production keeps global prices down and ensures America is competitive with our global adversaries. That is why I am a staunch supporter of this bill to over-

turn the administration's restrictions on oil and gas development in the Last Frontier.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this legislation to ensure robust, reliable production in Alaska, and I am proud to join my friend from Minnesota in support of the legislation to unleash the full potential of Alaskan energy.

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

I thank the gentleman from Washington for his refreshingly rare vote for Ukraine military aid and also the chairman, Mr. WESTERMAN, for joining Democrats in that very important vote in the interests of our national security.

I think, as we continue with this debate, it is worth talking about just what a fiscal and financial boondoggle drilling in the Arctic refuge is. It is, first of all, a proposition that is so deeply unpopular that the only way it became law was to sneak it into the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the Trump tax scam.

Two lease sales were included in the legislation to partly offset tax cuts for the wealthy. Initially, Republicans in Congress and the Trump administration claimed that these lease sales would bring in \$1.8 billion in revenues for the Federal Government and the State of Alaska through bonus bids, and they proceeded to give a whole bunch of tax cuts away to billionaires and corporations on the basis of this illusory offset.

Later, the Congressional Budget Office lowered the estimate to \$900 million, specifically \$725 million for the first lease sale. Fast forward to the first lease sale that finally took place in 2021 in the final days of the Trump administration. Guess what happened? Well, it generated less than \$15 million—not billion—in bonus bids, around 2 percent of what even CBO's reduced estimate had projected.

In 2022, two of those lessees actually asked BLM to cancel and refund their leases. They wanted out. Separately in 2021, two development companies, Chevron and Hilcorp, paid \$10 million to get out, just to walk away from their legacy leases in the Arctic refuge. At least five major U.S. banks and 18 other international banks have said they won't finance drilling in the refuge.

If my Republican colleagues are interested in Federal revenues, if they are interested in fiscal conservatism, I am sorry to say that the pristine Alaska wilderness is not their piggy bank, and, in any event, it turns out that it is empty.

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

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

I just have to take issue with this issue about lackluster sales or lackluster lease sales. I note that the first ANWR lease sale was held in early 2021

during the throes of the COVID pandemic when oil prices were historically low, and the argument is that the administration projected, the Trump administration projected \$1.8 billion from ANWR lease sales over 10 years, and my friends are arguing they only made less than 1 percent of those initial projections. They are not telling, as Paul Harvey would say, the rest of the story.

This one sale was held after the election of President Biden who said on the campaign trail that he would end oil and gas production on Federal lands. I have to point out to my friends that revenue comes from oil and gas royalties based on production, not leasing.

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

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources for leading on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I often wonder where in the world we are sometimes. We are under an administration that has set energy policies that are causing energy prices to go up, to increase for Americans.

My friend from California's home State, I believe the average gasoline price in L.A. County right now is \$5.40 a gallon. In my home State of Louisiana when President Biden took office, lowest gasoline prices were \$1.74 a gallon.

I struggle to understand why my friend from California would want to force their ideas and policies on the rest of the country. This is the State that is the most dependent State on Amazon Rainforest oil to power their State's economy. This is the State that has the least reliable energy grid in America, the State that has had the eighth-worst emissions growth in the country, and, according to the American Lung Association, just last week, the State that has the dirtiest air over and over and over again in all of these cities including where my friend represents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friend, please keep his ideas to himself. Ruin California, but don't ruin the rest of the country. Don't ruin the other 49 States.

This is absolutely remarkable. We have watched as this administration comes in and does a ban on exporting American energy, on new exports of American energy, does a ban. That very tool would have been one of the most powerful tools available to actually reduce global emissions, but what my friend's policies are advocating and what they are supporting is supporting more Iranian energy because Iran is increasing their exports and filling the void.

The Biden administration's own figures show that there is going to be a 50 percent growth in global energy demand, 57 percent increase in natural

gas, and we have the cleanest sources of gas in the world.

I don't understand why my friend thinks that it is better to cede this, to give this to Iran. This is the Biden administration's figures. I don't understand why my friend thinks we should cede this to Russia, why we should cede this to Venezuela.

□ 1545

President Biden facilitated. He lifted sanctions that allowed for the Nord Stream 2 pipeline to be built, the pipeline that took Russian energy and sent it into the European Union. Then, in the same breath, he blocked pipelines in the United States.

Let's review. We support Russian energy and Russian pipelines. We support Iranian energy, including the \$65 billion they got that has gone directly to funding groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist groups that have killed American soldiers and invaded our ally, Israel.

We have watched as these very strategies have resulted in emissions actually going up. As the United States has led the world in reducing emissions, for every ton we reduce, China has multiple times more increases.

How many more times do we have to learn from these flawed energy strategies that harm America, enrich Venezuela, enrich Russia, enrich Iran, and harm the United States?

There is evidence all over the place. We can sit here and have these emotional arguments all day long. Math and science prove these policies are flawed. This bill helps to address it, and the fact we are even here when a law already says you are supposed to open up leases, including in areas called the National Petroleum Reserve. That is right. It is reserved for wildlife. What? This is outrageous.

The fact that we even have to be here doing this bill that the gentlewoman who represents the entire State of Alaska voted for in committee, that the gentlewoman who represents the entire State of Alaska has clearly said she will not oppose—yet, my friends from California are coming in and saying: Don't worry. We have the solution. We are going to impose our harmful strategies, our harmful energy policies, on you, as well. That way, maybe people stop leaving California.

Mr. Speaker, I can't even begin to emphasize how important it is that we move forward with this legislation, that we treat American energy fairly. I urge adoption of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes feel like, serving in this Congress, I need a good chiropractor because you just political whiplash one day to another, one week to another.

Just now, my friend from Louisiana, in service of the fossil fuel agenda, made a sanctimonious speech opposing Russia and Vladimir Putin as if the whole country, the whole world, didn't

watch his vote last week with the rest of his Republican Conference to hand Ukraine over to Russia, to vote "no" on critical military aid to Ukraine.

It is like that. It is remarkable whip-lash.

My friend has the ability to actually criticize the air quality in California caused by catastrophic wildfires driven by the climate crisis caused by our fossil fuel addiction and suggests that that is because of California's climate agenda, which is absurd, while ignoring the fact that the one place of persistent air pollution and respiratory illness and other problems with air quality in California is in the oil patch, Bakersfield, former Speaker McCarthy's district where it is frankly a lot like Louisiana and Texas. It is pretty rich.

Yet, we also have a Record if anybody is interested in cutting through the political theater and seeing where people really stand, including last week's vote against Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. HUFFMAN, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6285.

Mr. Speaker, while Democrats are working hard to lower the cost of living for Americans and protect our communities, House Republicans seek to make their lives much more expensive. They seek to pillage the places that make America special, the special places that we value.

In doing so, here is the dirty secret: They are simply carrying the water for powerful special interests and polluters that have way too much power and influence here on Capitol Hill.

Fortunately, H.R. 6285 has no chance of becoming law, but it does provide a glimpse of the GOP's alliance with polluters over the best interests of the American people.

Whether we are talking about the Arctic refuge or my beautiful part of the country along the Gulf of Mexico, Republicans simply are aiming to sell out America's public lands and waters to their friends in Big Oil and the NRA.

One of the six bills that were considered today would roll back the Biden administration's rules supporting conservation on public lands. Another would prohibit the government from regulating the use of toxic lead in ammunition. That is the single-largest source of unregulated lead discharged into our environment. The so-called Trust in Science Act would make it easier to hunt and kill the endangered gray wolf.

The bill currently before us would threaten millions of acres of wildlands by mandating unfettered oil and gas development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, regardless of the impacts on wildlife and nearby communities or what it will do to increase the costs of the overheating planet.

We have to ask ourselves if this is really what the American people are asking the Congress to do right now. Does the average American really want to see Congress make it easier to pollute and needlessly develop our special places, our wildlife refuges? I don't think so.

There is an incredible contrast right now in our country between when it comes to who is on the side of the people and who is standing up to the polluters. We just celebrated the 54th Earth Day. Look at the actions of President Biden compared to the Republican pro-polluter messaging bills.

First, last week, the Department of the Interior finalized a new rule that would protect more than 13 million acres of irreplaceable wildlife habitat in the Western Arctic.

Then, President Biden announced the creation of the American Climate Corps, kind of modeled after the Conservation Corps of decades ago. It is a groundbreaking initiative that will put more than 20,000 young Americans to work, protecting our communities, building environmental infrastructure, and helping us to lower costs and be more resilient to the rising costs of the overheating climate.

Last but not least, the EPA rolled out awards under a new Solar for All initiative, a \$7 billion grant to help deliver cleaner, cheaper energy across this great country, especially to working-class communities that really need help on their electric bills. This is going to be a godsend in my State, the so-called Sunshine State. We are going to help families put rooftop solar on their roofs, lower their electric bills.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Because I couldn't help our good friend from Louisiana when he was talking about how unfettered oil and gas will really help lower bills, on the front page of my hometown paper today, the Tampa Bay Times, was a story about why our electric bills are so high. Do you know why they are so high? Because in the so-called Sunshine State, 75 percent of electricity is generated from gas. Our utilities are keeping us hooked on gas.

That is why Solar for All, helping to unleash the abundant, free energy from the sun to help lower electric bills, is vital.

It is time for the House to get serious about cleaner, cheaper energy. Enough with these messaging bills. Let's move to bipartisan legislation that will help us achieve a prosperous, sustainable future. Banning offshore oil drilling off of the beautiful Florida coast is where we should start.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that if our friends across the aisle are so concerned with American energy bills, you would think they would at some point say no to the LNG export extravaganza that all serious economic analysis shows is driving up U.S. energy prices. Yet, they continue to come to this floor to introduce legislation and advocate against the commonsense pause that the Biden administration has taken so that we can look at the impacts of more LNG export infrastructure on U.S. energy prices as well as our climate crisis.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, a lot of things to contest here and issues to cover, but I want to start with this idea of environmental treasures and this idea that ANWR is this environmental treasure that was never intended for any kind of development. Let's look at a little history.

When ANWR was created in 1980, the law included a section, section 1002, setting aside 1.5 million acres of the coastal plain to be assessed for its development potential. After years of careful study, in 1987, the Department of the Interior recommended that the 1002 Area be open to responsible development projects.

The Alaska Native village of Kaktovik, which has public interest in the lands in ANWR and multiple entities as members of Voice, is the sole community located in the 1002 Area of ANWR and the only community located in all of the over 19 million acres of ANWR.

The president of Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation testified: "We are a small community that suffers as the Federal winds blow and feel the Biden administration is working to effectively erase us from the land that we have inhabited for hundreds of years. Since 1980, we have fought to open the 1002 Area, also known as the coastal plain, to oil drilling and pursue economic freedom."

On to another issue that my friend from California mentioned about the poor air quality there due to forest fires: if my colleagues would work with us on that, we could fix that issue, as well.

What California has is very poor forest management. They have a hands-off approach to forest management. As a result of that, we are even losing giant sequoias. As much as 20 percent of the ones on the planet we lost in 2 years due to catastrophic wildfire were not because of climate change but because fire had been suppressed in those groves for over 100 years. They finally had to pay the piper. You had white fir trees that grew up into the lower canopy of the giant sequoias. My colleague

from California knows I am a forester and would love to help fix some of those problems with forests in California.

Now, to this issue about energy cost and reliability, as my friends across the aisle are pushing for more and more solar and wind, I am an all-of-the-above energy kind of guy. I would love to have more solar and wind, but we have to have baseload power. We have to have either coal or natural gas or a lot more hydro or a lot more nuclear power.

Going back to an earlier discussion that nuclear power is generated from uranium and that we are now dependent on Russia, we have to buy our uranium—most of it—from Russia or Kazakhstan to generate our nuclear power.

When we talk about low-cost solar energy, I have a real problem with that. Maybe it is low cost in the United States because we pay solar farm developers 30 percent of their costs with our tax dollars. If you build a solar farm, you get a 30 percent tax credit back. If you spend a million dollars, you get \$300,000 back from your fellow taxpayers. If you build a windmill, you get 2.7 cents per kilowatt hour.

Maybe that is a way that it is lower cost, but if it is truly lower cost, why is the number one manufacturer of solar farms in the world building 50 gigawatts of coal power plants every year? That is China, which we rely on to buy not only the elements and minerals that we need to do electrification but also builds most of the solar panels with Uyghur slave labor. They are building a big coal plant every 5 days.

□ 1600

Now, natural gas in the United States has caused us to be able to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions more than any other country in the world. We are only around 13 percent of the global greenhouse gas emissions now, and China is over twice that.

When we become more dependent on China, when we become more dependent on Russia, who are big polluters, then we are becoming more responsible for global greenhouse gas emissions than if we would use our own energy and our own minerals to build things here, to build them more efficiently and more effectively than any place in the world.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman from Arkansas talk about energy subsidies and to criticize the subsidies that he believes should be questioned for clean energy.

I hope he has the same concern about the much greater amount of subsidy, especially if you consider all the environmental externalities that taxpayers just pick up the tab for and have for the past hundred years when it comes to the fossil fuel industry.

