



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2024

No. 80

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 8, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL CLOUD 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.

### GEORGIA'S BURKE COUNTY LEADING IN AMERICA'S NUCLEAR ENERGY

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Southern Company, Oglethorpe Power, MEAG Power, Dalton Utilities, and all partners involved in Plant Vogtle's Unit 4 officially coming online.

At the heart of Georgia's 12th District in Burke County, we are home to Plant Vogtle, where the first two new

nuclear reactors to be constructed in over three decades in the United States are now fully operational, representing a key investment in Georgia's energy future. Unit 3 entered commercial operation in July 2023, and now Unit 4 has followed suit.

This historic achievement has been years in the making and proves that America can still do big things. Plant Vogtle is now officially the largest nuclear power station in the country, and I am proud that Georgia's 12th District is a leader in America's nuclear energy future.

As I have said many times before, an all-of-the-above energy strategy is critical to reclaiming American energy dominance, and nuclear—our Nation's largest source of clean energy—has a pivotal role to play.

Throughout the Nation, we have 11,000 utility-scale electric power plants currently under operation, less than 60 of which are nuclear power plants. Even with such a relatively small footprint, nuclear energy accounts for approximately 20 percent of our energy production and approximately 50 percent of all emission-free energy generated in the country.

Nuclear power plants can operate 24/7, providing a stable baseload supply of electricity. This reliability is crucial for maintaining grid stability and ensuring uninterrupted power supply, particularly during periods of high demand or adverse weather conditions.

Since being elected to Congress, I have visited Plant Vogtle on numerous occasions to witness various stages of progress throughout the Unit 3 and Unit 4 construction process. In fact, I visited there just before loading of the fuel and was inside the container right before beginning operation of Unit 4.

Seeing this project come to fruition is nothing short of remarkable. Just last week, I was joined by fellow Members of Congress and industry leaders in Augusta for an informative panel

discussion on the benefits of nuclear energy expansion in the U.S., followed by a visit to Plant Vogtle to see the new units up and running.

Plant Vogtle is providing safe, reliable, emission-free energy to consumers and businesses across the Peach State and beyond, with each of the new units able to produce enough electricity to power an estimated 500,000 homes and businesses. It will continue to generate power for decades to come.

This massive accomplishment certainly came with its challenges along the way, but as we do in Georgia, we persevered. This historic milestone is a major win for all Georgians and America as a whole, and I would like to once again congratulate Southern Company, Oglethorpe Power, MEAG Power, Dalton Utilities, and all partners involved in this tremendous success through their perseverance.

I look forward to continuing my work on the House Energy and Commerce Committee to enact innovative solutions that further bolster America's clean energy future. I am proud that our bipartisan nuclear energy package will soon be on its way to the President's desk for signature, which includes my bill, the Nuclear Licensing Efficiency Act, to reform and streamline nuclear licensing and the permitting process.

### FUNDING HEAD START

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, for decades, Head Start and Early Head Start programs have provided comprehensive childhood development services to millions of children across America.

Research is showing that participation in Head Start can lead to positive outcomes for our children. By providing children with a strong foundation in their early years, Head Start

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.

helps level the playing field, especially for disadvantaged children, and gives them a better chance at academic success.

House Democrats have made it clear that investing in America's children will always be among our highest priorities. Thanks to investments we have fought for in the budget, we are working to ensure that Federal dollars reach every corner of the country.

In my district, I have secured \$23 million for Fresno County and \$22 million for Tulare County Head Start and Early Head Start programs. These funds will provide families with health and support services while growing the next generation of leaders in the San Joaquin Valley and in California.

Investing in education is investing in our children's future because when our children succeed, America succeeds.

HONORING YOM HASHOAH, HOLOCAUST  
REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to recognize what has been taking place this week in this country and around the world, and that is commemorating Yom HaShoah ending in 1945, recognizing the 6 million Jewish victims who were killed in the Holocaust.

Sadly, on October 7 last year, 79 years after the Holocaust, we witnessed a terrorist organization, Hamas, rape, execute, and take hostages. Over 1,400 Israelis, Americans, and other nationalities were killed, which was the largest killing of Jews since the Holocaust.

There is clear evidence of the rising threat of hate and anti-Semitism being spread here at home and across the world.

I commend President Biden and Speaker JOHNSON yesterday for bringing together a bipartisan gathering to speak against anti-Semitism and the challenges here in America. In the United States, anti-Semitic incidents have soared over 140 percent in 2023, breaking all previous records.

In America, we support free speech and peaceful protests, but disrupting academic education and attacking Jewish students and faculty have no place on college campuses or universities in America. It must be stopped.

We must unmask groups like the National Students for Justice in Palestine for what they are. They celebrated on October 8 the actions of Hamas that took 1,400 Israeli lives.

This is an extension of terrorist groups like Hamas. Hamas' mission statement is to eliminate the State of Israel and to kill Jews, as referenced in their slogan: "From the River to Sea." The river is the Jordan River, and the sea is the Mediterranean. Their purpose is to eliminate the State of Israel and kill Jewish people.

We must work together to break this cycle of hate that is plaguing our society and putting lives at risk around the world. In an era of rising anti-Semitism coupled with fading memory of the Holocaust, we must fight conspiracy theories and ensure the lessons of the past are never ever forgotten.

Last month, I was in Israel, and I went to the Nova concert site to witness the makeshift memorial where 364 concertgoers, innocent people, were killed on October 7.

Last week, I participated in a bipartisan visit of Members to the Holocaust Museum for an exhibit that clearly raises the issues of anti-Semitism in America in the 1920s and 1930s, which was led in part by prominent Americans like Henry Ford and Charles Lindbergh.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and others coming to Washington to go to see this comparative analogy of anti-Semitism from the 1920s and 1930s to what we are dealing with here today. For it is real, and we must do everything together to combat this plague of anti-Semitism, the politics of hate, and the politics of fear. For as the famous historian George Santayana once said: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

That is why it is important that we recognize this anniversary of the Holocaust and why we remember October 7 of last year. It is not a lingering, distant, fading memory. It is a reality that we have to deal with here today.

RECOGNIZING MILITARY  
APPRECIATION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Military Appreciation Month.

With 24 years of service in the Army and now representing a congressional district with a significant Active-Duty and veteran population, I am deeply honored to acknowledge the invaluable contribution of our Nation's heroes.

Military Appreciation Month was proposed by the late Senator John McCain in February 1999. Two months later, Congress voted to officially designate May as the nationally recognized period for honoring the military, culminating with Memorial Day.

Across the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, Coast Guard, and Space Force, there are more than 2.8 million service-members worldwide tasked with protecting the freedoms we enjoy here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who serve and have served. May God bless them, and may God bless the United States of America.

HONORING IOWA'S FIRST RESPONDERS AND RED CROSS

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the first responders across Iowa who were on the front lines following the recent tornado outbreaks across the State.

As Iowans, we are no strangers to severe weather. Every summer, we do what we can to prepare for the inevitable derecho, floods, severe thunderstorms, and potential tornadoes.

While we prepare for the worst, Iowa's first responders are the heroes on the ground, quickly jumping into action for people impacted by the horrific storms. Without our first responders, severe weather events like the ones so many Iowans experienced on April 26 would be much more catastrophic and deadly.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending these brave heroes and thanking them for their unbreakable commitment to the safety of all Iowans and all Americans.

CONGRATULATING NURSE WENDY DONALD

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Wendy Donald, who was named School Nurse of the Year for 2024 by the Iowa School Nurse Organization.

With more than 25 years of nursing experience and 7 years serving the Muscatine School District, Wendy's dedication shines through. She advocates tirelessly for the inclusion of school nurses in decisionmaking processes and collaborates with educators, parents, and healthcare professionals to meet the diverse needs of our students.

Wendy's proactive approach extends beyond the school walls, working closely with local healthcare providers to promote community health. Her initiatives, such as raising funds for children in the ER, exemplify her innovative thinking and compassion.

As a former nurse, I certainly recognize these attributes. Let's recognize Wendy's profound impact on our community.

I congratulate Wendy on this well-deserved recognition, and I thank her for her service and for inspiring us all.

NATIONAL SKILLED TRADES DAY

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Skilled Trades Day, which took place on May 1 this year.

In Iowa and across the Nation, our skilled tradespeople aren't just contributors to the economy, they are the heartbeat of our communities, shaping our infrastructure and crafting the world we live in. From carpenters shaping our homes to HVAC technicians keeping us comfortable, these individuals are the unsung heroes of our local communities.

Today, I stand proud to honor their contributions and reaffirm my commitment to champion their interests in Congress. Let us continue to support and celebrate the skilled trades, ensuring that future generations can pursue these fulfilling and essential careers.

CELEBRATING NEWLY DRAFTED IOWA HAWKEYES

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Iowa Hawkeyes Cooper DeJean, Erick All, Tory Taylor, and Logan Lee for recently being drafted into the National Football League.

Iowa is world-renowned for cultivating athletic talent, and these elite athletes will join 37 other Hawkeyes currently playing in the NFL. Coach

Kirk Ferentz and the entire crew at the University of Iowa have worked tirelessly in support of these players and in their journeys to the premier league in football.

Coach Ferentz and his team deserve the utmost credit for developing a first-class program that makes good players into great players and winners into champions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating these four drafted players and all of the Hawkeyes making their way to the NFL. By the way, it wasn't a fair catch.

As always, Go Hawkeyes.

□ 1015

#### WE ARE PAYING ATTENTION

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

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to affirm that we are paying attention.

We were paying attention when 35,000 Palestinians were killed. We were paying attention when over 14,500 children were robbed of their future. We were paying attention as 404 doctors and aid workers were killed, 100 journalists and media workers were killed. Finally, we are paying attention as over 1.1 million people are on the verge of starving to death.

Yesterday, we were paying attention when Israel began its invasion into Rafah and seized control of the Rafah crossing.

We were paying attention on February 8 when President Biden said that providing periodic congressional reports to Congress enables meaningful oversight.

We were paying attention last month when a nonpartisan task force issued an independent, credible report outlining the Israeli Government's violations of international humanitarian law. In 76 pages of details, they provide example after example of what they call a systematic disregard for international humanitarian law and military best practice regarding civilian harm mitigation by the Israel Defense Forces, including with U.S.-provided arms.

Today, we are paying attention as President Biden's National Security Memorandum 20, what we call the NSM-20, congressional reporting deadline on Israel's use of U.S. arms comes due. We know that Netanyahu's administration has been and is continuing to assure the U.S. Government that it is using U.S. weapons in line with international laws and is not interfering with the delivery of humanitarian aid.

However, given what we have witnessed over the last 214 days, how can we trust Netanyahu's official assurances that they are complying with international law?

How can we be expected to ignore the violations of international law and interference with the delivery of humani-

tarian assistance we have witnessed in real time?

What are we to say to the constituents whose families are starving, whose loved ones cannot receive medical care, or who never received the promised evacuation from Gaza?

What do we say to the brave and courageous students across campuses, our children, who are defending other children in Gaza who are being murdered with U.S. bombs?

What do we say to the children who are still looking for their mothers under the rubble, as we approach Mother's Day?

The administration's willingness to make exceptions for Israel has got to stop. The actions of the Netanyahu government are exceptional—exceptionally noncompliant with international law and exceptionally unconcerned with human rights. The Biden administration must consider other credible sources of information beyond the Israeli Government as it fulfills its NSM-20 reporting obligations, and the administration must fulfill those obligations today.

I expect that this country will demonstrate our commitment to international law, to human rights, and congressional oversight because we are paying attention. The time has come for the administration to follow through on its warning about Israeli conduct and take meaningful action because if the administration is paying attention, they will enforce both our laws through NSM-20 and section 6201 of the Foreign Assistance Act and also international law. Anything less undermines our credibility and is a stain on the legacy of our country's leadership.

#### WE WERE PAYING ATTENTION ON OCTOBER 7

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, we were paying attention. We were paying attention on October 7. We were paying attention when Hamas, the terrorist organization, slaughtered innocent women and children, elderly citizens of the Nation of Israel. We were paying attention.

Now the world is paying attention as Israel seeks to eliminate Hamas. We stand with Israel. We stand with the citizens of Israel, and we are paying attention not only to Israel as it seeks to destroy Hamas and rid the world of this terrorist organization, but we are paying attention to those in Congress and across the country who are siding with Hamas, who are siding with terrorists, who are siding with murderers.

Remember October 7. We stand with Israel.

#### JOHN HANDLEY SENIORS HONOR VETERANS

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of John Handley High School seniors. These remarkable students have taken on a significant project to honor alumni from

the Douglas School who valiantly served in World War II.

The project involves adding their names to the Patsy Cline Theater at John Handley High School, acknowledging the contributions and service of those veterans alongside those already honored from John Handley.

Douglas School served African-American students in Winchester until its closure in 1966, so the students want to make sure all of the community's World War II veterans are given the recognition they rightly deserve.

The students' work involves a great deal of researching and documenting the names of Douglas School veterans, a crucial step in preserving our history and ensuring the bravery and sacrifices of all of our World War II veterans are honored. So far, they have collected 300 names of World War II veterans and are working to verify that they attended Douglas High School.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding these students and their efforts to ensure that the contributions of our veterans are never forgotten.

#### CONGRATULATING SALEM HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE TEAM

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Salem High School debate team for winning the 2024 Virginia High School League championship, the first in their history.

This historic win came after an impressive performance at James Madison University, where Salem's team showcased their unparalleled skill and determination against the Rock Ridge team, winning with a score of 21–13.

The team was led by Claire Rawlins and Kaylee Christley, whose unmatched skills in policy debate steered Salem to victory. Claire Rawlins has also etched her name in VHSL history by winning titles in both forensics, impromptu speaking, and a debate event in a single year.

In the VHSL competition, Rawlins and Christley went a combined 10 wins and 1 loss while winning the region, super region, and State championships. Their achievements, along with those of their teammates, propelled Salem to this prestigious State title.

I congratulate Salem High School on their State championship in debate and to the students, coaches, and everyone involved in this monumental achievement.

#### HONORING WWII VETERAN GEORGE BAILEY

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize George Bailey, a valiant World War II veteran who joined the Capital Wing Warbird Showcase at Shenandoah Valley Airport as part of his 99th birthday celebration.

George Bailey, who faithfully served in the Army's 283rd Field Artillery Battalion, represents the best of American courage and resolve. His dedication to our country, followed by his distinguished career at Pratt & Whitney showcases the enduring American spirit of innovation and excellence.

At the showcase, George Bailey was given the honor to take to the skies on

a flight aboard the historic Stinson OY-1.

George's enthusiasm for aviation serves as a powerful reminder of the gratitude we owe to our veterans. Their commitment and sacrifices have paved the way for the freedoms and opportunities we enjoy.

As we look forward to celebrating George's 100th birthday next year, with hopes of another flight, I thank George. To all those who joined in this memorable showcase, your dedication ensures that the legacy of our Nation's heroes continues to be celebrated and remembered for generations to come.

APPLE BLOSSOM FESTIVAL CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Shenandoah Apple Blossom Festival's 100th birthday. This year marked the 100th anniversary of the festival's establishment in 1924, despite having hosted only 97 festivals to date because of the profound impacts of World War II and, more recently, the COVID-19 pandemic.

The festival includes 10 days of events, including a carnival, dances, parades, band concerts, and parties. It attracts crowds of more than 250,000 people.

Last week, 500 people joined a celebration at James R. Wilkins, Jr. Athletics & Events Center at Shenandoah University to honor a century of tradition, resilience, and community spirit at the Shenandoah Apple Blossom Festival.

Mr. Speaker, this achievement is an incredible milestone. I extend my utmost gratitude to all those who worked tirelessly behind the scenes to make the Apple Blossom Festival one of the best celebrations in Virginia's Sixth District and nationwide. Year after year, their dedication has created a celebration for our community to recognize and enjoy the rich agricultural heritage of the Shenandoah Valley.

CELEBRATING OPAL LEE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an amazing Fort Worth, Texas, and now U.S. hero, Ms. Opal Lee, better known as the grandmother of Juneteenth. She is an incredible gift to not just Fort Worth but, again, the entire Nation.

This past Friday, she was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for her efforts in establishing Juneteenth as a national holiday. When I say effort, I mean effort. Ms. Opal Lee, literally, at 90-plus years of age, walked across the country and took many steps, literally, to make this happen.

At 97, not only did she receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom, but she will also be receiving an honorary doctorate from Southern Methodist University at their upcoming commencement. I am so glad to see all this work that Ms. Opal Lee is doing be rewarded and recognized.

I also want to touch on a few of the other things that she is doing. She has an amazing community garden that feeds people all over Tarrant County and Fort Worth. She also has an incredible food bank that is doing similar work.

I know that everyone is watching what Ms. Lee is doing and proud of her accomplishments and just all of the fame that she has brought to Fort Worth. The United Riverside community is also proud of her, as they get to call her a neighbor.

Keep up the good work. We are proud of Ms. Lee and cannot wait until we get that museum done.

CELEBRATING CHAMPION TRACK ATHLETES ACROSS FORT WORTH

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of some of our young people in Fort Worth.

In 2024, at the Texas Relays, we had three State champions. You may have heard these names before, and it is because they were also State champions in previous meets.

First, I want to highlight Kalani Lawson from Paul Laurence Dunbar High School, who defended her State championship in the girls 4A 100-meter hurdles. She is only a junior. Not only that, she broke last year's record that had been on the books since the 1990s, and she broke her own record again this year in taking home the gold running the 100-meter hurdles in 13.89 seconds.

I also want to take the time to highlight another back-to-back champion, Fort Worth's O.D. Wyatt's Malik Franklin, who won the State championship in the class 5A boys' 400-meter, with a winning time of 47.23. Again, Malik won back-to-back championships. He is also a great student and star of the football team. You should check out some of his videos on MaxPreps. Malik is going to take his talents and continue his track career at Arizona State University. Again, we are very proud of his accomplishments.

I also want to give a shout-out to A.P. Ranch and Greg Sholars, and the coaches out there that are just bringing home those championships for north Texas and working with so many of our kids, really making north Texas one of the great areas for sprinters and distance runners.

Last but not least, I want to recognize Angel Sanchez of Diamond Hill-Jarvis High School. He had an injury last year, but he won the State championship his sophomore year. He claimed the boys 4A 3200-meter and also the mile championship.

During the 3200 meters, he posted a time of 9:14.44, which was nearly five seconds faster than the second-place finisher. In the 1600, he posted a 4:13.08, which is a new class 4A record. Angel has literally raced all around the country. He has been highlighted running in Oregon and running in many other high school meets. Upon his graduation here in a couple weeks, he is going to

be headed to Oklahoma State to continue to run. Go Pokes.

We will continue to watch Angel run while he is at Oklahoma State. I really want to congratulate him for everything that he has done for Diamond Hill-Jarvis. That entire community on the north side of Diamond Hill is just extremely proud of Mr. Sanchez and what he is doing and can't wait to continue to see him run.

□ 1030

FARM BILL PRIORITIES

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue calling attention to the need for Congress to pass a comprehensive 5-year farm bill that provides certainty to our agriculture producers while responding to market changes and strengthening the ag safety net.

My priorities for the next farm bill have not changed. It is in the best interests of our American farmers, ranchers, and agriculture producers to authorize a farm bill that protects and strengthens crop insurance, incentivizes agriculture trade programs that help Americans remain competitive on the global stage, and conducts rigorous oversight and rolls back overly restrictive regulation and supports agriculture research and development.

Investing in agriculture research, and, particularly, animal health research, supports our Nation's food security and ultimately our national security.

This is especially true today as the Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza virus spreads across wildlife, poultry, and dairy cattle around the country.

My staff and I remain in close contact with USDA regarding the spread, and we are grateful for USDA's efforts to control the outbreak. However, it emphasizes the reality that animal health often does not get the attention that it deserves.

Luckily, HPAI has no proven impact on our country's food supply, but we are starting to see the economic impact of this virus.

Last week, Colombia became the first country to restrict US beef imports coming from States where HPAI is present.

As of yesterday, at least 22 States had issued some restrictions on the importation of dairy cattle from affected States.

By actively investing in research of animal disease, we have the opportunity to allocate resources to the prevention rather than outbreak control.

These investments serve as a more cost-effective approach to protecting our Nation's food supply by limiting animal disease and outbreaks before they spread.

For years, Kansas has led the United States in supporting global food security initiatives. Just last year, the U.S.

Department of Agriculture opened a state-of-the-art National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Manhattan, Kansas.

The facility will conduct research into serious animal disease threats and the potential impact of those diseases.