There is a lot of work we could do together to take inappropriate subsidies out of U.S. energy policy, and I hope the gentleman would be interested in that.

I want to assure him when it comes to the forestry and trees and air quality part of our conversation that the wildfires and the air quality problems in California, because of them, are not something you can log your way out of.

I know the gentleman is interested in forest management, and there is a lot that we could work on there together as well for healthy forests. Some of the worst wildfires in California that produced the worst air quality were through heavily cutover land where there had been all the clear-cutting anybody could ever want.

The same can be said for some of the terrible Canadian wildfires last year that gave us awful air quality right here in Washington, D.C. Much of that ripped right through heavily cutover, clear-cut land.

Logging, you know, is not the simple solution to these problems. A better solution is to step back and realize the climate crisis that is driving it and to begin working together to actually reduce the worst impacts of that crisis.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close as well and yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, I oppose this bill. We have massive wildfires, prolonged droughts, stronger hurricanes, and coastal flooding. All across this country, our communities are feeling the increased severity and frequency of tragic events from the climate crisis, sending us dire warnings.

The crisis is real, it is here, and we need to act now for the sake of this planet and future generations.

In the Arctic, temperatures are rising four times faster than the global average. In the indigenous communities in northern Alaska who are so disproportionately facing the devastating impacts of the climate crisis, we must also pay attention to the impacts on them.

The melting permafrost is creating our country's first but not last climate refugees. Changing species migration patterns are threatening food security and cultural continuity. Oil and gas development only exacerbates all of these impacts.

Of course, not all Alaskans, including indigenous Alaskans, share the same perspective on oil and gas development. Native American Tribes are not a monolith.

You can bet that whenever my friends across the aisle can find some indigenous individual or advocacy group or other entity that supports oil and gas development, they are going to wrap themselves around Tribal con-

sultation and pretend to be great champions for Indian Country.

In many other votes, when Indian Country opposes pipelines and dams and mining projects and other things that are against their interests, I am afraid the Tribes are thrown under the bus by my Republican friends pretty much every time.

Revenue from extraction often supports local governments and indigenous regional and village corporations.

That is part of the consideration in Alaska, but in so many cases, the tradeoffs create unacceptable impacts as well. That is why it is not a monolith when you talk to indigenous communities in Alaska.

This bill is an instrument of blunt force that allows for extraction across Alaska in places that are too special and too fragile to drill.

It would reinstate oil and gas leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, an area known to the Gwich'in people as "The sacred place where life begins." These were leases the Biden administration canceled because they were based on shoddy Trump-era analyses.

The bill would withdraw the administration's rule to protect over 13 million acres of public land in the NPR-A, a region that is already feeling the impacts of oil and gas development.

It would undo protection of 125 million acres of the Arctic Ocean from offshore drilling, and it would undo the reinstatement of the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area. In the Bering Sea, an oil spill would be beyond detrimental. It would be catastrophic.

Rolling back these protections is the wrong approach. We can't simply give these lands and waters away to the highest bidder.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill and yield back the balance of my time.

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

To close, I am going to quote from the testimony of Charles Lampe, the President of the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation who testified on the Biden administration's action in November.

We do not approve of efforts to turn our homeland into one giant national park, which literally guarantees us a fate with no economy, no jobs, reduced subsistence, and no hope for the future of our people.

I urge all my colleagues to show their support for Alaska and the Alaska Native communities on the North Slope by voting for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-477.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. DESIGNATION OF SPECIAL AREAS OF THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may not designate any new Special Areas, add resource values to existing Special Areas, or expand existing Special Areas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska unless an Act of Congress enacted after the date of enactment of this Act specifically authorizes the Secretary to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

I rise to offer my amendment that strengthens the underlying legislation to prevent the Biden administration from taking further steps to block oil and gas production in the great State of Alaska.

In the Bureau of Land Management's press release announcing the final NPR-A rule, they teased future action by the administration to create new special areas or expand/adjust existing special areas within the boundaries of the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. These special areas are a means to lock up acreage from oil and gas production. There is no disputing that.

My amendment prohibits the Department of the Interior from creating or expanding special areas without congressional authorization.

When the administration announced its moratorium and canceled leases in ANWR and withdrew millions of acreage from development within the NPR-A, the local Alaska Native communities on the North Slope weren't given a proper heads-up, just like members of the Navajo Nation heard about the Chaco Canyon withdrawal. Alaska Native community leaders learned of these policy changes in the media.

This administration did not even properly consult with the very communities this oil and gas development would benefit, and it is clear why, because they weren't in lockstep with the administration's policies.

Mr. Speaker, just this morning we had a hearing. I asked the Secretary of the Interior five times if she consulted with the North Slope Native American communities, and she would not answer.

I finally had to go get some emails where they requested a meeting with her, and she denied meeting with them.

Let's make it very clear. The Alaskans on the North Slope requested a meeting with the Secretary of the Interior prior to this rule, and she blew them off. She didn't have the courtesy to meet with them after she was up there in Alaska already.

The administration also held an incredibly short public comment period on these actions. When the Bureau of Land Management was pressed on this

timeline, which was right in the middle of whaling season for the sustenance fishing communities that support oil and gas development, a BLM official responded that the administration wanted a short comment period to rush a rule through in order to prevent it from falling into the Congressional Review Act window.

Mr. Speaker, not only did this administration fail to properly consult with local Native Alaskan communities on the North Slope, but they have taken explicit steps to subvert Congress' constitutional responsibility to serve as a check on the executive branch.

This administration cannot be trusted to do right by the American people. Policies coming out of this administration, especially energy and natural resources policies, undermine the American people and the hardworking men and women who stand ready to responsibly develop our vast natural resources.

That is why Congress must take every step to prevent the administration from pushing forward these policies. We must close every loophole that might be out there to shut down domestic energy production.

This includes preventing the administration from creating new or expanding existing special areas within the NPR-A.

They can't be trusted to do the right thing by the American people and the Alaska Native communities on the North Slope.

Congress must step in. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this amendment, as well as joining me in voting for the underlying legislation.

The Alaskan communities deserve this. They have been producing energy under their feet in their natural resource space for years.

The energy production—we want to be energy independent, and again, the oil and gas royalties will help the North Slope communities, Mr. Speaker.

I said 10 minutes ago they had come to an EMR hearing stating that these royalties help us live, help us buy our food, help us build our infrastructure. Without those revenues, they can't do it. They simply can't do it. In fact, at the EMR hearing, there was a resident that actually was in tears, Mr. Speaker, because of this rule. It is going to be devastating for her and her family to not be able to live on the North Slope comfortably.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Louisiana, I actually liked his expression, and I think my colleague on the other side of the aisle may be offended by this, but you know, my good friend from Louisiana actually said—

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

We have a process problem. Last week, the Rules Committee issued a notice for amendment submission for this bill, and 16 amendments were submitted: 12 from Democrats, 4 from Republicans.

We really should be having an open, robust, and lively debate, but no. The amendment debate this afternoon will be really quick because all six Natural Resources bills up this week, with all six of those bills, this is the only bill that was open to any amendments, and Republicans made only one, this one, this fossil fuel industry wish. That was the only one made in order.

Republicans have made a mockery of what they promised, and they boasted about back in the early days of this Congress.

They guaranteed it would be a robust and open process. Half the time, the Rules Committee isn't even open, but when it is, it is cooking the books like we see this week with this one single amendment for us to debate.

With other bills that have been up this afternoon, the so-called Mining Regulatory Clarity Act, my colleague, Representative LEGER FERNANDEZ, filed several amendments, amendments that Ranking Member GRIJALVA previously offered at the bill's markup.

They would prevent foreign bad actors, for example, including adversaries like China from mining our Federal lands, something that is all too common today through their thinly veiled American subsidiaries, but no, that was not ruled in order, so we don't get to talk about it.

Yesterday at the Rules Committee hearing, Chair WESTERMAN told us he didn't accept the amendment because it wasn't worded properly.

Well, this language was already in the Republicans' prized H.R. 1 where it was included as a Republican amendment, so it is hard to take that argument seriously.

Maybe they realized H.R. 1 would never become law and that is why more than a year later, Republicans still haven't sent that bill even to the Senate, or maybe they realized foreign bad actors also happen to be padding their pockets.

□ 1615

If that is not the case, I am eager to continue working across the aisle to get these bad actors off our Federal lands, and we will be following up.

Now, back to Alaska. The amendment we are here to debate would do nothing but make the bill more extreme. It would prevent the administration from designating any further special areas without an act of Congress, preventing further protections for an area that is so fragile, special, and ecologically important.

They blocked debate on every other amendment, including my amendment to require a study on the impacts to subsistence resources, another to pro-

hibit the Secretary from issuing the lease sale until revenue is raised at least to the level that CBO estimates, and one to prohibit oil and gas leasing in the Arctic Ocean.

Representative PELTOLA, the sole House Representative for Alaska, filed an amendment to protect the critically important Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area, but Republicans refused to let that proceed. This is not good faith debate.

I will end with a word about my friend's statement that he asked Secretary Haaland repeatedly about Tribal consultation. My friend would have been well-served to listen to Secretary Haaland and learn a thing or two about Tribal consultation. She is the highest-ranking indigenous person in American history. She knows a thing or two about this subject, including the fact that a nonprofit advocacy group, which is the consultation that my friend was referring to, is not a group she has to meet with or consult as part of Tribal consultation.

Tribal consultation is government to government. That is how it works. If there was a little more listening and a little less screaming and table-pounding, there might be a better understanding of Tribal consultation across the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Castor of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6285 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

The material previously referred to by Ms. CASTOR of Florida is as follows:

Ms. Castor of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6285 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION OF OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRELEASING, LEASING, AND RELATED ACTIVITIES IN CERTAIN AREAS OFF THE COAST OF FLORIDA.

Section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(j) PROHIBITION OF OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRELEASING, LEASING, AND RELATED ACTIVITIES IN CERTAIN AREAS OFF THE COAST OF FLORIDA.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or any other law, the Secretary may not offer for oil and gas leasing, preleasing, or any related activity any tract located in—

“(A) any area of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico that is referred to in section 104(a) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006;

“(B) the portion of the South Atlantic Planning Area south of 30 degrees 43 minutes North Latitude; or

“(C) the Straits of Florida Planning Area.

“(2) LIMITATION ON EFFECT.—Nothing in this subsection affects any right under any lease issued under this Act before the date of enactment of this subsection.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANTISEMITISM AWARENESS ACT
OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6090) to provide for the consideration of a definition of antisemitism set forth by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities, and for other purposes will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 6090 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 6285;

Passage of H.R. 6285, if ordered;

The motion to recommit on H.R. 2925;

Passage of H.R. 2925, if ordered; and Adoption of H. Res. 1112.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 320, nays 91, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—320

Adams	Fulcher	Meng
Aderholt	Garbarino	Meuser
Aguiar	Garcia, Mike	Mfume
Alford	Gimenez	Miller (IL)
Allen	Golden (ME)	Miller (OH)
Allred	Goldman (NY)	Miller (WV)
Amodei	Gonzales, Tony	Miller-Meeks
Armstrong	Gonzalez,	Mills
Babin	Vicente	Molinaro
Bacon	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Baird	Gooden (TX)	Mooney
Balderson	Gottheimer	Moore (AL)
Banks	Granger	Moore (UT)
Barr	Graves (LA)	Moran
Barragan	Graves (MO)	Morelle
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Moskowitz
Beatty	Griffith	Moulton
Bentz	Guest	Mrvan
Bera	Guthrie	Mullin
Bergman	Harder (CA)	Napolitano
Bice	Harris	Neal
Bilirakis	Harshbarger	Neguse
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Nehls
Bishop (NC)	Hern	Newhouse
Blunt Rochester	Hill	Norcross
Bost	Himes	Nunn (IA)
Boyle (PA)	Hinson	Obenoltte
Brown	Horsford	Ogles
Brownley	Houchin	Owens
Buchanan	Houlahan	Pallone
Bucshon	Hoyer	Palmer
Budzinski	Hudson	Panetta
Burchett	Huffman	Pappas
Burgess	Huizenga	Pascrell
Calvert	Issa	Pelosi
Cammack	Ivey	Peltola
Caraveo	Jackson (NC)	Pence
Carbajal	Jackson (TX)	Perez
Carey	Jackson Lee	Perry
Carl	James	Peters
Carter (GA)	Jeffries	Petterson
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Pfluger
Cartwright	Johnson (SD)	Phillips
Castor (FL)	Jordan	Posey
Chavez-DeRemer	Joyce (OH)	Quigley
Cherfilus-	Joyce (PA)	Raskin
McCormick	Kamlager-Dove	Reschenthaler
Chu	Kaptur	Rodgers (WA)
Ciscomani	Kean (NJ)	Rogers (AL)
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rogers (KY)
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Rose
Cohen	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Rouzer
Connolly	Kildee	Ruiz
Correa	Kiley	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kilmer	Rutherford
Courtney	Kim (CA)	Ryan
Craig	Krishnamoorthi	Salazar
Crawford	Kuster	Salinas
Crow	Kustoff	Sarbanes
Cuellar	LaHood	Scalise
Curtis	LaLota	Schiff
D'Esposito	LaMalfa	Schneider
Davids (KS)	Lamborn	Scholten
Davis (NC)	Landsman	Schrier
Dean (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Schweikert
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Scott, Austin
DelBene	Latta	Scott, David
Deluzio	LaTurner	Self
DesJarlais	Lawler	Sessions
Dingell	Lee (FL)	Sewell
Duarte	Lee (NV)	Sherman
Duncan	Lesko	Sherrill
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Simpson
Edwards	Levin	Slotkin
Elzey	Lieu	Smith (MO)
Emmer	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Escobar	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Eshoo	Luetkemeyer	Smith (WA)
Espallat	Luttrell	Smucker
Estes	Lynch	Sorensen
Ezell	Mace	Soto
Fallon	Malliotakis	Spanberger
Feenstra	Maloy	Spartz
Ferguson	Mann	Stanton
Finstad	Manning	Stauber
Fischbach	Mast	Steel
Fitzgerald	Matsui	Stefanik
Fitzpatrick	McBath	Steil
Fleischmann	McCaul	Steube
Fletcher	McClain	Stevens
Flood	McClintock	Strickland
Foxx	McCormick	Strong
Frankel, Lois	McHenry	Suozzi
Franklin, Scott	Meeks	Swalwell
Fry	Menendez	Tenney

Thanedar	Van Duyn	Westrup
Thompson (CA)	Van Orden	Westerman
Tiffany	Vargas	Wild
Timmons	Vasquez	Williams (NY)
Titus	Veasey	Williams (TX)
Tonko	Wagner	Wilson (FL)
Torres (CA)	Walberg	Wilson (SC)
Torres (NY)	Waltz	Wittman
Trahan	Wasserman	Womack
Turner	Schultz	Yakym
Valadaw	Weber (TX)	Zinke
Van Drew	Webster (FL)	

NAYS—91

Amo	Donalds	McGarvey
Auchincloss	Evans	McGovern
Balint	Foster	Moore (WI)
Beyer	Foushee	Nadler
Biggs	Frost	Norman
Blumenauer	Gaetz	Ocasio-Cortez
Boebert	Garamendi	Omar
Bonamici	Garcia (IL)	Pingree
Bowman	Garcia (TX)	Pocan
Brecheen	Gosar	Porter
Burlison	Green, Al (TX)	Pressley
Bush	Greene (GA)	Ramirez
Cardenas	Hageman	Rosendale
Carson	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Cartier (LA)	Hoyle (OR)	Sánchez
Casar	Hunt	Scanlon
Case	Jackson (IL)	Schakowsky
Casten	Jacobs	Scott (VA)
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Stansbury
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Takano
Cloud	Kelly (IL)	Thompson (MS)
Clyburn	Khanna	Tlaib
Clyde	Kim (NJ)	Tokuda
Collins	Lee (CA)	Underwood
Crane	Lee (PA)	Velázquez
Crockett	Leger Fernandez	Waters
Davidson	Lofgren	Watson Coleman
Davis (IL)	Luna	Wexton
DeGette	Massie	Williams (GA)
DeSaulnier	McClellan	
Doggett	McCollum	

NOT VOTING—18

Arrington	Galleo	Magaziner
Cleaver	Garcia, Robert	Murphy
Cole	Gomez	Nickel
Crenshaw	Grijalva	Sykes
De La Cruz	Grothman	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Langworthy	Trone

□ 1650

Mr. HUNT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BURCHETT and MILLS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Speaker, I regretfully missed the vote on H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 172.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote for H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 172.

ALASKA'S RIGHT TO PRODUCE
ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAMMACK). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 6285) to ratify and approve all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the establishment and administration of the

Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 211, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]
YEAS—201

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

NAYS—211

Aderholt	Balderson	Bilirakis
Alford	Banks	Bishop (NC)
Allen	Barr	Boebert
Amodei	Bean (FL)	Bost
Armstrong	Bentz	Brecheen
Babin	Bergman	Buchanan
Bacon	Bice	Bucshon
Baird	Biggs	Burchett

Burgess	Harshbarger	Newhouse
Burlison	Hern	Norman
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Nunn (IA)
Cammack	Hill	Obernoite
Carey	Hinson	Ogles
Carl	Houchin	Owens
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Palmer
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Pence
Chavez-DeRemer	Hunt	Perry
Ciscomani	Issa	Pfluger
Cline	Jackson (TX)	Posey
Cloud	James	Reschenthaler
Clyde	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Collins	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (AL)
Comer	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Crane	Joyce (OH)	Rose
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Rosendale
Crenshaw	Kean (NJ)	Rouzer
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Roy
D'Esposito	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Davidson	Kiggans (VA)	Salazar
DesJarlais	Kiley	Scalise
Donalds	Kim (CA)	Schweikert
Duarte	Kustoff	Scott, Austin
Duncan	LaHood	Self
Dunn (FL)	LaLota	Sessions
Ezell	LaMalfa	Simpson
Fallon	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Feenstra	Latta	Bucshon
Ferguson	Letlow	Burchett
Finstad	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Fischbach	Lucas	Smucker
Fitzgerald	Luetkemeyer	Spartz
Fitzpatrick	Luna	Staubert
Fleischmann	Luttrell	Steel
Flood	Mace	Steupe
Fox	Malliotakis	Strong
Franklin, Scott	Maloy	Tenney
Fry	Mann	Thompson (PA)
Fulcher	Massie	Tiffany
Gaetz	Mast	Timmons
Garbarino	McCauley	Turner
Garcia, Mike	McClain	Valadao
Gimenez	McClintock	Van Drew
Gonzales, Tony	McCormick	Van Doyne
Good (VA)	McHenry	Wagner
Gooden (TX)	Meuser	Walberg
Gosar	Miller (IL)	Waltz
Granger	Miller (OH)	Weber (TX)
Graves (LA)	Miller (WV)	Webster (FL)
Graves (MO)	Miller-Meeks	Wenstrup
Green (TN)	Mills	Westerman
Greene (GA)	Molinaro	Williams (NY)
	Moolenaar	Williams (TX)
	Mooney	Wilson (SC)
	Grothman	Witman
	Moore (AL)	Womack
	Guthrie	Yakym
	Hageman	Zinke
	Harris	

NOT VOTING—17

Arrington	Garcia, Robert	Magaziner
Cleaver	Gomez	Moore (WI)
Cole	Gonzalez,	Murphy
De La Cruz	Vicente	Nickel
Diaz-Balart	Grijalva	Sykes
Gallego	Langworthy	Trone

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1656

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 199,

answered “present” 2, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]
AYES—214

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

NOES—199

Adams	Caraveo	Correa
Agullar	Carbajal	Costa
Allred	Cardenas	Courtney
Amo	Carson	Craig
Auchincloss	Carter (LA)	Crockett
Balint	Cartwright	Crow
Barragán	Case	Davids (KS)
Beatty	Casten	Davis (IL)
Bera	Castor (FL)	Davis (NC)
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Dean (PA)
Blumenauer	Cherfilus-	DeGette
Blunt Rochester	McCormick	DeLauro
Bonamici	Chu	DelBene
Bowman	Clark (MA)	Deluzio
Boyle (PA)	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Brown	Clyburn	Doggett
Brownley	Cohen	Escobar
Budzinski	Connolly	Eshoo
Bush		

Espaillat Levin Sánchez
 Evans Lieu Sarbanes
 Fitzpatrick Lofgren Scanlon
 Fletcher Lynch Schakowsky
 Foster Manning Schiff
 Foushee Matsui Schneider
 Frankel, Lois McBath Scholten
 Frost McClellan Schrier
 Garamendi McCollum Scott (VA)
 Garcia (IL) McGarvey Scott, David
 Garcia (TX) McGovern Sewell
 Goldman (NY) Meeks Sherman
 Gomez Menendez Sherrill
 Gottheimer Meng Slotkin
 Green, Al (TX) Mfume Smith (WA)
 Harder (CA) Moore (WI) Sorensen
 Hayes Morelle Soto
 Himes Moskowitz Spanberger
 Horsford Moulton Stansbury
 Houlihan Mrvan Stanton
 Hoyer Mullin Stevens
 Hoyle (OR) Nadler Strickland
 Huffman Napolitano Suozzi
 Ivey Neal Swallow
 Jackson (IL) Neguse Takano
 Jackson (NC) Norcross Thanedar
 Jackson Lee Ocasio-Cortez Thompson (CA)
 Jacobs Omar Thompson (MS)
 Jayapal Pallone Titus
 Jeffries Panetta Tlaib
 Johnson (GA) Pappas Tokuda
 Kamlager-Dove Pascrell Tonko
 Kaptur Pelosi Torres (CA)
 Keating Peters Torres (NY)
 Kelly (IL) Pettersen Trahan
 Khanna Phillips Underwood
 Kildee Pingree Vargas
 Kilmer Pocan Vasquez
 Kim (NJ) Porter Veasey
 Krishnamoorthi Pressley Velázquez
 Kuster Quigley Wasserman
 Landsman Ramirez Schultz
 Larsen (WA) Raskin Waters
 Larson (CT) Ross Watson Coleman
 Lee (CA) Ruiz Wexton
 Lee (NV) Ruppertsberger Wild
 Lee (PA) Ryan Williams (GA)
 Leger Fernandez Salinas Wilson (FL)

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 204, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—210

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

Duncan Joyce (PA) Pence
 Dunn (FL) Kean (NJ) Perry
 Edwards Kelly (MS) Pfluger
 Ellzey Kelly (PA) Posey
 Emmer Kiggans (VA) Reschenthaler
 Estes Kiley Rodgers (WA)
 Ezell Kim (CA) Rogers (AL)
 Fallon Kustoff Rogers (KY)
 Feenstra LaHood Rose
 Ferguson LaLota Rosendale
 Finstad LaMalfa Rouzer
 Fischbach Lamborn Rutherford
 Fitzgerald Latta Salazar
 Fitzpatrick LaTurner Scalise
 Fleischmann Lawler Schweikert
 Flood Lee (FL) Scott, Austin
 Foxx Lesko Self
 Franklin, Scott Letlow Sessions
 Fry Loudermilk Simpson
 Fulcher Lucas Smith (MO)
 Garbarino Luetkemeyer Smith (NE)
 Garcia, Mike Luttrell Smith (NJ)
 Gimenez Mace Smucker
 Gonzales, Tony Malliotakis Spartz
 Gooden (TX) Maloy Stauber
 Gosar Mann Steel
 Granger Massie Stefanik
 Graves (LA) Mast Steil
 Graves (MO) McCaul Steube
 Green (TN) McClain Strong
 Greene (GA) McClintock Tenney
 Griffith McCormick Thompson (PA)
 Grothman McHenry Tiffany
 Meuser Timmons
 Guthrie Miller (IL) Turner
 Hageman Miller (OH) Valadao
 Harris Miller (WV) Van Drew
 Harshbarger Miller-Meeks Van Dуйne
 Hern Mills Van Orden
 Higgins (LA) Molinaro Wagner
 Hill Moolenaar Walberg
 Hinson Mooney Waltz
 Houchin Moore (AL) Weber (TX)
 Hudson Moore (UT) Webster (FL)
 Huizenga Moran Wenstrup
 Hunt Nehls Westerman
 Issa Newhouse Williams (NY)
 Jackson (TX) Norman Williams (TX)
 James Nunn (IA) Wilson (SC)
 Johnson (LA) Johnson (SD) Obernolte Wittman
 Johnson (SD) Soto Ogles Womack
 Jordan Owens Yakym
 Joyce (OH) Palmer Zinke

NOT VOTING—15

Arrington Gallego Murphy
 Cleaver Garcia, Robert Nickel
 Cole Grijalva Roy
 De La Cruz Langworthy Sykes
 Diaz-Balart Magaziner Trone

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1714

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENOUNCING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1112) denouncing the Biden administration's immigration policies, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

NAYS—204

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Griffith Peltola
 NOT VOTING—14

Arrington Gallego Murphy
 Cleaver Garcia, Robert Nickel
 Cole Grijalva Sykes
 De La Cruz Langworthy Trone
 Diaz-Balart Magaziner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1703

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."
 So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2925) to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.
 The Clerk redesignated the motion.