It is the only maximum biocontainment space in the country where USDA conducts comprehensive research, develops animal vaccines and antivirals, and explores diagnostic and training capabilities.

This facility is just down the street from my alma mater, Kansas State University, and their School of Veterinary Medicine and the Biosecurity Research Institute.

These institutions are the crown jewels of the animal health corridor, creating a scientific hub where world-renowned research happens, leading the world in agriculture research and health.

American farmers, ranchers, and agriculture producers understand that to turn a profit, we must embrace the data of innovating, adapting, and increasing efficiency.

According to USDA, agriculture research returns \$20 in benefits to the economy for every public dollar that is spent.

We save American tax dollars and the risk of disrupting our food supply chain when we adequately invest in agriculture and animal health research.

Despite this, Federal funding has declined in real dollars over the past two decades while other forms of research have increased.

If we continue down this path, we will not only hurt our agriculture producers but also American consumers, American food security, and, in turn, our national security.

We must ensure the farm bill addresses the risk to animal health and better positions us to invest in prevention rather than outbreak control.

Investing in animal health research bolsters the long-term availability of U.S. animal agriculture to be competitive in the global marketplace, provides consumers with safe, wholesome, and affordable food, and ensures agriculture thrives in America.

#### BUILDING GREEN

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

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, we all know that our planet is the most important thing we have, which is why we need to make the necessary investments to protect it.

I am proud to announce that I have joined forces with Senator ELIZABETH WARREN to introduce the BUILD GREEN Infrastructure and Jobs Act.

This bill is part of the Green New Deal, and it is a major step toward addressing climate change. It will invest \$500 billion over 10 years to electrify

and modernize public vehicles and trains across the country, all while building new electric transportation infrastructure in every major city in America.

It will make our transportation networks safer and cleaner from buses to trains to rail. The bill links transit investments with increasing density and affordable housing. It will also help create millions of new green jobs with strong protections for labor.

The BUILD GREEN Act is sustainable, equitable, and most importantly, necessary for protecting our future. We will continue working to combat our climate crisis and supporting a Green New Deal for every single American. Let's pass this bill now and electrify the Nation.

#### CELEBRATING THE CONSERVATIVE PARTNERSHIP INSTITUTE'S SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the Conservative Partnership Institute, otherwise known as CPI, on their 7-year anniversary. I also welcome Ed Corrigan and Mark Meadows into the gallery to recognize this great organization.

In 2017, former Congressman and Senator Jim DeMint began this organization to be an incredible support system for conservatives in Washington, D.C.

CPI was designed to train and unite true conservative leaders in Washington and all across the country to stand up against the swamp.

I consider the CPI a safe haven, a place that feels like home for conservative lawmakers and staff to go to connect, to learn, and to brainstorm.

CPI has shown a great commitment to conservative offices, to conservative Members, to conservative staffers, and to conservative lawmakers alike.

CPI provides everything from regular training seminars on House and Senate procedures, advertisement on floor strategy, communications, budget, and much, much more.

Their vested interest in all aspects of governance plays a large role in the success we have seen from conservative offices and individuals.

The training provided by CPI is top of the line, and its positive impacts are clearly on display not only here in Washington, D.C. but in districts all across the country. Their efforts continue to ensure that we are well prepared in our fight for this great Nation.

I also want to take the time to specifically honor Jim DeMint and his lifelong and tireless fight for freedom, prosperity, and traditional American values.

Jim represented South Carolina in the House of Representatives and then in the Senate from 1999 to 2013. He led meaningful efforts such as a ban on

congressional earmarks and reclaiming control of billions of dollars of wasteful spending.

Today, he and others, including Ed Corrigan and Mark Meadows, spearhead the fight for a new generation of true conservatives.

All over America, the CPI has been a bulwark against the swamp and the support systems for conservatives looking for the right thing to do. The goal is reflected daily in the operations of CPI and the tremendous impact that it continues to spread.

I cannot thank the many patriots who have fought hard to preserve this great American system as we know it, otherwise known as freedom for we, the people.

Please join me in congratulating CPI for their excellence during the first 7 years. It means everything to me and my colleagues and our staffs to have a home at the CPI building.

I am forever grateful to Jim DeMint and others and the entire team at CPI for providing the platform for us to grow even stronger in our American ideals.

I look forward to watching them pave a path forward for true conservatives to thrive and to make America the best that it can be.

#### CELEBRATING TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, our teachers do not get nearly enough love. Well, maybe during COVID they did when students were all at home, and parents and families suddenly realized just how important those teachers were, but not before or since and not nearly enough.

I am very happy that it is Teacher Appreciation Week, although, honestly, I think we should be appreciating our teachers every single day.

I am so proud to honor outstanding teachers across my community in Pennsylvania's 7th starting with Ms. Jennifer Danzeisen from Palmerton Area High School in Carbon County.

Ms. Danzeisen has worked at the Palmerton School District for more than 20 years, and her students have repeatedly commended her calming presence, her heavy involvement in extracurricular activities, and her commitment to all of them.

On top of her work as the department chair for business and technology classes, she advises the Mock Trial Club and Future Business Leaders of America and coaches the tennis team.

Even while juggling numerous responsibilities, she prioritizes treating all of her students with dignity and respect.

I thank Ms. Danzeisen and all of our wonderful teachers for their commitment to shaping our next generation.

In this teacher appreciation week, I am also proud to recognize Ms. Susan Klotz from Kenneth N. Butz Jr. Elementary School in the Nazareth Area

School District. Ms. Klotz has been an educator in the Nazareth Area School District in Northampton County for 23 years.

In addition to making each and every one of her students feel valued and supported in their learning journey, she is an adviser for the Kindness Squad, working with students to spread kindness not just throughout their school but across our community and even globally.

This year alone, she facilitated the collection of more than 2,000 books for the Cops 'n' Kids program and organized a toy drive for students in the Dominican Republic. Ms. Klotz also spends time mentoring aspiring educators from East Stroudsburg University.

She always goes the extra mile to make school a place where everyone—teachers, students, and families alike—can thrive.

I thank Ms. Klotz and all of our wonderful teachers for their dedication to bettering our community.

This teacher appreciation week, I am proud to recognize Morgan Polony, a third-grade teacher at Steckel Elementary School in Lehigh County.

As a Whitehall High School graduate herself, Morgan is deeply connected to her community, both inside and outside the classroom.

She has served as a high school softball coach, teacher leader, mentor, and active participant in various district committees.

Her students and colleagues know that they can always count on her for encouragement, leadership, and a positive attitude.

Morgan's impact in Whitehall goes beyond teaching. She actively participates in community events and fund-raising for organizations like Big Brothers, Big Sisters and the Lehigh Valley Reilly Children's Hospital.

Her presence is felt at her students' sporting events and spirit days where her colleagues said her school spirit is truly unmatched.

We thank Morgan, and all of our wonderful teachers, for her unwavering dedication to our shared community.

#### CONGRATULATING ADMIRAL JOHN AQUILINO

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

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Guam would like to congratulate and recognize Admiral John Aquilino, call sign "LUNG."

Admiral Aquilino began his career as a midshipman at the U.S. Navy Academy. Upon graduating in 1984, he would go on to receive his aviator wings.

Over his four decades of service in the U.S. Navy, he performed his duties with distinction. From his first fighter squadron assignment to commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, he has stood a most commendable watch.

As the admiral stood his last watch as commander of the U.S. Indo-Pacific

Command, he ensured 375,000 service-members and civilian personnel maintained a bias toward action and excellence. This was especially the case in his service to the land of America's first sunrise, Guam.

During his tenure as INDOPACOM commander, he led the establishment of the Joint Task Force Micronesia and continually advocated for the Guam Missile Defense System.

His efforts ensured the people of Guam know that the Defense Department is committed to defending the homeland and our allies globally.

As the U.S. Indo-Pacific Command welcomes Admiral Paparo, we would like to take time to thank Admiral Aquilino and his family for their support, advocacy, and commitment to the Navy and our Nation.

Today, we take pause to witness this shipmate go ashore for the final time. May God bless Admiral Aquilino. We wish him fair winds and following seas. Hooyah.

□ 1045

#### CELEBRATING ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation celebrates Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, I proudly rise to recognize my community, the island of Guam.

Over 7,000 miles away from the U.S. mainland resides a proud community of Chamorros, Filipino Americans, Korean Americans, Micronesians, and an array of other ethnicities. We are a melting pot of different cultures and backgrounds united by our shared values and beliefs.

At the core of it all lies "inafa maolek," which means "restore harmony" or "make good." The concept of inafa maolek plays a significant role within our Asian-American and Pacific Islander community on Guam. This cultural value encourages community members to uplift one another, take care of each other, and work toward a common goal of unity and harmony.

As Guam's Representative in Congress, I am committed to ensuring that the voices and perspectives of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are heard on the national stage.

During this month, may we continue to pay tribute to the achievements and invaluable contributions of over 50 ethnic groups speaking more than 100 languages and dialects. Let us honor the rich diversity of cultures, traditions, and contributions that the AAPI community has woven into American history.

To my community back home and fellow islanders on the mainland, I extend my warmest wishes during Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

#### SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the body to discuss the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the Nation's number one antipoverty program for children. That is Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I know you know this, but can you imagine that Congress hasn't made an adjustment to Social Security in more than 53 years? Richard Nixon was President of the United States the last time that Congress enhanced benefits for the country. Imagine that, Mr. Speaker, as 10,000 baby boomers a day become eligible for Social Security.

The fund is about to be cut by 20 percent in two ways. If Congress does nothing, by 2034, according to the latest report, it will be cut 20 percent. Basically, the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly will be cut by 20 percent if Congress does nothing, and it hasn't done anything in more than 50 years.

There are some proposals, including Social Security 2100, that would extend and pay for this. There are others, like the Republican Study Committee, that say what they want to do is raise the age. The idea is that people are living longer. Well, that is true. That is a good thing.

If people are living longer, they should be working longer and should be getting less. I don't know how that makes sense, that if you are living longer, when you retire, you should be receiving less.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, for every year you raise the age, that is a 7 percent cut in benefits. Raising the age to 70 is a 21 percent cut. If that were to be enacted, that would cut Social Security 21 percent before 2033—again, leaving our most vulnerable behind.

It is not only, Mr. Speaker, seniors. Social Security is also the number one antipoverty program for children. It is also the disability program that more veterans rely on than they do the VA.

This body, this Congress, is the only body capable of doing this. The President can't do it through executive order. The Supreme Court isn't going to rule on it. The only body that can act is the United States Congress, and it hasn't done a thing.

The American people, especially with 10,000 baby boomers a day becoming eligible for Social Security, are demanding that Congress act.

We have a proposal to enhance benefits. We have a proposal to lift up the more than 5 million Americans who get below-poverty-level checks from their government after having paid into Social Security throughout a lifetime. That simply isn't fair. We have a proposal to give a tax cut to 23 million Americans who currently continue to work because they have to and whose Social Security ends up being taxed.

The Republican Study Committee lays out tax cuts for the extraordinarily wealthy in the trillions. How about we do something for the average

American citizen, the guy who gets up and works every day?

President Biden has suggested what we need to do. Because these programs are all paid for and don't impact the debt or the deficit and are an earned benefit, he has suggested that we have people making over \$400,000 pay their fair share. Currently, billionaires pay next to nothing. Millionaires are done paying Social Security on February 2. Everybody else has to pay in.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time we own up to our responsibility.

#### HONORING IRA SULLIVAN

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, just 1 week after his heavenly birthday, to honor one of the legends and icons of jazz music, the great Ira Sullivan.

Ira was many things: a jazz great, an educator, a mentor, a father, a husband, and a friend of mine. I remember first meeting Ira as a jazz student at the University of Miami's Young Musicians Camp Honors Jazz Program.

I remember walking in when I was very young. I think I was in the eighth or ninth grade. He asked me to play vibraphone on a jazz song. I had auditioned as a drummer, so to me that was a very foreign thing. I wasn't hip to the history of jazz vibraphone, so I felt almost like he was asking me to play timpani and play timpani on a jazz song.

Either way, the next day, he came in and gave me a pair of Gary Burton mallets and told me to try playing the vibraphone to jazz. Believe it or not, I was still very confused.

Either way, that decision changed my entire life. From then on, I started practicing jazz vibraphone and became very obsessed with it.

Years passed, and he would always invite me to come back to perform with him in the new class he was teaching, all young people that Ira had inspired and whose lives he changed.

Ira Sullivan also achieved technical skills not achieved by many, a multi-instrumentalist in the truest sense of the word, fluidly being able to play the trumpet, the saxophone, the flute, the drum set, the piano, and many other instruments.

He was born in Chicago but moved to Miami in the sixties to perform and teach. Ira had the ability to be both a jazz great in the history books but also remain an accessible educator for artists of many different levels and calibers.

Ira mentored jazz greats like Jaco Pastorius and Pat Metheny. He also taught high schoolers at the Young Musicians Camp at the University of Miami, where I met him.

Today, I want to honor Ira Sullivan for inspiring so many people.

I stopped playing jazz a few years ago, and I have been telling myself I

would get back into it. Just a few days ago, I joined a high school jazz combo from central Florida, Freedom High School, and played drums on a standard tune. I am going to start practicing again in honor of Ira.

May Ira rest in peace, a jazz legend and great teacher.

#### CELEBRATING ROSEN COLLEGE OF HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Rosen College of Hospitality Management at the University of Central Florida.

Established through a transformational \$18 million donation from Mr. Harris Rosen, the college advances educational and community development initiatives that bolster Florida's leading industry, tourism and hospitality.

UCF Rosen College is consistently ranked as the top hospitality college in the Nation and among the top five globally, a testament to its educational excellence and leadership in hospitality research.

Committed to advancing knowledge, embracing innovation, and serving humanity through hospitality, the college stands out not only for its top rankings but also for its extensive range of programs that provide a 99 percent job placement rate for their graduates.

It is an honor to be able to represent the UCF Rosen College of Hospitality Management here in the Halls of Congress as they propel Florida's primary economic sector forward and enrich our State and the global hospitality landscape.

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH HONOREES

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor four extraordinary women for their impact on central Florida and beyond. Their tireless efforts, unwavering determination, and profound achievements have shaped our local history and continue to inspire generations to come. We honor them for their strength of character, unwavering spirit, and profound influence they have on our community.

They are Onchantho Am, associate general counsel at the University of Central Florida College of Medicine; Graciela Noriega Jacoby, chief operating officer for Heart of Florida United Way; Dr. Marie-Jose Francois, founder of the Center for Multicultural Wellness and Prevention; and Pastor Sharon Y. Riley, founder and pastor of Agape Perfecting Praise and Worship Center.

I celebrate these women for all that they are: trailblazers, visionaries, scientists, educators, and leaders. Among countless others, they have left behind a legacy of compassion, innovation, and empowerment in a State that needs that now more than ever.

#### GOP ATTACKS ON REPRODUCTIVE HEALTHCARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the name of freedom, the freedom that women should have to make decisions about their own bodies and have that ability, a sacred freedom that House Republicans are fighting to take away from your mother, your sister, your daughters, and every woman in America.

This week, Republicans are holding votes to say the government should not be involved in households having more efficient appliances, yet they have no problem saying government should tell women what to do with their bodies and limit their access to women's healthcare.

While House Democrats will continue to fight to restore Roe v. Wade so women have the freedom over their bodies, we must call out the extreme Republican agenda that is focused on a nationwide ban to access women's reproductive healthcare.

This assault on women and our freedoms is already underway in many Republican-led States where women are now subject to cruel abortion bans which have brought fear and danger, but also have brought heartbreaking experiences that will have lasting impacts.

For example, in Mississippi, a 12-year-old rape victim was forced to carry a baby to term.

In Ohio, a woman was criminally charged for having a miscarriage after she went to the hospital to seek care when her doctor said that the fetus was not viable.

Republican-controlled States throughout the South and Midwest have passed extreme laws that leave no options for women to access reproductive healthcare. These women have no choice but to travel hundreds of miles to a State where access to care is still available.

A Missouri woman had to travel to Illinois to save her own life after both the States of Missouri and Kansas health systems refused to provide care when her water broke at just 4 months and doctors said she was at risk of losing her uterus.

Mothers who cannot afford to travel out of State for reproductive care have been forced to endure painful pregnancies and risk their own lives when advised of serious consequences.

□ 1100

Bans make access to reproductive care unobtainable for low-income women, many of whom are Latinas and other women of color. Over 6.7 million Latina women live in States that have banned, or are likely to ban, abortions. More than 3 million of these women come from families that earn below 200 percent of the poverty line.

Access to reproductive healthcare is a women's rights issue, and it is a racial justice issue.

Republicans in Congress also want to strip women of their fundamental right

to decide when to start a family. Just look at their policies and their voting records.

Mr. Speaker, 127 House Republicans are cosponsors of a bill that will threaten access to IVF nationwide and have blocked legislation by Democrats that would protect IVF access, and 195 House Republicans have voted against legal contraception. House Republicans voted unanimously against the restoration of Roe v. Wade.

Moreover, extreme MAGA Republicans plan to go further and let States monitor women who are pregnant to restrict their ability to access reproductive care.

House Democrats will not stand by and let MAGA Republicans restrict the freedom of women from getting the lifesaving care they need. We will continue to fight to make reproductive freedom the law of the land and allow women to make decisions about their own healthcare again.

#### 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 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

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

As we face the day that lies ahead, send us out to serve You, dear God. May we be faithful to keep Your commands. May we take time to enjoy the fellowship You provide. May we be eager to be loyal to You and may our deep desire to be worthy of You sustain us when so many other things clamor for our attention.

These are, indeed, challenging times, but we trust that You hold them in Your care. Give us wisdom to appreciate the steadfastness of heart and soul our service to You requires.

In a world where efficiency all too often overrides effectiveness, may our goal be Your intent for our energies. While whole communities are rent by the contest of wills and divided by the race for power, may we live into Your plan which transcends all selfish desire. As we watch as even the slightest disagreement becomes grounds for discord, may we step up and step in to be instruments of the reconciliation You desire for Your creation.

Make us strong and courageous. You have commanded us to serve You and have blessed us with Your trust. We

need not fear nor be dismayed, for You, O Lord, are with us this day and in the days ahead.

In Your abiding love we stand, and in Your name we pray.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CARL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CARL 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.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Avery M. Stringer, one of his secretaries.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

#### RECOGNIZING DOUG STRALEY

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor the extraordinary service of Louisa County School Superintendent Doug Straley.

Mr. Straley has worked tirelessly for many years to improve the lives of students, teachers, and staff in Louisa County Public Schools. For his effort, Mr. Straley was named the 2024 Virginia Superintendent of the Year by the Virginia Association of School Superintendents, recognizing his outstanding leadership of the county schools.

Mr. Straley began his career as a teacher and served as an athletics director, high school principal, and assistant superintendent before assuming his current position as superintendent.

As a lifelong resident of Louisa County, Mr. Straley has proudly dedicated 29 years of service to Louisa County Public Schools. His contributions to the Louisa community are immeasurable, and he is a most worthy recipient of this award.

I thank Mr. Straley for his exceptional achievements in Louisa County.

I wish him continued success as he strives to impact students in the county.

I am honored to represent Superintendent Doug Straley and all the incredible public servants of Virginia's Fifth District.

#### CELEBRATING NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Nurses Week and to celebrate the incredible contributions and sacrifices that nurses make each and every day.

As an occupational therapist myself, I have seen firsthand how important nurses are, not only in the delivery of healthcare but in their daily interactions with patients. They build connections and tend to a patient's needs, serving as the main conduit to a patient's medical care.

My grandmother, Dechantal O'Brien Kennedy, was a nurse. My mother, Mary Wilson Kennedy, was a nurse for more than 54 years and went on to teach nursing at D'Youville University in retirement.

We should be grateful to our nurses, but we need to do more to support them. This Congress should prioritize the passage of H.R. 2530. This legislation will mandate specified minimum nurse-to-patient ratios in hospitals, ensure Medicare payments reflect those ratios, and empower nurses to speak up if those ratios are violated.

It is common sense that we protect patients and reduce burnout and fatigue among nurses. It will save lives. Let's get it done.

#### BIDENFLATION HURTS FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, disastrous decisions by Biden and far-left Democrats continue to cause distress for families and destroy jobs.

The Federal Reserve announced that they would keep interest rates at a two-decade high because of Bidenflation, making homeownership unattainable for millions of Americans.

Biden has produced the highest inflation in 40 years, with higher prices every day since he took office. Egg costs are up 49 percent, baby food is up 31 percent, electricity is up 29 percent, poultry is up 24 percent, and coffee is up 20 percent.