Aderholt Bilirakis Chavez-DeRemer
 Alford Boebert Ciscomani
 Allen Bost Cline
 Amodei Brecheen Cloud
 Armstrong Buchanan Clyde
 Babin Busch Collins
 Bacon Burchett Comer
 Baird Burgess Crawford
 Balderson Burlison Crenshaw
 Banks Calvert Curtis
 Barr Cammack D'Esposito
 Bean (FL) Carey Davidson
 Bentz Carl DesJarlais
 Bergman Carter (GA) Donalds
 Bice Carter (TX) Duarte

[Roll No. 176]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—191

Adams	Carbajal	Costa
Agullar	Cárdenas	Courtney
Allred	Carson	Crockett
Amo	Carter (LA)	Crow
Auchincloss	Cartwright	Davis (IL)
Balint	Casar	Dean (PA)
Barragán	Case	DeGette
Beatty	Casten	DeLauro
Bera	Castor (FL)	DelBene
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Deluzio
Bishop (GA)	Cherfilus-	DeSaulnier
Blumenauer	McCormick	Dingell
Blunt Rochester	Chu	Doggett
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Escobar
Bowman	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Boyle (PA)	Clyburn	Españillat
Brown	Cohen	Evans
Brownley	Connolly	Fletcher
Bush	Correa	Foster

Foushee	Manning	Scanlon
Frankel, Lois	Matsui	Schakowsky
Frost	McBath	Schiff
Garamendi	McClellan	Schneider
Garcia (IL)	McCollum	Scholten
Garcia (TX)	McGarvey	Schrier
Goldman (NY)	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Gomez	Meeks	Scott, David
Gonzalez,	Menendez	Sewell
Vicente	Meng	Sherman
Gottheimer	Mfume	Sherrill
Green, Al (TX)	Moore (WI)	Slotkin
Hayes	Morelle	Smith (WA)
Himes	Moskowitz	Soto
Houlahan	Moulton	Spanberger
Hoyer	Mrvan	Stansbury
Hoyle (OR)	Mullin	Stanton
Huffman	Nadler	Stevens
Ivey	Napolitano	Strickland
Jackson (IL)	Neal	Suzoi
Jackson (NC)	Neguse	Swalwell
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Takano
Jacobs	Ocasio-Cortez	Thanedar
Jayapal	Omar	Thompson (CA)
Jeffries	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Panetta	Titus
Kamlager-Dove	Pappas	Tlaib
Kaptur	Pascrell	Tokuda
Keating	Pelosi	Tonko
Kelly (IL)	Peters	Torres (CA)
Khanna	Petterson	Torres (NY)
Kildee	Phillips	Trahan
Kilmer	Pingree	Underwood
Kim (NJ)	Pocan	Vargas
Krishnamoorthi	Porter	Vasquez
Kuster	Pressley	Veasey
Landsman	Quigley	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Ramirez	Wasserman
Larsen (CT)	Raskin	Schultz
Lee (CA)	Ross	Waters
Lee (PA)	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Leger Fernandez	Ruppersberger	Wexton
Levin	Ryan	Wild
Lieu	Salinas	Williams (GA)
Lofgren	Sánchez	Wilson (FL)
Lynch	Sarbanes	

NOT VOTING—15

Arrington	Gallego	Murphy
Cleaver	Staubert	Nickel
Cole	Garcia, Robert	Roy
De La Cruz	Grijalva	Sykes
Diaz-Balart	Langworthy	Trone
	Magaziner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1720

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, due to a family illness, I was unable to be present for votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 172, NAY on Roll Call No. 173, YEA on Roll Call No. 174, NAY on Roll Call No. 175, and YEA on Roll Call No. 176.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, MAY 2, 2024; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MAY 2, 2024, TO MONDAY, MAY 6, 2024

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, May 6, 2024, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MALOY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

GIVE-UP GROUPS

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

Mr. LALOTA. Madam Speaker, “give-up groups” is the new term coined by our brave Border Patrol for an assembly of about 10 to 30 migrants who cross north across America’s southern border, where there is no wall or barrier, and who don’t even attempt to evade Border Patrol.

Rather, the give-up groups know that if they falsely claim asylum, President Biden will facilitate their parole into our country. Not only that, the Biden administration will give them a pair of Crocs, a sandwich, a sweat suit, and a plane ride to a city, like New York.

I learned about give-up groups this past weekend on my fourth trip to the southern border. This new tactic is another way the migrants are taking advantage of President Biden’s terrible border policy.

Madam Speaker, to secure the border and to stop these give-up groups, President Biden should reinstate the 64 successful Trump-era border policies.

UKRAINE AID PACKAGE BOLSTERS THEIR FIGHT

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

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, mere hours after this House finally passed critical security aid for our democratic allies, I found myself on a train in the countryside of war-torn Ukraine.

Along with a bipartisan group of colleagues, we were the first four Members of Congress to celebrate our bicameral accomplishment with Ukraine’s President Volodymyr Zelenskyy. He shared with us that the world watched that vote, and he shared his gratitude, the gratitude of a President, of an army, and of a nation.

We were grounded by this victory and clear-eyed about victories yet to come. Ukraine must defeat Putin’s illegal, barbaric assault on democracy. Our aid package will bolster their fight, providing training, equipment, and weapons to Ukraine, as well as replenishing our own U.S. weapons stock.

While abroad, we met with the Ukrainian military and our own 82nd Airborne Division. They told us they feel the weight of this struggle. They feel a sense of purpose, a sense of history, and their role in it.

By passing aid to Ukraine, Madam Speaker, we fulfill our American obligation to lead and meet our obligation to protect the health, safety, and security of democracies worldwide.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Avery M. Stringer, one of the secretaries.

□ 1730

NEW YORK TAX

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

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise to point out that New York State has never seen a tax that it does not like. Sadly, in New York, we are once again looking at a \$15 cash grab to enter Manhattan city center, affecting constituents of mine in Staten Island and Brooklyn, shifting traffic to the outer boroughs of New York City, and of course, hurting our economy when we are trying to get back on our feet post COVID.

It is unconscionable that the Biden Administration rubber-stamped the congestion pricing cash grab of the MTA at the request of Governor Kathy Hochul without even requiring an environmental impact statement as required by Federal law. The NEPA process is clear, and this is a clear violation, which is why myself and others, including some in this Chamber, have sued to try to stop this cash grab.

We call on the Biden administration to reverse course. Do not allow this toll to go through. You are hurting the people of New York State. You are hurting New York City's center, which is an economic engine for the entire country.

I hope my colleagues will join my legislation to stop it.

SOCIAL SECURITY FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. LANDSMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call for real action on the Social Security Fairness Act and have it be brought to the floor. There are over 300 of us who have signed onto this bill, and once you hit 290, it should come to the floor.

Now, the bill itself will be a game changer for public employees who are retired and aren't getting all of their Social Security, even though they paid into Social Security throughout their career.

The bill aims to ensure that retired public servants receive their full Social Security benefits. This is obviously so critically important as people are working to pay their bills, visit family, buy groceries, et cetera.

Americans pay into Social Security. They have for decades so that they can receive their hard-earned dollars when they retire. By fixing the program, millions of families will know their full Social Security benefits will be there for them when they retire.

I will say that people come up to me all the time and say, if this passes, we are talking \$1,800, \$2,000. Please bring it to the floor.

HONORING ALEXANDRIA CARBONE AND MARISSA RAMIREZ

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroic actions of two Claxton High School students.

Dedicated soccer players, Alexandria Carbone and Marissa Ramirez were at their local Dairy Queen for an after-practice treat when they witnessed a medical emergency. Both Alexandria and Marissa jumped in to perform CPR on the man as they waited for first responders.

Their situational awareness and preparedness saved a life that day. While many people may know the basics of CPR, it can be very challenging to put knowledge into action in high-pressure situations.

Both of these young women demonstrated selflessness and bravery by stepping up and stepping in. They want this to serve as a reminder to be aware of your surroundings and to always be compassionate towards those in need.

They were recently honored by their city council, and it is my pleasure to honor these outstanding individuals here today. I thank Alexandria and Marissa for their actions and example.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO JUSTIN MATURO

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I pay tribute today to an outstanding public servant, Justin Maturo, who is ending his nearly 6-year tenure as my legislative director.

He joined my team in 2018, and I quickly came to trust Justin's analytic mind to sort through the myriad of bills going to the floor each day as well as his political judgment and prudence. He has helped me secure important legislative wins as that was part of his job, but his service was always connected to the success of our Nation, not just to the success of his boss.

While my heart is heavy upon the loss of my highly valued lieutenant, our country is the richer as Justin assumes a role as special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs.

I wish him well in his new position and thank him for the service he has rendered to me, my constituents, and our Nation. In turn, all I ask him to do is continue to do great things for us all.

SPREAD OF ENCAMPMENTS AT UNIVERSITIES

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

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, the spread of tent encampments and all of the associated illegal and anti-Semitic activity at our universities is deeply disturbing, disruptive, and dangerous. We are seeing scenes that absolutely defy belief, that I never would have expected to see in this country.

At UCLA, Jewish students are being physically blocked from entering campus or going into the library. Our university administrators have allowed this to happen. It never should have gotten to this point.

Enough is enough. I am calling on university leaders to work with law enforcement to immediately clear the encampments, arrest lawbreakers, and put a stop to this chaos.

Cancelling classes, as some universities have done, punishes all students and is not the answer. The Education and the Workforce Committee is expanding its investigation to California, and the chancellor of UC Berkeley will be testifying in a few weeks.

We are closely watching events at our universities and will hold university leadership accountable for inaction.

REMEMBERING ADMIRAL JOHN C. AQUILINO

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

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, this Friday at Kilo Pier, Pearl Harbor, Admiral John C. Aquilino, call sign "Lung," relinquished his command of the U.S. Indo-Pacific Command and closes four decades of service to our Nation.

Throughout, Admiral Aquilino has exemplified loyalty to his oath. At INDOPACOM, he has been fiercely realistic about the challenge we face and fiercely focused on the path we must take.

His rock has always been his wife, Laura, and their daughters, Jess and Lisa. We owe them a true debt of gratitude.

When he assumed command 3 years ago, Admiral Aquilino quoted Admiral Nimitz doing the same in December 1941 at Pearl Harbor: "It is a great responsibility, but I shall do my utmost to meet it."

Admiral Aquilino has more than met his responsibility, and we are truly grateful.

HONORING REAR ADMIRAL MING ERH CHANG

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

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of the first naturalized Asian American to become a flag officer in the United States Navy, Rear Admiral Ming Erh Chang.

He was born in Shanghai, China, in 1932. Just over a decade later, in 1946, his family immigrated to the United States to escape the Chinese Communist Party.

His dream was to attend the U.S. Naval Academy. However, because he was not a citizen, he was not allowed to do so. He was not deterred.

Instead, he attended the College of William and Mary. After graduating, he joined the Navy in 1958, becoming one of the first officers to earn the rank of admiral after completing officer candidate school rather than the Naval Academy.

Rear Admiral Chang served our Nation honorably for 34 years before retiring in 1992. He dedicated the rest of his life to mentoring and promoting young Asian Americans so they could achieve the American Dream as he had done.

Rear Admiral Chang passed away in October 2017. He embodied what it meant to be an American, to serve our great Nation, and to carve a path forward for future generations of Asian Americans. It is a privilege to honor his legacy here today.

HONORING THE POLISH-AMERICAN RELATIONSHIP

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, the relationship between Poland and the United States and the contributions of Poles and Polish Americans to liberty during and since our American Revolution in 1776 are legendary.

As Polish Constitution Day approaches this Friday, May 3, our bipartisan House Polish Caucus will introduce a resolution recognizing the 105th anniversary of diplomatic relations between Poland and the United States. Those began on May 2, 1919, following the devastation of World War I.

Our Nation's enduring friendship dates back even further to Polish Generals Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski who nobly served during America's Revolutionary War fighting for America's independence.

During World War I, famed pianist Ignacy Jan Paderewski and Henryk Sienkiewicz traveled to the United States to promote the idea of an independent Poland.

Following World War I, President Woodrow Wilson delivered a compelling speech to Congress on January 22, 1917, advocating for Polish independence.

Let us pay tribute to the many contributions of Polish Americans and Poles to liberty on this Earth.

As Poland's first President Lech Walesa observes: "Every Pole is born with the Freedom gene."

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to co-sponsor this bipartisan resolution.

WILDFIRE SEASON APPROACHING

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

Mrs. KIM of California. Madam Speaker, with California's peak wildfire season approaching, many of my constituents are weary of the increased threat of wildfires. First responders' ability to detect wildfires and share information rapidly and securely during a wildfire is a matter of life and death.

That is why I am thrilled that the House this week passed the Fire Weather Development Act, which I helped introduce with Representatives GARCIA and CARAVEO. This bipartisan bill includes two bills I worked on that boost fire weather forecasting technologies and public safety communication standards, which I introduced after hearing from local, State, and Federal first responders.

I am proud to co-lead this common-sense bill, and I will continue to fight to get this across the finish line so we can improve wildfire readiness and protect our communities.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE COMMISSION CORPS

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Speaker, the United States Public Health Service Commission Corps is one of the Nation's uniformed service branches on the front lines of public health access across our country and our world.

Since wildfires destroyed Lahaina last August, 86 officers have been deployed to Maui to support behavioral health, disaster recovery, and environmental health responses.

They provided clinical care, created safe spaces for people to face their trauma, and made sure that first responders got the mental health support they needed, too. They even help initiate a biosurveillance program to monitor toxic exposure on first responders and the Hawaii National Guard.

Understanding the importance of meeting people where they are at, they provided services at schools, at congregate and non-congregate shelters, and at community events. Working with trusted local entities, they developed a mandatory cultural briefing for all responders, greatly enhancing their ability to care for a community in crisis.

The next time you thank our uniformed service branches for their service to our country, remember the men and the women of the Public Health Corps. When the health and wellbeing of our communities are on the line,

when you need them, they will be there.

HONORING TERRY ANDERSON

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

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Terry Anderson, who recently passed at his home in Greenwood Lake, New York. Terry served our country with honor and distinction, first as a marine and later as a journalist.

In 1985, while reporting on the Lebanese civil war as the AP's chief Middle Eastern correspondent, Terry was abducted by terrorists from Hezbollah and held hostage for 7 years. Terry never lost his sense of humor or his fiery spirit.

After his return to freedom, his extraordinary humanitarian efforts uplifted lives in our community and across the globe. Terry cofounded the Vietnam Children's Fund, building over 50 schools for communities in need. It was my privilege to fight alongside him to end veteran homelessness through the Rumshock Veterans Foundation on whose board he served.

My thoughts and our whole community's thoughts are with Terry's family and the countless friends and colleagues that come from a life well lived and grounded in service.

I want to share in closing words from Terry himself: "If you keep the hatred, you can't have the joy." I think we can all learn something from Mr. Terry Anderson, a true American patriot.

□ 1745

RECLASSIFYING MARIJUANA

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

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the news that the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration will soon reclassify marijuana as a less dangerous drug.

Reclassifying marijuana from a schedule I drug to a schedule III drug while not legalizing marijuana is an important step in normalizing cannabis use in the United States and recognizing that marijuana is not cocaine, and it is not heroin.

The order will broaden access to the drug for medicinal purposes and move us further away from a time of prosecution and incarceration for simple possession, something that has had damaging effects to Black and Brown communities across this country.

I commend President Biden for his important work on this issue. From pardoning thousands of Americans convicted of simple possession of marijuana to reviewing all Federal marijuana laws, the Biden administration is taking the necessary steps to improve marijuana policy in the United States.

Promises made, promised delivered. I thank President Biden.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLOTTE

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

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, in the face of tragedy, we often find ourselves angry and disillusioned, but Madam Speaker, I rise today because I am thankful.

I am thankful for the strength of the Charlotte community, I am thankful for the law enforcement personnel that put their lives on the line each and every day to protect us, and I am thankful for the four officers that made the ultimate sacrifice in Charlotte this past Monday.

Thomas “Tommy” Weeks, was a 13-year veteran of the U.S. marshals, a husband and dedicated father of four children.

Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department Officer Joshua Eyer, was a 6-year veteran of the Department who was recently named Employee of the Month. Joshua leaves behind his wife, Ashley, and their beautiful 3-year-old son.

Department of Adult Correction Officers Sam Poloche and Alden Elliott, were both 14-year veterans of the Department.

Officer Poloche was known for being active in his community, a loving husband, and a devoted father to his two sons who are set to graduate from high school and college in just a few weeks.

Officer Elliott also leaves behind a loving wife and one child.

As we mourn these four men and pray for the speedy recovery of the four other officers who were injured, let us never forget to be thankful for the heroes that walk among us and to the families and colleagues these men leave behind.

Your community is with you. We are here for you, and we are lifting you up in prayer. The days and weeks ahead will be difficult, but together, we will persevere because we are Charlotte Strong.

May the memories of these officers be the light that guides us forward and provides comfort to those who are mourning.

WE ARE BETTER THAN THIS

(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. Madam Speaker, I wish there were many, many minutes, but let me take this 1 minute to say to the American people: We are better than this, and to offer to all of those who are in pain, those who feel that they are not respected, who have come from the Mideast and believe that people do not respect them, yes, you are. This is America. We believe in free speech, free expression.

For those who are Palestinian, we respect your view, we respect the view of those who are from Israel, and we must show that as we go home to honor our communities. We must show that.

We must also stop anti-Semitism and show who we are. If we show them who we are, that is who we are. We must show that freedom of religion counts in America, freedom of religion, freedom of speech.

Yes, we must honor those law enforcement officers who have fallen in the line of duty. This week they have died. We want them to know that they will not be forgotten.

I stand here today as I started, Madam Speaker, by saying: We are better than this. We are Americans. We will always fight for freedom.

We will always fight for your freedom. We will always fight for your ability to say that, and I will leave this floor right now to say that speech and those words are important, Madam Speaker.

DESIGNATION OF JILL BAISINGER AS ACTING INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-134)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is to advise that I am exercising my authority to designate an Acting Inspector General of the Department of Commerce. I have directed that Jill Baisinger, who is currently serving as the Chief of Staff in the Office of Inspector General at the Department of the Interior, shall serve concurrently as Acting Inspector General of the Department of Commerce, effective 30 days from today.

In January, the Inspector General of the Department of Commerce resigned and the Deputy Inspector General began performing the functions and duties of the Inspector General in an acting capacity.

I have determined that during this period of transition, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) at the Department of Commerce would benefit from leadership brought in from outside of the office. In a letter to the President dated March 18, 2024, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (Committee) stated that they had reached the same conclusion after a 10-month investigation. The attached letter from Counsel to the President Ed Siskel, which I have incorporated here by reference, provides additional details regarding the Committee's investigation.

Jill Baisinger is well positioned to provide independent and strong leader-

ship to the OIG at the Department of Commerce. She has an exemplary track record in the Office of Inspector General at the Department of the Interior and previously at the Office of Inspector General at the Department of State. Her leadership experience, deep understanding of the mission of Inspectors General, and expertise in oversight and investigations will help the OIG perform its vital role for the Department of Commerce.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 1, 2024.

IMPORTANT ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, this is an important week in the House of Representatives as we discuss several issues important to Americans across the country, from standing up for Jewish students in the midst of dangerous anti-Semitic rhetoric and demonstrations being tolerated at universities across the country to denouncing the Biden administration for their mishandling of the crisis at our southern border.

It was also Lands Week this week, and House Republicans proudly championed and passed legislation that will unleash American energy, promote outdoor access, and support local communities.

In my home State of Utah, we are deeply concerned about the Biden administration's Federal land overreach that is stifling economic growth, national security, and recreation opportunities.

I thank my colleague for joining me this evening, on a fly-out day, no less.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN).

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah, my friend, for having this Special Order tonight to once again highlight the failures of the Biden administration on our southern border.

Since President Biden's first day in office, he has failed our Nation by refusing to secure the southern border.

During his first year, President Biden reversed several of President Trump's policies that were effective in addressing illegal immigration.

President Biden stopped construction of the border wall, even though it was already funded. Instead, he paid contractors \$6 million a day while he studied the border.

President Biden ended President Trump's remain in Mexico policy before the Supreme Court forced him to reinforce it.

President Biden came into office hyperfixated on implementing radical policies to appease progressive activists, and in turn, he has left our southern border wide open.

Since he was sworn in, there have been more than 9.2 million illegal immigrant encounters across the country, nearly three times the population of my home State of Kansas.

More than 1.8 million of those illegal immigrants have evaded the U.S. Border Patrol and slipped into the country.

There have been at least 350 encounters with individuals on the terrorist watch list and more than 24,000 encounters with Chinese nationals.

Make no mistake. The Mexican cartels have been empowered by President Biden's failed policies, and they are cashing in by helping people all across the globe illegally enter our great country.

As a result, we have had more drugs on our streets and crimes in our neighborhoods. Fentanyl has poured into the country while human trafficking and uncontrollable crime run rampant.

Under President Biden's policies, every State is a border State. Border security is national security, and enough is enough.

House Republicans voted again this week to make our Nation safe and restore order to our Nation's immigration system. It is time for President Biden to work with House Republicans to secure the southern border for good.

I thank Mr. MOORE again for having this Special Order hour.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas, and we appreciate the chair for the time today on this Special Order, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HEALTHCARE UNDER ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACOBS. Madam Speaker, 3 years ago during my first year in Congress, I froze my eggs, which means I went through the initial stages of IVF, except that after egg retrieval, my eggs were frozen and stored.

For weeks, I took hormone pills, gave myself injections, and went to the doctor for checkups. Then I had a procedure under twilight sedation to harvest my eggs.

Many people use IVF if they are single or LGBTQ+, if they are older or experiencing fertility issues or have suffered multiple miscarriages, but no matter the reason for IVF, it should be a valid and viable choice for anyone.

Unfortunately, IVF, like many reproductive healthcare options, is under at-

tack in the courts and here in the Halls of Congress.

Madam Speaker, 184 of my Republican colleagues have cosponsored legislation that supports "fetal personhood" giving embryos the same full legal rights as a person.

□ 1800

This fringe ideology is dangerous and could be used to prosecute people for miscarriages or for having an abortion and could potentially affect access to birth control, too.

It could threaten access to IVF. During IVF, doctors often create more fertilized embryos than they plan on using, because some may be genetically unviable or result in miscarriages.

I have 17 mature eggs frozen. Patients like me pay for the storage of our eggs or embryos, and eventually some embryos are usually donated for medical research or destroyed.

Fetal personhood legislation, and even court rulings like the one in Alabama, could force patients to pay for storage of their embryos forever or leave clinics liable to criminal charges if embryos are damaged. That is why at least one IVF clinic in Alabama is ending the service.

This is just the beginning. Last week, Supreme Court Justice Alito acknowledged fetal personhood in his line of questioning in *Moyle v. United States*, a case that could decide the future of emergency abortion care.

I say this to my Republican colleagues: You can't support fetal personhood and support IVF access. You can't falsely claim to be pro-life and then rip away people's dreams of having children, and you can't hide and try to bury your true end goal.

I call on all 184 House Republicans, including Speaker JOHNSON, who have cosponsored legislation that would treat embryos as children and threaten access to IVF and other reproductive health services to come to the House floor and publicly remove their name from this bill, prove that they support IVF access, prove that they support families, and prove that they are not a hypocrite.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, first and foremost, let me thank Representative JACOBS for her determined leadership on this particular issue, among many others.

I stand here today in solidarity with Representative JACOBS, Representative WILD, and the leaders of the Pro-Choice Caucus in the United States Congress to help shine a light, as my colleague from California has done so well, on House Republican hypocrisy.

In February, as we now know, the Alabama Supreme Court issued a dangerous ruling that upended fertility care and opened the door for extremists to push through their destructive agenda.

In the months that followed, as Representative JACOBS referenced, many House Republicans have rushed to this House floor, to any TV camera that they may be able to find, to profess their support for IVF, the reproductive technology in question.

To them, I say the same admonition that Representative JACOBS offered: Their actions have clearly shown otherwise. They have already shown who they are and what they believe.

Make no mistake, Madam Speaker. If given the chance, unfortunately, extreme Members of the Republican Conference will find every opportunity to deprive Americans of their fundamental freedoms, criminalizing abortion nationwide, prosecuting the doctors and nurses willing to perform life-saving care, and pursuing this dangerous legislation that Representative JACOBS so eloquently described.

We, of course, are already seeing the consequences of that extremism across the country, in Ohio, in Alabama, and in Florida, where just today, a ban on abortion past 6 weeks of pregnancy has taken effect.

Madam Speaker, the American people will not stand for this. House Democrats will not stand for this. We will keep pushing back against these plans to drag Americans back to the laws of the last century, and we will keep working to protect the right of every woman to make her own healthcare decisions.

I again salute Representative JACOBS, and, in particular, I want to salute Representative WILD, who introduced legislation that this body must pass in the days and weeks ahead. I salute her for her leadership and her determination on behalf of every American in our land.

Ms. JACOBS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PROTECTING ACCESS TO IVF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, before we begin, I want to take a moment to acknowledge that as of today, Florida's cruel and inhumane 6-week abortion ban has taken effect. Attacks on women's basic reproductive freedom have not and will not stop. While days like today are difficult, they also remind us of the stakes that we are facing in this fight.

I, for one, am proud to stand here and declare my unwavering support for reproductive freedom. When the Supreme Court took the cruel but unsurprising step to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, my heart broke for all the women whose basic reproductive freedom would now be in jeopardy.

As a mother, a lawyer who used to represent healthcare providers, and as a sitting Member of Congress, I have

always believed that private medical decisions should be kept squarely between a woman and her healthcare provider.

After my immediate horror at the Dobbs decision faded, I started thinking about what other opportunities this would open up for far-right extremists to further control women's bodies and their healthcare decisions. It is why I worked hard with my staff in the year after Dobbs to draft and introduce the Access to Family Building Act, which would codify a right to in vitro fertilization and other assistive reproductive technologies at the Federal level, because I knew that extreme politicians, intent on controlling women's bodies, wouldn't stop at abortion rights. They were coming after all forms of reproductive healthcare.

One month after I introduced this bill on the House floor, the Alabama State Supreme Court made the heart-breaking and cruel decision to classify frozen embryos as children, throwing IVF patients and providers into a state of confusion and panic.

We heard it almost immediately. Clinics stopped doing the procedures at all. Women who were in the middle of an IVF treatment cycle literally had to just stop.

On the heels of the Alabama decision, more than 150 of my colleagues signed on as cosponsors of the bill. Numerous healthcare and advocacy organizations endorsed it, including the Military Family Association, and constituents across my community and throughout the country shared their own difficult fertility journeys.