Corrupt Judge Merchan has unintentionally confirmed the deranged Big Government corruption to defame Donald Trump. This helps Donald Trump. This corrupt judge now will be my guest. I invite him to come in January

to the inauguration of Donald Trump, which he unintentionally is causing.

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

#### MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as Mental Health Awareness Month. Mental Health Awareness Month has been a cornerstone of addressing the challenges faced by millions of Americans living with mental health conditions.

By breaking the stigma and talking about depression, anxiety, and other conditions, we can help those affected to seek the quality care that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, by bringing attention to mental health, we can elevate the conversations surrounding mental health. We are focusing on prioritizing mental health and acknowledging it is okay to not be okay.

If you are suffering or feel alone, please reach out for help. It is important to remember that you are not alone.

This month, reach out to your loved ones and check in. By starting the conversation, we are one step closer to ending the stigma surrounding mental health.

#### REMEMBERING MARINE CORPS MAJOR GENERAL JEROME GARY COOPER

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

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Marine Corps Major General Jerome Gary Cooper.

Cooper began his career at the University of Notre Dame, receiving his bachelor's degree in finance, while participating in naval ROTC. He then joined the Marine Corps. During the Vietnam war, he became the first African American to ever command a Marine Corps infantry company.

Among his many accolades, he was awarded the Bronze Star and two Purple Hearts. In 1988, he was promoted to Major General at the Headquarters Marine Corps.

In 1989, President George H.W. Bush appointed Cooper as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force in Manpower and Reserve Affairs. Then, President Clinton appointed him as U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica.

Cooper leaves behind a legacy of sacrifice, heroism, and inspiration to all. He passed away in Mobile at the age of 87 and will be remembered for his priceless service to our Nation. Oorah, Marine.

courages personal responsibility, a responsibility that supports the health of the American free enterprise system.

#### ALS SUFFERERS SHOW STRENGTH

(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, ALS is a neurological disorder that affects thousands of people worldwide. Recently, I had the privilege of meeting two incredible advocates living with ALS, and their courage and determination deeply moved me.

One of them is Lou Hall, a fellow Air Force veteran who was diagnosed in 2020 after undergoing several surgeries. With his wife, Tammy, Lou is working tirelessly to raise awareness about the importance of early detection.

Troy Tatum, an ordained Disciples of Christ reverend, was diagnosed in early 2022. Since his retirement, Troy and his wife, Leigh Ann, have provided unyielding support and encouragement to others.

To Lou and Troy, I greatly admire your strength, resilience, and unwavering commitment to a cure. Your stories are a testament to the human spirit and power of hope.

#### CYCLING FOR HOPE THE MISSION

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, over the past 8 weeks, my friends, Ken and Rowan, have pedaled 3,500 miles across this country to address the national homeless crisis and to raise funds to provide homes.

Founded 15 years ago in the San Fernando Valley, Hope the Mission has grown to become the largest rescue mission in the country, operating 23 interim housing shelters with 2,700 beds and serving over 3 million meals annually.

Hope will be adding 11 new projects in 2025, including five permanent supportive housing sites. I might point out that they are able to provide these housing sites at less than a quarter of the cost done by local government in the Los Angeles area.

Hope works to treat the unique needs of the housing insecure, operating shelter sites for families and for other victims of domestic violence, offering mental health services as well as shelter.

Ken and Rowan have put their bodies on the line more than once, not only bicycling across the country, but they also lived for 4 days on the streets. They also lived for 4 days in a car, and they previously ran to Las Vegas from Los Angeles.

I look forward to continuing to support Hope's efforts. I hope my colleagues, particularly in the Los Angeles area, do so as well. I am pleased to

#### REAUTHORIZING THE FAA

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to pass a full reauthorization of the FAA.

Right now, we have a Federal Aviation Administration that is operating under 20th century technology. Full reauthorization ensures the United States remains the gold standard on the world stage in aviation by bolstering U.S. technology and restructuring the FAA to improve efficiency.

As a matter of fact, the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2024 includes a handful of amendments many of my colleagues have worked with industry experts on for several months, one of which I was proud to have included in the House-passed version. This amendment encourages private-sector investment in hypersonic technology so we can remain competitive on the world stage.

Our aviation sector drives over 5 percent of the GDP and supports 11 million jobs. Full authorization ensures that our skies remain safe, and our aviation industry stays competitive. I urge my colleagues to get this good piece of legislation across the finish line.

#### STUDENT LOAN FORGIVENESS SCHEMES

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address President Biden's student loan bailout schemes.

Just weeks ago, the President unveiled a new executive action even after the Supreme Court shut down his previous attempts to let people off the hook for their loans. He is not just trying to unilaterally cancel student debt; his agencies have been working to make the student loan repayment process dysfunctional.

On one hand, the Federal Student Aid Agency is paying contractors who service student loans less money, and that agency has acknowledged that the level of service for student loan holders will suffer as a result.

On the other hand, the CFPB is using its enforcement authority to pursue these same contractors for the reduced levels of service that are the result of these same FSA cuts. It seems like a plan designed to break the entire student loan system.

Americans can't let the Biden administration's plan succeed. We need a return to principled fiscal policy that en-

have secured \$2 million for them for homeless services, another \$2 million for mental health services, and just this year almost a million to provide modular affordable housing.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION RELATING TO “STAFF ACCOUNTING BULLETIN NO. 121”

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1194, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) 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”, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 109

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to “Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121” (87 Fed. Reg. 21015 (April 11, 2022) and a letter of opinion from the Government Accountability Office dated October 31, 2023 (which was printed in the Congressional Record on November 1, 2023, on pages S5310–5312), concluding that such Staff Accounting Bulletin is a rule under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code), and such rule shall have no force or effect.*

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

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) will each control 30 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan resolution of disapproval. This resolution is an essential effort to protect consumers and foster innovation in digital asset markets.

It is also critical to stop the Securities and Exchange Commission’s regu-

latory power grabs and efforts to circumvent the Administrative Procedure Act.

I thank my friend Congressman FLOOD of Nebraska, a leader on financial innovation and digital asset policy, for introducing this bipartisan resolution.

Staff Accounting Bulletin 121, or SAB 121, is one of the most glaring examples of the current Securities and Exchange Commission’s reign of overreach.

Through SAB 121, the Commission is trying to dictate how financial institutions and firms safeguard Americans’ digital assets, in particular here, digital assets, under the guise of so-called staff guidance.

Let me explain why this is deeply concerning. Because they call it a staff guidance, the Securities and Exchange Commission could avoid public comment and the rulemaking process governed by the Administrative Procedure Act, or APA.

This is where the public gets to give an opinion back or expertise back to the agency so they can improve the rulemaking by listening to the public. This is a longstanding process here in the United States.

Not only did the Securities and Exchange Commission bypass Congress and the Comptroller General, but the Commission did not even consult with other financial regulators, prudential regulators responsible for overseeing banks prior to issuing SAB 121.

Thanks to the work of the House Financial Services Committee and my friend Senator LUMMIS, the GAO rightly deemed SAB 121 a rule for purposes of the Congressional Review Act, providing Congress with the opportunity to right the wrong of the agency action.

SAB 121 requires financial institutions and firms that are safeguarding their customers’ digital assets to hold those assets on their balance sheet.

That means banks would be required to take on significant capital liquidity and other costs under the existing prudential regulatory framework.

This essentially makes it cost prohibitive for financial institutions to custody their customers’ digital assets.

This is a massive deviation for how highly regulated banks are traditionally required to treat assets they hold on behalf of their customers.

Now, this is the point that everyone can understand. This is a change that harms consumers and makes them less protected. It is not a change for the better, clearly.

It limits the options for consumers and increases concentration risk to the financial system. Perhaps even worse, it could leave Americans’ assets vulnerable in the event of a bank failure, just as we saw with Silicon Valley Bank last year.

If you want Americans’ assets to be protected, they should be held in custody, not on a bank balance sheet. If you want Americans to be able to en-

gage with digital assets safely and securely, banks, which are some of the most highly regulated entities in our country and in the world, are probably the best places for them to be kept. Unfortunately, SAB 121 makes this nearly impossible.

We hear a lot from our Democrat colleagues about consumer protection. If that concern is genuine, and I think it is, they should support Congressman FLOOD’s bipartisan resolution before us today.

Let me give you one example of why this guidance is problematic. The Securities and Exchange Commission recently approved 11 Bitcoin ETFs, which allow everyday investors to gain exposure to this new technology. It is a decade old, but it is relatively new.

Of those 11, zero—and I repeat, zero—use banks as their primary custodian. Instead, all that risk is now concentrated in a few entities.

Let’s do a quick recap. The Securities and Exchange Commission through Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 upended traditional custody practices.

Just like you hold a stock with a stockbroker, it is held in custody. That means if that entity goes bankrupt, your asset is still protected. It is held in custody and safeguarded as if it is in a safe.

We want digital assets to be treated the same way that we treat other assets and be protected. This staff accounting bulletin upends traditional custody practices for banking institutions and makes a joke of the rulemaking process and ignores other regulatory agencies and market participants that are impacted by this bulletin. That is a bad process with even worse policy outcomes.

If you want consumers to be protected in digital assets markets, vote “yes” on this resolution. If you want to return bank custody practices to the tried, tested, and successful approach that we have had in this country for centuries, then vote “yes.” If you support financial innovation, you should vote “yes,” as well.

Finally, if you want to send a message that rogue regulators cannot circumvent Congress and our well-established rulemaking process, vote “yes.”

Let’s bring a level of common sense into the world of the digital asset debate or crypto and bring consumer protection back to this marketplace where it needs to be.

I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on this Congressional Review Act.

Finally, I thank Congressman FLOOD on the Republican side and Congressman NICKEL on the Democrat side for their leadership on this important topic.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 109, a Congressional Review Act resolution that would overturn accounting guidance for crypto

assets from the Securities and Exchange Commission known as Staff Accounting Bulletin 121, or SAB 121.

The bill's sponsors have falsely asserted that this bill is meant to address a narrow concern from a particular special interest group, but, in reality, it is drafted in a way that is far broader than this narrow concern.

The collateral damage caused by this CRA resolution would be far-reaching, causing significant harm to investors, consumers, public companies, and the safety and soundness of our capital markets.