As someone who struggled with infertility myself, I know how heart-breaking and expensive this process can be. I know for sure that politicians and courts should not have a say in how anyone chooses to start or grow their families.

Don't let anyone tell you that it is just rich career women seeking to defer their childbearing years who rely on IVF. Over the past several months, I have been in close contact with both veterans and cancer patients, men and women, by the way, who have spoken about their own IVF needs and their fears that this safe and reliable procedure may now be in jeopardy.

The reality is that these are the stakes that we are dealing with. The reason we are gathered here tonight is to shed light on additional pieces of legislation that some of our colleagues have introduced or supported, which, if enacted, could have the same repercussions as the Alabama decision.

It is important to note that not everyone on the other side of the aisle is aligned on this issue, and I applaud the handful of my Republican colleagues who have signed onto the Access to Building Families Act to protect IVF and other forms of reproductive assistance. However, there is a real and present threat that exists right here in Congress of extremists who have signaled their explicit intention to attack

IVF and other forms of reproductive healthcare at the Federal level.

Make no mistake. Any of these national bans that have been talked about or proposed that would classify frozen embryos as children would supersede State-level protections thereby throwing IVF access into complete jeopardy nationwide. That includes a State like mine, Pennsylvania, which currently has no such restrictions.

A Federal ban would absolutely affect every woman and couple in Pennsylvania and throughout the country trying to start a family and experiencing infertility issues requiring them to avail themselves of these types of reproductive technologies.

That is why I am not going to stop fighting to protect it, and it is why I am proud to have received such overwhelming support for the Access to Family Building Act. I hope that we will soon be able to bring this to a vote on the House floor.

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

AN EXTRAORDINARY DISPLAY OF ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I would note that today we have seen around the country an extraordinary display of anti-Semitic activity on college campuses throughout the country: Columbia University, USC, and even in Austin, Texas, at the University of Texas near where I live and a city that I represent in part.

We saw today protesters replacing the American flag with the Palestinian flag in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. We are seeing all sorts of derogatory actions and statements being directed to our Jewish brothers and sisters in this country, and it should not be tolerated. It should be called out. It is unacceptable.

It is not speech. It is not speech when you are engaging in the kind of conduct that we are talking about where a young Jewish man was being denied entry into a building and being asked whether he was Zionist.

This is not speech. This is action with these encampments when you take over a university, State-owned or private, in particular the University of Texas, a State university. When you take over at USC, you deny the ability of parents and students who have worked to graduate. You are blocking access. This is not speech. Let me be perfectly clear.

University of Texas President Jay Hartzell and the leadership of that university are doing the exact right thing by clearing out the people in the encampments taking over the university. President Ben Sasse at the University of Florida is doing the exact right thing by saying that the University of

Florida is not a daycare, that these are adults, and they know full well what they are doing and that they will get the consequences of their actions. That is leadership.

The University of Texas has allowed free speech multiple times in respect to people who are protesting the conflict, protesting Israel, and supporters of the Palestinians. I think there have been 13 or 14 events at the University of Texas that have been officially sanctioned and other free speech.

Here is the thing. Yet again today, here on the floor of the House of Representatives, we had another show vote to make people feel good about themselves by passing a bill that says anti-Semitism in the title. That is what happened. It was put on the floor by Republican leadership, and it was put on the floor by Republican leadership despite knowing that it was pulled from going through committee. We didn't have a chance to amend it. We didn't have a chance to discuss it and debate it. We didn't have a hearing on it. It was jammed through to take advantage of this political moment while all of these horrific things are going on around the country. Republican leadership wanted to score political points, so they moved through legislation without the kind of deliberation and debate that is supposed to be carried out by the people in this Chamber.

As a result, today, a significant number of my Republican colleagues, including myself, voted no. As a result, we will be accused of—I don't know—being for anti-Semitic behavior, being accused by our friends and allies of not wanting to support Israel, supporting our Jewish-American colleagues and friends, constituents, and fellow Americans. Nothing could be further from the truth, but that is what will happen. It will happen because we dared to stand up and say we don't believe in thought police.

□ 1815

We don't believe that a bill should be brought to the floor of the United States House of Representatives, having not gone through committee, that has a reference to an international organization's definition literally in the statute, and then taking that international organization's definition and then literally in the statute representing and referencing the examples of anti-Semitic behavior.

I find the vast majority of the things that are listed in that to be horrific activity, and most likely, if not certainly, they are anti-Semitic, at least in most contexts. Some of them are problematic.

In totality, they certainly raise First Amendment concerns. They certainly raise concerns about something that I have opposed, to the best of my knowledge and ability, having read through the piece of legislation at every turn and every vote, to oppose the whole notion of hate speech, hate crimes, thought police, thought crimes, and

putting the government into your head and your motivations when you are engaged in criminal behavior.

Criminal behavior is criminal behavior. Violating people's civil rights is violating people's civil rights.

When we want to insert the government into what you are thinking and what motivates you, Madam Speaker, then you are empowering that which should never be empowered: the ability of the government to police thought, to police speech, and to police your views, not the views that carry out, then the actions. The actions are the problem. Police the actions.

Yet, that is what we did, and I am damned proud of my colleagues, particularly on this side of the aisle, who stood up and said no because it was a hard vote.

Madam Speaker, do you know what I have to spend my time doing tonight, tomorrow, and this week? I will be explaining to my Jewish constituents, supporters, and friends that I stand with them unequivocally.

They will say: What do you mean unequivocally? You voted against the bill that is titled anti-Semitism.

I will say it is because the slippery slope of tyranny that has led to the death, that has led to the harassment, and that has led to the abject discrimination and oppression of people around this world—those roads lead through the empowerment of government bureaucrats at the expense of liberty. Liberty stops at the door of harming somebody—taking their stuff, blocking roads, and doing the kinds of things that actually directly impact and harm people—not what you think.

That is what we do. We do things for political motivations. The Republican leadership knew it, and they put it on the floor anyway.

I am sick of it. I am sick of my Republican colleagues who want to go out and campaign for power to maintain power to then come in here and do the very things we said that we oppose.

There is a bill in the House Judiciary Committee right now. That bill will say that the Department of Justice can go into a State and prosecute a cop killer if the local jurisdiction effectively refuses to do that.

That sounds good, doesn't it, Madam Speaker, if you are pro-cop and pro-police and have a George Soros prosecutor sitting in Austin, Texas, or New York City who is refusing to do their job, do their duty, and follow their conscience to go prosecute a dangerous individual who killed a cop? You say, well, CHIP, of course, we should bring in the Department of Justice and take care of that horrific result.

Here is the problem: There is no end. The bill is based on commerce. The gun transports in commerce. The defendant traveled in commerce.

Why does that matter? Let me ask you a question, Madam Speaker. The bill before the Judiciary Committee says that if something is involved in commerce, then the Federal Govern-

ment and the Department of Justice, whether it is led by a Republican or Merrick Garland, can come in, based on whatever rationale they want, and say they are going to prosecute this crime committed against a cop.

Why not against a nurse? Why not against a doctor? Why not a firefighter? Why not a teacher? Why not a member of the clergy? It won't end.

Our Founders didn't set up a Federal police. Our Constitution does not contemplate a Federal police. Our Federal Government is not supposed to police us in our homes and in our communities.

It is egregious that there are cops who have been murdered and DAs who refuse to do their duty to prosecute their killers, but I will be damned if I am going to empower a government to extend beyond its constitutional limits using the same bastardized use of the Commerce Clause that we have decried for decades because it has expanded a government that is now tyrannically using its power to go after the American people, go after former politicians, including the former President, that is spending money we don't have, that is using that power to regulate us to death on virtually every bill that virtually every Republican on this side of the aisle who claims to be a limited government conservative votes for.

Why? It is because they don't want the Fraternal Order of Police or other law enforcement organizations to come after them.

Last night, I didn't even have an amendment circulated yet. I simply begged the question: Why are we putting forward a bill that expands the power of the Department of Justice under the Commerce Clause, no matter how meritorious our goal is in ensuring cop killers go to jail? Why are we doing that?

Aren't we limited government conservatives who don't believe in the expansive use of the Commerce Clause to expand the power of the Federal Government because it is used for thousands of other things that we don't like?

I hadn't even gotten the ink dry on the concept of an amendment when someone in the body had already notified police organizations and said: Go after him.

Do you know what, Madam Speaker? Go ahead. I work for 750,000 Texans. I respond to them, God, and the Constitution of the United States. I do not work for anybody in this Chamber. I do not work for any organization. I don't work for any donor. I work for the people, and I work for a people who are sick and damn tired of this institution run by a bunch of people who campaign saying one thing and get here and do another.

Madam Speaker, \$34.5 trillion of debt, \$1 trillion every 3 months—we already spend more on interest than on defense. We are about to crack \$1 trillion of interest. They say we will hit \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion of interest by 2030.

Our borders are wide open. We have kids dying. In Austin, Texas, four more people the other night died from fentanyl poisoning. A bunch of others had to be resuscitated with Narcan. The people of Texas are continuing to deal with thousands of people pouring across the border.

It is not in the headlines right now because universities are in the headlines, but everybody in Texas who is reeling from inflation, who can't afford a car, who can't afford their home, who can't afford the interest on their mortgage, who can't afford to buy groceries, who is dealing with crime on their streets, and who is dealing with open borders want some sort of sanity coming out of this institution.

What do we do? What are Republicans doing in all their infinite wisdom? We fund more of it. We fund the Department of Homeland Security again. We give the FBI a brand-new \$200 million headquarters.

Madam Speaker, you can't even make this stuff up.

We give more power to the intelligence community to spy on Americans. We don't even protect Americans with warrants. Madam Speaker, you can't even make it up.

Over the last 16 months, there has been a battle that represents the larger war brewing within the Republican Party. That is because, unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have gone far down the rabbit hole of radical progressive policies that absolutely destroy our country every single day. They are littering our country with regulations, littering our country with all sorts of crime, littering our country with open borders, and engaging in endless wars.

All the stuff that is happening is because our Democratic colleagues are, frankly, undermining the American Dream, undermining Western civilization, and undermining everything we hold dear.

I want to tell you, Madam Speaker, there is a battle going on for the soul of the party and the country within the Republican Party. I want to tell you, Madam Speaker, I am not in the majority. I am not.

You say, CHIP, you are in the majority of the House, and you have a razor-thin majority. No, I am not. I am not in the majority. I am in the minority, a minority of Republicans who try to wake up here and change this place rather than just campaign on it. That is the truth.

Right now, President Biden is considering bringing refugees from Gaza into the United States. I don't know what the background checks will be. I don't know what we will do to ensure that these are individuals who are not affiliated with terrorist organizations.

The number is something like three-quarters of the people of Gaza support what Hamas is doing in attacking Israel. Large numbers of civilians were involved in the attacks on Israel.

The bill we just voted on last week, the foreign aid package of \$95 billion, is

it paid for? No. Does it fund Ukraine with no clear mission? Yes.

Everybody here who voted for it said: Don't worry. That will be the last. We just need that money, and when President Trump gets elected, it will be over.

The ink was not even dry, and they were already talking about a new Ukraine package for the fall, more Ukraine money. Do you think that will be paid for? No.

The money for Israel, \$17 billion, is that paid for? No.

Was there another \$9 billion that is going to be used for the nongovernmental organizations, the NGOs, and filter that money to Hamas? Yes.

Was there \$5 billion in there that will go to refugee assistance? Yes. Will that refugee assistance fund moving some of these folks from Gaza to America to be your neighbor, Madam Speaker? Yes.

That is what we voted on. That is what we voted for. Thankfully, a majority of Republicans voted against it, but our illustrious Republican leadership brought it to the floor anyway. Why? We are told that we had no choice. There is no choice. That is always the excuse.

Meanwhile, here, in addition to the refugees who may be dumped in here from Gaza, in 2023, last year, in an 8-month stretch, about 200,000 migrants flew into the United States via the President's parole program. Eighty percent of those folks went to Florida, thousands went to Texas, and thousands were flown around our country.

The American people have no idea how bad the border situation really is. Our Democratic colleagues are practically giddy at what they are getting out of the Republicans in the House of Representatives, which is nada in terms of opposition. It is nothing, zero opposition to what our Democratic colleagues are trying to perpetrate on the American people by way of a President ignoring the law, racking up, I am told by independent outside organizations making determinations of the cost, about \$800 billion to \$1.4 trillion in student loan forgiveness.

Madam Speaker, you can't even make this up. What do we do? We pay for it. We keep paying for it. We are paying for the administration of it.

□ 1830

We didn't put any blocks in place through the omnibus appropriations bill. We didn't get a single change to open borders. We didn't get a single change to the student loan repayments or forgiveness. We didn't get a single change to the continuation of endless wars. We got negligible change on the FISA spying program. Right now, we have a backlog of several million people waiting for court proceedings as late as 2035 or 2037.

I was talking to some friends of mine the other night, who are a little bit more on the other side of the aisle, and they were saying: Republicans have issues with immigrants.

I said: Well, let me ask you a question: How many people do you think are in the United States who are foreign born?

I told them the answer: About 51½ million.

How many are legally coming every year? It depends on the year, but somewhere between 800,000, a million, 1.1 million. It depends on the year. It is almost a million. No other country is even close, by the way.

We are anti-immigrant because we think maybe we ought to pause for a second, maybe take stock of the state of our country? We can't pay for Medicare. We can't pay for Social Security without printing money. Hell, we can't pay for anything pretty much without printing money.

Here is the thing I would say to all of my Republican colleagues: Enjoy it when I come down here to the floor and I file a bill to raise taxes on whoever I decide needs to have their taxes raised on and have my colleagues explain how the majority is voting for more spending for endless wars and endless conflict and \$95 billion for Ukraine and overseas conflict and not paying for it. I will tell you what, I will give you the ability to pay for it.

Do my colleagues want to go out and sell tax increases to all of their donor friends? Go ahead. Go ahead to my Republican colleagues because Republicans have been taking a free ride on the idea of trickle down now for 25 years.

Now, I believe in low broad tax rates creating the maximum economic growth and opportunity and driving up revenues to the Treasury without constraining the productivity of the American people. I believe that.

However, I don't believe in listening to people complain to me that we are somehow obstructing the great Ronald Reagan's view of what we need to do through peace through strength to go help other people around the world, like Ukraine. We are now \$175 billion in. They already know they want another \$60 billion, \$100 billion. Hell, I saw a news account of \$500 billion. Who is going to pay for that?

Some people around town have had the temerity to tell me: CHIP, that is not that much money. Why are you gagging on an add? It is just \$60 billion. It is just \$175 billion.

The real problem is Medicare. Let me ask anybody who wants to jump in here. Oh, that is right, there are no more colleagues here.

Do you think that if you can't vote against a gay senior center in Massachusetts as an earmark that you are somehow going to go out and sell Medicare reform? No, you are not. You are selling a lie.

You are selling a fiction that, oh, trust me, one day, when we get the full power in the House, the Senate—never mind that we won't have 60 votes in the Senate, we will give that excuse next year—then, trust me, CHIP, we will do something like set a percentage of GDP

that we can tolerate as our overall spend level, and we will constrain, and we will fix this, and we will fix the doughnut hole, and we will fix all of these things nobody in America knows about, and we will pass some bills.

We will pat ourselves on the back, and we will pass another 10-year budget that has all of its cuts in the tenth year. Then, when it comes to the tax cut time, we are going to be for those tax cuts.

Again, I want to be very clear. I am for low taxes on the American people. Let me even go farther. If we are going to keep printing money, why do we have taxes at all?

I have asked that question in the Budget Committee. Nobody can answer it. If we are literally not going to actually adhere to a budget, balance the budget, constrain spending and do the responsible thing, which we never do, why on Earth would we not just get rid of taxes? If you are going to spend almost twice as much as you take in—which we are getting dangerously close to—if you take in \$4 trillion and you are spending \$3 trillion more than that—I don't know what the numbers are—why not just print the \$7 trillion? It was a genuine question.

Oh, CHIP, well, that would be irresponsible.

Why? We all know why. It is because we are living a fiction. We are living like this is something that isn't going to blow up on us. It is.

For all my colleagues who said: Oh, CHIP, 1980s, Ronald Reagan, he stood up and he said: "Tear down this wall." "Peace through strength." Built the military. Do you know what our debt-to-GDP ratio was then? About 35 percent. Do you know what it is today? About 120 percent, depending on which numbers you look at.

It is insane. It is like, oh, well, we will send this because Ukraine will stop Putin. Well, let's put aside whether that is even true or not. When are you going to pay for it? You are not.

Then, today, it is like we are going to go put forward a bill so we can feel good about ourselves so we can go out to our Jewish friends and say: Look, we passed an anti-Semitism bill. Pat me on the back. I am anti-anti-Semitism. Meanwhile, you completely destroy any notion of a principle that we should be against thought police.

Last year, we set out to change this place. I think we successfully did it for a while. We got seven appropriations bills passed out of the House Chamber. We had votes on about 1,100 amendments. We passed the strongest National Defense Authorization Act we have ever passed. We passed the strongest border security package in H.R. 2 we have ever passed. We finally put to bed notions that, to do that, you had to advance amnesty.

We were able to, over the course of the last year and a half, move all of the spending debate to the point where nondefense spending was held flat and the defense spending that went up was

paid for by taking money out of the IRS expansion and COVID funds. We were having serious conversations across the ideological spectrum, getting votes on bills, having regular order, going to committee, voting on amendments, and this place was briefly working again.

Right now, I have never seen it worse, with bills being cooked up in back rooms, being jammed through without going to committee, without amendment, many of which have miserable policies in them. We spent \$1.7 trillion in omnibus spending with all sorts of earmarks, all sorts of funding for FBI headquarters, continuation of broken and open borders, continuation of endless wars. We have busted the caps. Less than a year after passing the caps, we have busted the caps.

We then fund \$95 billion of additional foreign aid after passing a reauthorization to FISA. I will note: Conservatives jumped in there, and I think we forced it down to a 2-year reauthorization of FISA, so we will get another bite at that apple in 2 years. You are welcome. They are crumbs of freedom and liberty.

I am telling you, if you want to save this country, you need to make sure that we have a Republican Conference that is going to do what they said they were going to do. You need to make sure that the minority of us who are coming to the floor to fight for you are no longer in the minority.

We have a little bit of time. I said good-bye this last weekend to my 89-year-old grandmother. She passed away Sunday morning. I know she is up there with Jesus, no doubt getting a laugh at some of my antics down here. She was a wonderful woman, went to church every Sunday. She lived right.

She, her generation, all who came before her, they didn't fight as she did. She served for 35 years in the Air Force as a civilian at Barksdale Air Force

Base in Louisiana. Neither she, nor any of the other people who wore the uniform, nor any of the 400,000 tombstones at Arlington National Cemetery, nor any of the tombstones that are sitting over in Normandy when we go over there and we celebrate D-Day on June 6, on the 80th anniversary—none of those people gave the last full measure of devotion or are willing to risk the last full measure of devotion to mortgage this country away vote by vote, dollar by dollar, year by year.

We have a duty right now to take our country back because the radical, progressive Democrats and leftists who want to destroy it and who are going around city by city and university by university, they are not the majority. They don't represent a fraction of the people in this country who want to go about their job, honor God, take care of their family, work hard, earn a living, take care of their kids, start a business, achieve the American Dream. I am here to tell you: I am not going anywhere. We are going to take this country back because they don't get to have it.

We have to stand up as a party and do what we said we would do, or we will be in the ash bin of history.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 292. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 24355 Creekside Road in Santa Clarita, California, as the "William L. Reynolds Post Office Building".

H.R. 996. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3901 MacArthur Blvd., in New Orleans, Lou-

isiana, as the "Dr. Rudy Lombard Post Office".

H.R. 2379. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 616 East Main Street in St. Charles, Illinois, as the "Veterans of the Vietnam War Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 2754. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2395 East Del Mar Boulevard in Laredo, Texas, as the "Lance Corporal David Lee Espinoza, Lance Corporal Juan Rodrigo Rodriguez & Sergeant Roberto Arizola Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 3865. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 South 8th Street in Lebanon, Pennsylvania, as the "Lieutenant William D. Lebo Post Office Building".

H.R. 3944. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Church Street in Mount Vernon, Georgia, as the "Second Lieutenant Patrick Palmer Calhoun Post Office".

H.R. 3947. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 859 North State Road 21 in Melrose, Florida, as the "Pamela Jane Rock Post Office Building".

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 474.—An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen reporting to the CyberTipline related to online sexual exploitation of children, to modernize liabilities for such reports, to preserve the contents of such reports for 1 year, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 2, 2024, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2024, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, XENIA FLORES RUIZ, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 14 AND MAR. 18, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Xenia Flores Ruiz	3/14	3/18	Morocco		440.00		3,254.20				3,694.20
Committee total					440.00		3,254.20				3,694.20

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE JOHNSON, Apr. 18, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ESTONIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 22 AND MAR. 25, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Brett Guthrie	3/22	3/24	Estonia		370.59		8,178.90				8,549.49
Hon. Michael Turner	3/22	3/25	Estonia		610.88		12,277.50				12,888.38
Hon. Joe Wilson	3/22	3/25	Estonia		370.59		17,028.40				17,398.99
Jason Galanes	3/22	3/25	Estonia		720.88		6,838.50				7,559.38

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ESTONIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 22 AND MAR. 25, 2024—Continued

Table with columns: Name of Member or employee, Date (Arrival, Departure), Country, Per diem (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Transportation (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Other purposes (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Total (Foreign, U.S. dollar). Rows include Brian Fahey, Kate Knudson Wolters, Adam Howard, and Committee total.

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE JOHNSON, Apr. 18, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2024

Table with columns: Name of Member or employee, Date (Arrival, Departure), Country, Per diem (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Transportation (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Other purposes (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Total (Foreign, U.S. dollar).

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. [X]

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. GLEN THOMPSON, Apr. 23, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2024

Table with columns: Name of Member or employee, Date (Arrival, Departure), Country, Per diem (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Transportation (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Other purposes (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Total (Foreign, U.S. dollar). Rows include Hon. Lloyd Doggett and Committee total.

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JODEY C. ARRINGTON, Apr. 19, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2024

Table with columns: Name of Member or employee, Date (Arrival, Departure), Country, Per diem (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Transportation (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Other purposes (Foreign, U.S. dollar), Total (Foreign, U.S. dollar).

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. [X]

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL GUEST, Apr. 15, 2024.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3988. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — User Fees for Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection Services [Docket No.: APHIS-2022-0023] (RIN: 0579-AE71) received April 26, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-3989. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Major final rule, rescission — Definition of "Employer"—Association Health Plans (RIN: 1210-AC16) received April 30, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-3990. A letter from the Senior Policy and Regulatory Coordinator, Immediate Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Health and Human

Services Grants Regulation (RIN: 0945-AA19) received April 23, 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-3991. A letter from the Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 74.1231(i) of the Commission's Rules on FM Broadcast Booster Stations [MB Docket No.: 20-401]; Modernization of Media Initiative [MB Docket No.: 17-105]; Amendment of Section 74.1231(i) of the Commission's Rules on FM Broadcast Booster Stations [RM-11854] received April 24, 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-3992. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guidance — Preemption Authority, Enhanced Weapons Authority, and Firearms Background Checks [Regulator Guide 5.86, Revision 1] received April 24, 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-3993. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commis-

sion, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — FOIA Improvement Act [Notice 2024-13] received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3994. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Upholding Civil Service Protections and Merit System Principles [Docket ID: OPM-2023-0013] (RIN: 3206-AO56) received April 16, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3995. A letter from the Biologist, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to U.S. Space Force Launches and Supporting Activities at Vandenberg Space Force Base, Vandenberg, California [Docket No.: 240404-0097] (RIN: 0648-BM48) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3996. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Outdated Regulations (RIN: 0917-AA24) received April 25, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3997. A letter from the Fishery Management Specialist, NMFS, Office of International Affairs, Trade and Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Affairs; Antarctic Marine Living Resources Convention Act [Docket No.: 240311-0077] (RIN: 0648-BJ85) received April 16, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3998. A letter from the Biologist, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — List of Fisheries for 2024 [Docket No.: 240208-0041] (RIN: 0648-BM19) received April 16, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3999. A letter from the Fishery Management Specialist, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for Threatened Caribbean Corals; Correcting Amendment [Docket No.: 240312-0079] (RIN: 0648-BG26) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4000. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagics Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Amendment 31 [Docket No.: 181009921-8999-02] (RIN: 0648-BI46) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4001. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Island Fisheries; 5-Year Extension of Moratorium on Harvest of Gold Corals [Docket No.: 231215-0306] (RIN: 0648-BM34) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4002. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2023 Harvest Specifications for Pacific Whiting, and 2023 Pacific Whiting Tribal Allocation [Docket No.: 230523-0136] (RIN: 0648-BM07) received April 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4003. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Debarring Vessels From Entering U.S. Ports [Docket No.: USCBP-2022-0016; CBP Dec. 24-

07] (RIN: 1651-AB20) received April 16, 2024, 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-4004. A letter from the Division Chief, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Definition of "Engaged in the Business" as a Dealer in Firearms [Docket No.: ATF 2022R-17; AG Order No.: 5920-2024] (RIN: 1140-AA58) received April 19, 2024, 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-4005. 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 29, 2024, 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-4006. A letter from the Senior Trial Attorney, Office of Aviation Consumer Protection, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures in Regulating Unfair or Deceptive Practices [Docket No.: DOT-OST-2021-0142] (RIN: 2105-AF03) received April 10, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4007. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disadvantaged Business Enterprise and Airport Concession Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program Implementation Modifications [Docket No.: DOT-OST-2022-0051] (RIN: 2105-AE98) received April 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4008. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel, Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Harmonization With International Standards [Docket No.: PHMSA-2021-0092 (HM-215Q)] (RIN: 2137-AF57) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4009. A letter from the Senior Regulatory and Policy Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Designated Placement Requirements Under Titles IV-E and IV-B for LGBTQI+ Children (RIN: 0970-AD03) received April 23, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-4010. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Imposition of Import Restrictions on Archaeological and Ethnological Material of Pakistan [CBP Dec. 24-09] (RIN: 1515-AE82) received April 25, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-4011. A letter from the Regulations Writer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration,

transmitting the Administration's final rule — Omitting Food From In-Kind Support and Maintenance Calculations [Docket No.: SSA-2021-0014] (RIN: 0960-AI60) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. House Joint Resolution 109. Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121" (Rept. 118-480). Referred to the Committee on 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 Mrs. PELTOLA:

H.R. 8193. A bill to prohibit and restrict certain actions in the Bristol Bay watershed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 8194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude compensation from secondary employment for certain taxpayers from the income tax and payroll taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself, Mr.