The bill takes a sledgehammer to fix an issue that may merely need a scalpel, and it does so because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not only interested in doing the bidding of special interest groups, they are also interested in attacking and undermining the SEC in every possible way, as they have done relentlessly since the beginning of this Congress.

SAB 121 is highly technical guidance, therefore, let me break it down simply. SAB 121 has been in place for 2 years, and it only applies to companies that hold crypto assets on behalf of their customers.

This is known as providing custody services. SAB 121 provides guidance for these companies in two respects.

First, it advises companies on how they should disclose crypto assets that they have in custody, and second, it advises companies on how they should record those crypto assets on their balance sheets.

The first prong of the guidance I described on disclosure of crypto assets is critical to providing transparency for investors and the public on volatile crypto assets.

This kind of transparency helps prevent the kind of fraud and mishandling of crypto assets that led to the collapse of major crypto companies like FTX. In fact, this disclosure guidance has been broadly supported by industry and advocate stakeholders alike.

The second prong of SAB 121 advises relevant companies on how to record crypto assets on their balance sheets.

Under the guidance, the amount of the liability should correspond to the fair value of the crypto assets they are obligated to safeguard.

This ensures that the company providing custody services has sufficient resources to secure these assets for the users against any theft, loss, or other misuse that could result in financial consequences.

The SEC has explained that this guidance is prudent due to the unique risks and uncertainties associated with crypto assets.

The sponsor of this resolution has tried to reason that this bill is meant to respond to a narrow concern from largely custody banks, but it really has much more far-reaching, negative consequences.

Specifically, this special interest group has raised concerns that the second prong of SAB 121 that I described

on accounting mechanisms would interact with existing bank capital requirements in a way that would absolutely make it cost prohibitive for them to provide custody services for crypto assets.

To be clear, even this special interest group has expressed support for the disclosure guidance in SAB 121. They are only concerned about how the accounting guidance applies to their balance sheet.

In fact, a letter sent by the special interest group requests "targeted modifications" to address this concern.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Bank Policy Institute, the American Bankers Association, the Financial Services Forum, and the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

FEBRUARY 14, 2024.

Hon. GARY GENSLER,  
Chair, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR GENSLER: The Bank Policy Institute ("BPI"), the American Bankers Association ("ABA"), the Financial Services Forum ("the Forum"), and the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association ("SIFMA") (collectively, the "Associations") write to request that the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") consider targeted modifications to Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121 ("SAB 121") to address recent policy developments and the challenges that SAB 121 has posed for U.S. banking organizations since it was issued on March 31, 2022.

As the two-year anniversary of the issuance of SAB 121 approaches, the Associations believe now would be an appropriate time to examine and discuss the implications of SAB 121 for regulated banking organizations. There have been several relevant developments during this two year period, including the GAO report issued in October, approval of certain Spot Bitcoin ETPs, and the SEC's proposed rule on Safeguarding Advisory Client Assets that would cover the custody of digital assets if finalized as proposed. The Associations believe that SAB 121 can be modified to mitigate the specific challenges identified herein without undermining the stated policy objectives of the Commission to enhance the information received by investors and other users of financial statements.

The Associations are happy to continue to serve as a resource and work collaboratively with the Commission to provide recommendations that would ensure that investors are provided the requisite disclosures while allowing responsible innovation to occur. The Associations and Commission share the common goals of ensuring the highest levels of investor protection and implementing policies that advance principles of market integrity and financial stability.

We believe the recommendations set forth in this letter are consistent with those principles and would remove unintended barriers for well-regulated U.S. banking organizations to engage in certain activities. Below we describe the drivers behind this request and suggest targeted modifications to SAB 121.

#### I. BACKGROUND

Since SAB 121 was issued in 2022, the Associations have articulated their concerns regarding the Bulletin to the Commission both in writing and in meetings with Commission staff. The foremost concern identified and discussed is how the on-balance sheet re-

quirement of SAB 121 negatively impacts U.S. banking organizations and investors due to the associated prudential implications. The Associations have underscored that on-balance sheet treatment will preclude highly regulated banking organizations from providing a custodial solution for digital assets at scale. Moreover, the Associations have highlighted that the on-balance sheet requirement, coupled with the overly-broad definition of "crypto-asset" in SAB 121, will have a chilling effect on banking organizations' ability to develop responsible use cases for distributed ledger technology (DLT) more broadly.

U.S. banking organizations' experience over the past two years has confirmed that SAB 121 has curbed the ability of the Associations' members to develop and bring to market at scale certain digital asset products and services. In comparison, in-scope entities of SAB 121 other than U.S. banking organizations have not suffered the same effects. For example, digital asset custodial services are currently offered by various non-banking organizations, thereby keeping activity outside the prudential perimeter and avoiding the necessary oversight by regulators. Indeed, if regulated banking organizations are effectively precluded from providing digital asset safeguarding services at scale, investors and customers, and ultimately the financial system, will be worse off, with the market limited to custody providers that do not afford their customers the legal and supervisory protections provided by federally-regulated banking organizations. The Associations continue to urge the Commission to work with industry to adopt solutions that could mitigate the described challenges.

#### II. CONCRETE EXAMPLES OF THE IMPACT OF SAB 121 ON U.S. BANKING ORGANIZATIONS

The Associations highlight two specific examples of the negative impact of SAB 121 on banking organizations, investors, and the financial ecosystem:

(1) Spot Bitcoin ETPs: The Commission recently approved 11 Spot Bitcoin ETPs, allowing investors access to this asset class through a regulated product. However, notably absent from those approved products are banking organizations serving as the asset custodian, a role they regularly play for most other ETPs. These ETPs have already experienced billions of dollars in inflows, but it is practically impossible for banks to serve as custodian for those ETPs at scale due to the Tier 1 capital ratio and other reserve and capital requirements that result from SAB 121. This raises important questions about the safety and stability of this ecosystem. We believe that this result could raise concentration risk, as one nonbank entity now serves as the custodian for the majority of these ETPs. That risk can be mitigated if prudentially regulated banking organizations have the same ability to provide custodial services for Commission regulated ETPs as qualified nonbank asset custodians. SAB 121 does not appear to contemplate this type of concentration risk, in part perhaps because Spot Bitcoin ETPs or similar products were not an approved product at the time SAB 121 was issued.

(2) Use of DLT to record traditional financial assets: Banking organizations are increasingly exploring the use of DLT to record traditional financial assets, such as bonds. The use of DLT has the potential to expedite and automate payment, clearing, reconciliation and settlement services, and multiple central banks outside the United States are partnering with banks to explore the adoption of DLT. However, SAB 121 has proven to be a barrier to banking organizations' ability to meaningfully engage in

DLT-based projects due to the breadth of the definition of “crypto-asset” in SAB 121: “a digital asset that is issued and/or transferred using distributed ledger or blockchain technology using cryptographic techniques.” Under this definition, a traditional financial asset issued or transferred using DLT could be considered a “crypto asset” and thus within scope of SAB 121, regardless of the applicable risks. SAB 121 makes no distinction between asset types and use cases, but instead generally states that crypto-assets pose certain technological, legal, and regulatory risks requiring on-balance sheet treatment. However, there are significant differences between a cryptocurrency like Bitcoin that exists on a public, permissionless network versus a traditional financial instrument that is recorded on a blockchain network where access is controlled and transactions can be cancelled, corrected, or amended. The past two years have underscored these differences, as the turmoil in the crypto market has been wholly unrelated to banks’ use of permissioned DLT. DLT does not change the underlying nature or risks of traditional assets, nor do they present the risks SAB 121 purports to address, and thus SAB 121’s application to those assets should be reconsidered. Clear indication from the Commission that the use of DLT to record or transfer traditional financial assets is consistently outside the scope of SAB 121 would alleviate associated challenges.

### III. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

The Associations request that the Commission consider the following targeted modifications to SAB 121 to address the above concerns:

Narrow the definition of “crypto-assets” to clarify and confirm the exclusion of certain asset types and use cases. SAB 121 is premised on the risks posed exclusively by cryptocurrencies, and traditional financial assets recorded or transferred using blockchain networks should be excluded because they do not present the same risks as cryptocurrencies; the use of DLT does not change the underlying nature or risk of traditional assets. Moreover, certain exclusions for products wherein the underlying activity relates to the offering of a Commission-approved product should be clarified.

Exempt banking organizations from on-balance sheet treatment but maintain the disclosure requirements: As described previously, SAB 121 answers three questions, and the Associations’ and its members’ are primarily concerned with the first question: how an entity should account for its obligations to safeguard crypto-assets (the on-balance sheet treatment). We do not object to the requirements imposed in the answer to the second question (disclosures in Financial statements). Exempting banking organizations from the on-balance sheet treatment but requiring them to make certain disclosures about their digital activity would mitigate the concerns raised by banking organizations without undermining the goal of SAB 121 to promote disclosures to investors. Balance sheet disclosure may be appropriate where the controls are not adequate to protect investors from the risk of custodied assets, which is not the case for banking organizations that are subject to robust oversight from the federal banking agencies. The required disclosures in the answer to the second question are broad and may include disclosures in the description of business, risk factors, and management’s discussion and analysis of financial condition and results of operation, and such information will still “enhance the information received by investors and other users of financial statements

about these risks, thereby assisting them in making investment and other capital allocation decisions.”

### IV. CONCLUSION

The Associations and their members appreciate your attention to the issues raised in this letter. Given the upcoming two-year anniversary of the issuance of SAB 121, certain policy developments, the experience of U.S. banking organizations, and the evolution in technology since the guidance was first issued, we believe it is an appropriate time to reflect on the intended goals of SAB 121. We request a meeting with you and Commission staff to discuss the issues and proposed modifications set forth above.

We appreciate the Commission’s attention to this important topic and look forward to engaging with you further.

Respectfully submitted,

BANK POLICY INSTITUTE,  
AMERICAN BANKERS  
ASSOCIATION,  
FINANCIAL SERVICES  
FORUM,  
SECURITIES INDUSTRY AND  
FINANCIAL MARKETS  
ASSOCIATION.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill does far more than implement targeted modifications, as this letter proposes.

This CRA resolution would overturn all of SAB 121, not just the part that this special interest group has complained about.

Mr. Speaker, I am curious whether my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have actually read this letter from the special interest group that they are trying to pander to or whether they are bothered to consult the largest custody bank in the United States, the Bank of New York Mellon, which holds in custody more than \$45 trillion in customer assets because they told me that they do not want this CRA and did not push for it in any way because they share our concerns about the bill being overly broad.