ARRINGTON, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. YAKYM, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. CLINE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ESTES, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 8195. A bill to strengthen congressional oversight of the Administrative Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2023, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr.

FOSTER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 8196. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to safeguard access to information for consumers and to stop abusive debt litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 8197. A bill to amend the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 to impose sanctions on foreign countries in response to acts concerning chemical or biological programs that cause injury to other foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina):

H.R. 8198. A bill to reauthorize and improve the relending program to resolve ownership and succession on farmland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. CARAVEO (for herself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. BROWN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. ALLRED, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 8199. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to simplify supplemental nutrition assistance program access for elderly and disabled individuals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. TRONE, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. CHU, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. MORELLE):

H.R. 8200. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, to award grants to eligible entities to carry out construction or modernization projects designed to strengthen and increase capacity within the specialized pediatric health care infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 8201. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to lower the corporate tax rate for small businesses and close the carried interest loophole, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BIGGS, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. MAST, Mr. BURLISON, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. CAREY, Mr. FALLON, Mrs. LUNA, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 8202. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service-connection under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for certain diseases associated with the COVID-19 vaccine that become manifest during the one-year period following the receipt of the vaccine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. CHU, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 8203. A bill to prevent and address intentional misuse of subrecipient TANF funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER):

H.R. 8204. A bill to amend titles 5 and 31, United States Code, to require regulatory early notice by agencies, and for other purposes; 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. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. STEEL, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 8205. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that Byrne grant funds may be used for public safety report systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BARR, and Mr. MILLS):

H.R. 8206. A bill to ensure that Big Cypress National Preserve may not be designated as wilderness or as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOMEZ (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 8207. A bill to provide for the establishment of Medicare part E public health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. OGLES, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. CLINE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. BEAN of Florida, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 8208. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to finalize, implement, or enforce the interim final rule of the Bureau of Industry and Security relating to enhancing the control structure for firearms and related items and advancing human rights issued on April 26, 2024 (89 Fed. Reg. 34680); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 8209. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to notify Members of Congress and United States Governors each time a migrant flight lands in such official's area of jurisdiction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8210. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to eliminate a requirement that certain individuals be related by blood or marriage to be eligible for farm loans as a qualified beginning farmer or rancher, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. STEUBE, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina):

H.R. 8211. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit former employees of covered health agencies from serving on the board of entities involved in development and research of a drug, biological product, or device and from profiting from a drug, biological product, or device, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS):

H.R. 8212. A bill to provide for nonapplicability of a policy of denial for exports, re-exports, or transfers of defense articles and defense services destined for or originating in the Republic of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 8213. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for a national standard to prevent driving while intoxicated by requiring ignition interlocks for DWI offenders; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. PELTOLA:

H.R. 8214. A bill to ratify and approve all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the establishment and administration of the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 8215. A bill to exempt certain vessels transporting liquefied natural gas from certain coastwise endorsement requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 8216. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2024 through 2028, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 8217. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a special enrollment period under Medicare for individuals enrolled in COBRA continuation coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIMMONS (for himself, Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. HAGEMAN, and Mr. FRY):

H.R. 8218. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to require any individual who votes in a municipal election of the District of Columbia to be a United States citizen and to provide proof of citizenship; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. TOKUDA (for herself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CASE, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 8219. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Lahaina National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself and Mr. NUNN of Iowa):

H.R. 8220. A bill to clarify coverage of occupational therapy under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 8221. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect the removability of aliens who are charged with any crime related to their participation in pro-terrorism or antisemitism rallies or demonstrations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULCHER (for himself, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr.

OGLES, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. BOST, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. PALMER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. OBERNOLTE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.J. Res. 133. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards for Heavy-Duty Vehicles-Phase 3”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. BENTZ):

H.J. Res. 134. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to “Improving Protections for Workers in Temporary Agricultural Employment in the United States”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida (for himself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. CLINE, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARL, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. MEUSER):

H.J. Res. 135. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to “Improving Protections for Workers in Temporary Agricultural Employment in the United States”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DUARTE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HERN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. McCLAIN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CAREY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. OGLES, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. PENCE, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. D’ESPOSITO, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. BANKS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. COLLINS, Mrs. BICE, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. MANN, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GUEST, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FINSTAD, Mrs. HOUCHE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. EZELL, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FALLON, Mr.

WESTERMAN, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MAST, Mr. SELF, Mrs. HAGEMAN, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOST, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. FRY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. ROY, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. LESKO, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. BARR, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PALMER, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. ISSA):

H.J. Res. 136. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Ms. TOKUDA):

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina (for himself, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. OGLES, and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H. Res. 1188. A resolution expressing support for the month of May as “Fallen Heroes Memorial Month”; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 1189. A resolution supporting the designation of the week of April 29 through May 3, 2024, as “National Specialized Instructional Support Personnel Appreciation Week”; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 1190. A resolution recognizing the disenfranchisement of District of Columbia residents, calling for statehood for the District of Columbia through the enactment of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, and expressing support for the designation of May 1, 2024, as “D.C. Statehood Day”; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, Armed Services, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. BROWNLEY):

H. Res. 1191. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 4, 2024, as a “National Day of Reason” and recognizing the central importance of reason in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS,

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. PELTOLA:

H.R. 8193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit development of the Pebble deposit in Bristol Bay, Alaska

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 8194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Tax

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 8195.

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 establish a budget neutral requirement for discretionary administrative actions of the executive branch that affect direct spending.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 8196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—Commerce Clause

The single subject of this legislation is:

Consumer Protection

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 8197.

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:

Pentanyl sanctions

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 8198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. 1, § 8, cls. 1, 3, 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Heirs’ Property

By Ms. CARAVEO:

H.R. 8199.

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:

ESAP & SMD Permanent State Options

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 8200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To strengthen and increase capacity within the specialized pediatric health care infrastructure.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 8201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:
Small business taxes.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 8202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

“To improve distribution of care to meritorious beneficiaries of Department of Veterans Affairs subsequent to the Covid-19 Vaccine mandate injuries.”

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 8203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:
oversight

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina:

H.R. 8204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend titles 5 and 31, United States Code, to require regulatory early notice by agencies, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H.R. 8205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill expands the eligible use of Byrne JAG funding to include the development and maintenance of a public safety report system.

By Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida:

H.R. 8206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is granted the authority to introduce and enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To ensure that Big Cypress National Preserve may not be designated as wilderness or as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GOMEZ:

H.R. 8207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:
Health care

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 8208.

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 use of federal funds to finalize, implement, or enforce the interim

final rule of the Bureau of Industry and Security relating to enhancing the control structure for firearms and related items and advancing human rights issued on April 26, 2024 (89 Fed. Reg. 34680).

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 8209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to notify Members of Congress and United States Governors each time a migrant flight lands in such official's area of jurisdiction.

By Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to eliminate a requirement that certain individuals be related by blood or marriage to be eligible for farm loans as a qualified beginning farmer or rancher, and for other purposes

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 8211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Preventing corruption at government health agencies

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 8212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that “Congress shall have the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:
Defense

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 8213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for a national standard to prevent driving while intoxicated by requiring ignition interlocks for DWI offenders.

By Mrs. PELTOLA:

H.R. 8214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

The purpose of this bill is restore oil and gas development in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPR-A).

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 8215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To exempt certain vessels transporting liquefied natural gas from certain coastwise endorsement requirements.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 8216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for

the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2024 through 2028, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 8217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section VIII of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill provides for a special enrollment period for Medicare medical benefits for individuals who are enrolled in COBRA continuation coverage at the time they qualify for Medicare.

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 8218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to require any individual who votes in a municipal election of the District of Columbia to be a United States citizen and to provide proof of citizenship.

By Ms. TOKUDA:

H.R. 8219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Lahaina National Heritage Area.

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 8220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To improve access to Occupational Therapy as mental health care.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 8221.

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 Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the removability of aliens who are charged with any crime related to their participation in pro-terrorism or antisemitism rallies or demonstrations.

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.J. Res. 133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws “which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution” any of Congress’ enumerated powers, including Congress’s powers over appropriations.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This resolution provides for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards for Heavy-Duty Vehicles—Phase 3.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H.J. Res. 134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

Congressional Review Act 5 USC

The single subject of this legislation is:
Disapproving the Executive Branch action concerning the Department of Labor's "Improving Protections for Workers in Temporary Agricultural Employment in the United States"

By Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida
H.J. Res. 135.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is granted the authority to introduce and enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:
Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Improving Protections for Workers in Temporary Agricultural Employment in the United States".

By Mr. JAMES:
H.J. Res. 136.
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:

Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles".

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 82: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
- H.R. 451: Mr. FALLON.
- H.R. 521: Mr. TIFFANY.
- H.R. 537: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. CURTIS.
- H.R. 619: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.
- H.R. 889: Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. YAKYM, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H.R. 921: Ms. MACE.
- H.R. 1372: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 1380: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 1385: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

- H.R. 1536: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 1632: Mr. CLOUD.
- H.R. 1699: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 1831: Mr. PENCE and Mr. SARBANES.
- H.R. 2371: Mr. CASE.
- H.R. 2393: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 2412: Mr. BACON.
- H.R. 2584: Mr. BARR and Mrs. DINGELL.
- H.R. 2785: Mr. LANDSMAN and Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.
- H.R. 2891: Mr. VASQUEZ.
- H.R. 3127: Mr. KUSTOFF.
- H.R. 3325: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H.R. 3541: Mr. CASE.
- H.R. 3583: Mr. LIEU.
- H.R. 3702: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. LAHOOD.
- H.R. 3940: Mr. BACON and Mrs. HAYES.
- H.R. 4121: Mr. HOYER and Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 4137: Mr. HUNT.
- H.R. 4202: Mr. LIEU.
- H.R. 4323: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 4362: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 4660: Mr. HUNT.
- H.R. 4713: Ms. STANSBURY.
- H.R. 4763: Mr. TORRES of New York.
- H.R. 4851: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina and Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 4896: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
- H.R. 4974: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. CRAIG.
- H.R. 4998: Ms. MACE.
- H.R. 5099: Ms. CRAIG and Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.
- H.R. 5403: Ms. MALOY.
- H.R. 5457: Mr. BEYER.
- H.R. 5484: Mr. LIEU.
- H.R. 5547: Mr. BUCHANAN.
- H.R. 5577: Mr. CLINE.
- H.R. 5813: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.
- H.R. 5934: Mr. LAHOOD.
- H.R. 5995: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois.
- H.R. 6072: Ms. VAN DUYN.
- H.R. 6159: Ms. WILD.
- H.R. 6395: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 6468: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 6929: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia and Mrs. STEEL.
- H.R. 6951: Mr. ALFORD, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mrs. BICE, and Mr. TIFFANY.

- H.R. 7007: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H.R. 7085: Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 7214: Mr. HUNT.
- H.R. 7218: Ms. BALINT and Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.
- H.R. 7227: Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. CUELLAR.
- H.R. 7248: Mr. FITZGERALD.
- H.R. 7297: Mr. ARMSTRONG and Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
- H.R. 7315: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 7380: Mr. FERGUSON.
- H.R. 7438: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
- H.R. 7450: Mr. HUNT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. FRY.
- H.R. 7478: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.
- H.R. 7513: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. BACON.
- H.R. 7563: Ms. LETLOW.
- H.R. 7629: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. GARBARINO.
- H.R. 7708: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
- H.R. 7752: Mr. EVANS.
- H.R. 7802: Mr. FROST.
- H.R. 7849: Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 7855: Ms. TOKUDA.
- H.R. 7930: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
- H.R. 7936: Mr. NORCROSS.
- H.R. 7959: Ms. TENNEY and Mrs. LESKO.
- H.R. 7961: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
- H.R. 7963: Mr. LUECKEMEYER.
- H.R. 7991: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. LAMALFA.
- H.R. 8004: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
- H.R. 8040: Mr. MOLINARO.
- H.R. 8053: Mr. DAVIDSON.
- H.R. 8065: Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 8076: Mrs. DINGELL.
- H.R. 8091: Mr. BABIN.
- H.R. 8184: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. FERGUSON, and Ms. TENNEY.
- H.J. Res. 132: Mrs. HARSHBARGER and Mr. PERRY.
- H. Res. 547: Mr. HUNT.
- H. Res. 915: Mr. SCHIFF.
- H. Res. 1019: Mr. POSEY and Mr. HARRIS.