□ 1230

The consequences of using a CRA, rather than a more narrowly tailored bill, go beyond simply overturning SAB 121 entirely when the aforementioned concerns from special interests only have to do with one little piece of it.

If this resolution is passed, the SEC would be prohibited from issuing any guidance in the future that is substantially similar to this one, including disclosure guidance on this issue. This means that the SEC would not be able to simply turn around and narrowly address this one little concern while preserving the rest of the guidance. It also means that while the crypto industry clamors for the SEC to provide for clarity, this resolution would tie the SEC’s hands, making it harder for them to provide the clarity that the industry purportedly wants.

I am further concerned that if this resolution is passed, industry and investors alike will no longer be able to receive timely guidance from the SEC staff, as this resolution is also intended to be a warning. Passing this resolution would have broad and negative consequences for all public companies and their investors, with implications

for the entire securities market, not just crypto.

The SEC has issued numerous staff accounting bulletins. The one being repealed today is No. 121, which has helped companies understand how SEC rules apply in specific situations.

If the SEC were to pull back in this regard, it would be particularly harmful to smaller companies with less resources dedicated to compliance and could result in more enforcement actions as they struggle to understand how to best comply with SEC rules.

Chairman McHENRY and I have worked well together to find common ground on crypto issues like stablecoins. However, instead of finding ways to work together, Republicans are recklessly pushing this harmful, partisan resolution.

Let us not forget, the SEC is our cop on the block and should be supported because they protect our investors.

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

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Government Accountability Office’s October 31, 2023, decision on the “Applicability of the Congressional Review Act to Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121,” which can be found online at: <https://www.gao.gov/assets/870/862501.pdf>.

The decision makes clear that the accusations that the ranking member is making about how broad this is are simply not the case. It is a very targeted removal of the staff accounting bulletin that broadly affects digital assets, not one bank.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD), the sponsor of the resolution and a leader on innovation on the Financial Services Committee and broader policy.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman McHENRY for yielding.

I am pleased to speak in support of my bipartisan resolution, H.J. Res. 109, a Congressional Review Act resolution for the SEC’s Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121, or SAB 121 for short.

I thank Congressman NICKEL and Senator LUMMIS for working with me on this resolution and for the chairman’s leadership in getting this to the floor.

This is something of a complicated issue, as you have heard today, so I will break it down into a few different components.

First, I will begin by explaining what a staff accounting bulletin is. Staff accounting bulletins are technical accounting guidance for public entities. They are typically noncontroversial in nature and, importantly for this debate, are not rules. Guidance is not supposed to dictate a major change in policy. That is what our notice-and-comment rulemaking process is for.

This specific bulletin effectively requires banks to put digital assets held in custody on their balance sheet. Simply put, that is not how custody usually works.

As a Federal Reserve Chairman once said: "Custody assets are off balance sheet, always have been."

This bulletin upends custodial practice for banks, and it effectively keeps banks out of this market entirely. That is not good for consumers or investors.

Next, let's talk about the process, as the chairman has already mentioned. There were two major process fouls by the SEC in issuing SAB 121.

Number one, the SEC is not a bank regulator, and SAB 121 affects a core banking activity: custody. Yet, the SEC issued this bulletin without even talking to the regulators first. Think about that. The SEC issued this without even talking to the prudential regulators. That is an incredible oversight, particularly given the bulletin's unusual treatment of custodial assets.

Number two, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office determined that this bulletin is effectively a rule. In other words, the SEC got caught trying to circumvent the APA and the due diligence requirements that come with it.

Now, let's talk about solutions. The easiest way to fix this problem is for the SEC to simply rescind the bulletin themselves and work with the prudential regulators on an alternate solution.

Despite the fact that this bulletin was issued through a faulty process and despite the negative ramifications of keeping banks from taking custody of retail investor assets, the SEC has been unwilling to have any conversation about making changes.

That leaves us with no choice. Congress needs to act through the Congressional Review Act to rescind SAB 121.

Finally, let me briefly address an argument that Ranking Member WATERS and some of my Democratic colleagues have made on this issue. I have heard this argument that the CRA should not be applied to an accounting bulletin, but let's contemplate the alternative. What are the implications if we fail to pass this resolution?

This is an instance where the nonpartisan GAO outright said the SEC circumvented the proper regulatory process.

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

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, think about why the Congressional Review Act was passed in the first place: to give Congress the ability to check a regulator that has gone astray. If we don't pass this resolution, we are effectively giving the green light to our regulators to bypass the APA rulemaking process with impunity.

This isn't just about the SEC or bank custody. This is about providing a necessary check to executive branch power. Regardless of your feelings on the banking policy or the SEC, I urge my colleagues to support this resolu-

tion for the sake of upholding the authority of the institution we serve in.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD four letters.

Number one is a letter dated April 27, 2023, sent by Fed Vice Chair Michael Barr to Senator LUMMIS, discussing the impact of SAB 121 on Fed-regulated financial institutions.

Number two is a letter dated April 18, 2023, sent by FDIC Chairman Gruenberg to Chairman McHENRY and Senator LUMMIS, in response to their March 2, 2023, letter.

Number three is a letter dated February 28, 2024, sent by the Conference of State Bank Supervisors to Chairman McHENRY and Ranking Member WATERS, outlining the unintended effects SAB 121 could pose on consumers and markets.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, Washington, DC, April 27, 2023.

Hon. CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LUMMIS: Thank you for your letter dated March 2, 2023, regarding the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 ("SAB 121") published on April 11, 2022.

As you know, the Federal Reserve is not responsible for the general accounting policy for public companies and, as such, Federal Reserve staff were not consulted by the SEC regarding the development and issuance of SAB 121. For accounting and reporting purposes under U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), assets held in custody are generally not recognized on the custodian's balance sheet—as the custodian does not control the assets—and we defer to the SEC on these matters. However, I would note that state member banks may provide safekeeping services, in a custodial capacity, for crypto-assets if conducted in a safe and sound manner and in compliance with consumer, anti-money laundering, and anti-terrorist financing laws.

By law, regulatory reports and statements required to be filed with Federal banking agencies by all insured depository institutions must be uniform and consistent with U.S. GAAP. In light of SAB 121, the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) issued supplemental instructions to the Call Report related to SAB 121. The supplemental instructions state that an institution that determines that it is appropriate for it to apply SAB 121 for SEC or other financial reporting purposes should complete its Call Report consistent with the classification determination made for SEC or other financial reporting purposes. Institutions are encouraged to consult with SEC staff on the scope and applicability of SAB 121.

The Basel Committee's prudential treatment of crypto-asset exposures applies to various types of exposures to banks, such as exposures held as securities on balance sheet or through derivatives. However, the Basel standard does not generally apply to custodial assets.

The Federal Reserve continues to take a careful and cautious approach related to current or proposed crypto-asset-related activities at each banking organization and will continue to ensure that legally permissible activities are conducted in a manner that is safe and sound, and in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, including those designed to protect consumers.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL S. BARR.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, Washington, DC, April 18, 2023.

Hon. CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS,  
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.  
Hon. PATRICK McHENRY,  
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LUMMIS AND CHAIRMAN McHENRY: Thank you for your letter of March 2, 2023, to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) regarding the accounting and regulatory capital implications of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 (SAB 121).

FDIC staff was not consulted by the SEC before the issuance of SAB 121 and has not been advised of any plans by the SEC to modify or withdraw SAB 121. By law, regulatory reports and statements required to be filed with Federal banking agencies by all insured depository institutions must be uniform and prepared in a manner that is no less stringent than U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). In accordance with U.S. GAAP, assets held in custody are generally not recognized on the custodian's balance sheet, because custodial assets provide no economic benefit to the custodian and the custodian does not control the assets.

Beginning in June 2022, the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, of which the FDIC is a member, issued Supplemental Instructions for the Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income (Call Report). Those instructions state: "An institution that determines that it is appropriate for it to apply SAB 121 for SEC or other financial reporting purposes should complete its Call Report consistent with the classification determination made for SEC or other financial reporting purposes." The FDIC encourages institutions to consult with SEC staff on the scope and applicability of SAB 121. Reporting custodial assets on-balance sheet in accordance with SAB 121 would be no less stringent than U.S. GAAP.

The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) published its final standard on the prudential treatment of crypto-asset exposures in December 2022. The BCBS standard outlines that consistent with the leverage ratio standard, crypto-assets are included in the leverage ratio exposure measure according to their value for financial reporting purposes, based on applicable accounting treatment for exposures that have similar characteristics. The standard states that crypto-asset exposures include on- or off-balance sheet amounts that give rise to credit, market, operational and/or liquidity risks. Certain parts of the standards, such as those related to operational risk, are also applicable to banks' crypto-asset activities. The FDIC does not view the BCBS standard as being in conflict with the SEC's SAB 121, although the agency does acknowledge that the SEC's SAB 121 would require institutions to hold capital against custodied crypto-assets.

The FDIC continues to actively monitor activities associated with digital asset by regulated banking organizations that includes digital asset custodial activities. The FDIC will continue to ensure that legally permissible activities are conducted in a safe and sound manner and in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, including those designed to protect consumers.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated. If you have additional comments or questions, please contact me or Andy Jimenez, Director, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Sincerely,

MARTIN J. GRUENBERG.

CSBS,

Washington, DC, February 28, 2024.

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,  
Chairman, House Financial Services Committee,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. MAXINE WATERS,  
Ranking Member, House Financial Services  
Committee, Washington, DC.

CHAIRMAN MCHENRY AND RANKING MEMBER WATERS: On behalf of the Conference of State Bank Supervisors, I write to relay our concerns with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 ("SAB 121," or "the Bulletin"). The Bulletin, issued without public consultation, unilaterally upends traditional custodial accounting obligations. As written, SAB 121 could lead to significant downstream effects for custodial firms subject to prudential regulation.

State regulators strongly support appropriate customer protections and a safe and sound financial system. Further, we appreciate the SEC's effort to provide guidance concerning novel activities such as custodial services for "crypto-assets." However, decisions with wide-ranging implications across the banking sector should be made in consultation with prudential regulators at both the state and federal level and only after an opportunity for public notice-and-comment. As the Government Accountability Office (GAO) ruled in October 2023, SAB 121 qualifies as a rule under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and, as such, should have been made available for public comment.

While custodial activities may have once elicited images of only safe deposit boxes holding valuable physical objects, today's banks hold a variety of both physical and electronic assets. More recently, bank customers have been increasingly interested in banks' ability to custody crypto-assets, including cryptographic keys. While the nature of the underlying assets may change and prudential risk management requirements may vary from asset to asset, the accounting and regulatory principles applicable to such custodial assets should be consistent. In unilaterally departing from well-established accounting principles for safeguarding custodial crypto-assets, SAB 121 ignores existing regulatory frameworks in place to ensure custodial activity is conducted in a safe and sound manner.

Failure to take public comment or consult with other regulators on a cross-jurisdictional issue like this could result in substantial unintended consequences. Two areas of potential side effects from this opaque rulemaking include:

Potential Asset Concentration. The Bulletin requires on-balance sheet accounting of crypto-assets under custody, which is a significant departure from the treatment of other assets held under custody. Due to the prudential regulatory implications of on-balance sheet accounting, this would likely require custodial institutions to raise significant funds to maintain adequate leverage ratios—a step many industry participants have indicated would be prohibitive to providing these custodial services for customers. Not only is this model inconsistent with the principle that similar activities should be regulated in a similar manner, but it could also result in an unnecessary and potentially risky concentration of custodial assets outside of prudentially regulated institutions.

Loss of Insolvency Protections for Customers. Applying on-balance sheet treatment for crypto-assets may inappropriately subject customer assets to creditors' claims in the event of the insolvency of an institution offering custody products and services. In a traditional bankruptcy proceeding, assets accounted for on-balance sheet are typically subject to creditor claims. Conversely,

assets held in custody for the benefit of customers are considered accounted for off-balance sheet—and thus protected in bankruptcy—because they remain the assets of the customer. Requiring custodied crypto-assets to be accounted for on-balance sheet risks losing the bankruptcy remote protections of custody services. This is an important distinction from the treatment for a broker-dealer that would be subject to a different form of bankruptcy under the Securities Investor Protection Act.

These are only two unintended side effects that SAB 121 could impose on markets and consumers in an evolving technological environment.

History repeatedly demonstrates the shortcomings of rulemaking in a vacuum. Without significant consultation with peer regulators and comments from the broader public, these types of missteps are all too common, particularly with new and innovative technologies. We support robust consumer and market protections in this growing and evolving asset class and stand ready to provide Congress and our federal regulatory partners with our experience and expertise. However, given the lack of adequate consultation and opportunity for public comment, and the potential for significant detrimental effects, we have significant concerns with SAB 121.

Sincerely,

BRANDON MILHORN,  
President and CEO.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, number four is a letter dated February 29, 2024, sent by the American Bankers Association to Chairman MCHENRY and Ranking Member WATERS, expressing support for H.J. Res. 109.

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, February 29, 2024.

Re 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" (H.J. Res. 109).

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,  
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. MAXINE WATERS,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCHENRY AND RANKING MEMBER WATERS: The American Bankers Association (ABA) welcomes and supports H.J. Res. 109, the Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval for the Securities and Exchange Commission "Staff Accounting Bulletin 121," which was recently introduced by Reps. MIKE and FLOOD (R-NE) and WILEY NICKEL (D-NC).

#### ADVERSE IMPACT OF SAB 121 ON BANK DIGITAL ASSET PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

In March 2022, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) released Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 (SAB 121) to address perceived risks to publicly traded companies that safeguard crypto assets for their customers. Under SAB 121, an entity responsible for safeguarding cryptocurrency assets for platform users must present a liability on its balance sheet at fair value to reflect that obligation, as well as a corresponding asset. SAB 121 is a departure from the banking industry's historical practice of treating custody assets off-balance sheet, and this accounting treatment effectively precludes banks from offering digital asset custody at scale since placing the value of client assets on balance sheet will impact prudential requirements such as capital, liquidity, and other mandates.

On February 14, 2024, ABA joined with several other financial trades in a joint letter to the SEC. In the letter, we noted that U.S. banking organizations' experience over the past two years with SAB 121 shows that it has curbed the ability of our members to develop and bring to market at scale certain digital asset products and services. We gave two concrete examples:

#### (1) Spot Bitcoin ETFs

The Commission recently approved Spot Bitcoin Exchange Traded Products (ETPs), allowing investors access to this asset class through a regulated product. However, notably absent from those approved products are banking organizations serving as the asset custodian, a role they regularly play for most other ETPs. These ETPs have already experienced billions of dollars in inflows, but it is practically impossible for banks to serve as custodian for those ETPs at scale due to the Tier 1 capital ratio and other reserve and capital requirements that result from SAB 121. This raises important questions about the safety and stability of this ecosystem.

We believe that this result could raise concentration risk, as one nonbank entity now serves as the custodian for the majority of these ETPs. That risk can be mitigated if prudentially regulated banking organizations have the *same ability* to provide custodial services for Commission regulated ETPs as qualified nonbank asset custodians. SAB 121 does not appear to contemplate this type of concentration risk, in part perhaps because Spot Bitcoin ETPs or similar products were not an approved product at the time SAB 121 was issued.

#### (2) Use of DLT to record traditional financial assets

Banking organizations are increasingly exploring the use of Distributed Ledger Technology (DLT) to record traditional financial assets, such as bonds. The use of DLT has the potential to expedite and automate payment, clearing, reconciliation and settlement services, and multiple central banks outside the United States are partnering with banks to explore the adoption of DLT. However, SAB 121 has proven to be a barrier to banking organizations' ability to meaningfully engage in DLT-based projects due to the breadth of the definition of "crypto-asset" in SAB 121: "a digital asset that is issued and/or transferred using distributed ledger or blockchain technology using cryptographic techniques."

Under this definition, a traditional financial asset issued or transferred using DLT could be considered a "crypto asset" and thus within scope of SAB 121, regardless of the applicable risks. SAB 121 makes no distinction between asset types and use cases, but instead generally states that crypto-assets pose certain technological, legal, and regulatory risks requiring on-balance sheet treatment. However, there are significant differences between a cryptocurrency like Bitcoin that exists on a public, permissionless network versus a traditional financial instrument that is recorded on a blockchain network where access is controlled and transactions can be cancelled, corrected, or amended.

The past two years have underscored these differences, as the turmoil in the crypto market has been wholly unrelated to banks' use of permissioned DLT. DLT does not change the underlying nature or risks of traditional assets, nor do they present the risks SAB 121 purports to address, and thus SAB 121's application to those assets should be reconsidered. Clear indication from the Commission that the use of DLT to record or transfer traditional financial assets is consistently outside the scope of SAB 121 would alleviate associated challenges.

In the February 14 letter, we made several recommendations for changes to SAB 121

that would mitigate the specific challenges identified above without undermining the stated policy objectives of the SEC to enhance the information received by investors and other users of financial statements. We also asked for a meeting to discuss those changes, but as yet have not had a response from the SEC.

#### ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES FOR CONSUMERS

Banks have long provided safe and well-regulated custody services to investors for securities and other assets. However, the implications of SAB 121 mean few banks are currently offering custody services for digital assets, leaving consumers with few options for a safe, well-regulated custody service for digital assets.

In fact, many have turned to non-bank market entrants that are not subject to prudential regulation and examination and are not subject to robust capital and liquidity requirements. This unregulated activity can expose consumers and counterparties to significant harm.

#### CONCLUSION

We applaud Representatives Flood and Nickel for their leadership on this important issue. The SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 represents a significant departure from longstanding accounting treatment for custodied assets and threatens the banking industry's ability to provide its customers with safe and sound custody of digital assets. Limiting banks' ability to offer these services leaves consumers with few well-regulated, trusted options for their digital asset portfolios and ultimately exposes them to risk.

We encourage you and your membership to favorably report this resolution out of the Committee. We would be pleased to meet with you and your staff to discuss how Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 inhibits consumer access to safe, sounds access to digital asset custody services.

Sincerely,

KIRSTEN SUTTON,  
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT,  
*American Bankers Association.*

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

This is my response to the gentleman from Nebraska. My Republican colleagues have claimed that the SEC failed to consult with prudential regulators on SAB 121, but if this resolution is passed, the SEC will effectively be barred from consulting with prudential regulators in order to issue revised guidance on this matter.

Again, the plain consequences of this bill do not match the purported goals of the bill's sponsor and supporters. If Republicans wanted the SEC to consult with prudential regulators and reissue modified guidance, they should do that. This bill does the opposite. It actually prevents the SEC from consulting with prudential regulators in order to re-issue modified guidance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the crypto industry comes before our committee almost every week saying: We want clarity. Then the SEC provides the clarity. Now, the friends of crypto are here to abolish the clarity, to not only take away release 121, which re-

quires that the custodians of crypto indicate that on the balance sheet, but to prevent the SEC from issuing a revised version of 121 that could call for that same disclosure to be made in footnotes.

It is very clear to me, as co-chair of the bipartisan CPA Caucus, that the financial statements must reflect the incredible risk that banks take when they become custodians of billions and hundreds of billions of dollars, supposedly, worth of crypto.

Now, why the uniqueness of crypto? We have seen Sam Bankman-Fried. He was the face of crypto. He is now facing only a quarter century in jail, which seems rather light. The crypto industry would tell us that Sam Bankman-Fried was just a single snake in the crypto Garden of Eden. The fact is, we have learned since Sam Bankman-Fried's indictments that crypto is a garden of snakes. It is uniquely problematic. Why is that? Because crypto's whole purpose is to facilitate evading American law and to help criminals. Who does it attract? It attracts criminals.

What is the comparative advantage that crypto has as it attempts to become a currency and partially displace the dollar and the euro? Is it more stable? Certainly not. Is it more useful to buy something? You can go to Rayburn and buy a sandwich for \$1—well, okay, \$8, but you can't buy a sandwich anywhere in this complex for a bitcoin. It is not a better medium of exchange. It is not a better measure of value. What advantage does it have? It is secret.

Now, the best way to have their secrecy is to have the iceberg above the water be available and visible and then to have under the water seven-eighths of the crypto subject to being hidden from the know-your-customer and anti-money-laundering laws.

So how can the crypto compete with the dollar, aspire to become a currency, and compete with the best currency in the world? By tapping into the markets that don't want to be surveilled by the U.S. Government. What are those? Obviously, the sanctions evaders, the drug dealers, and the human traffickers, but that is not a big enough market for crypto. They want the tax evasion market.

The IRS Commissioner under Donald Trump testified that we are losing a trillion dollars in revenue. That means that those who are cheating on taxes, almost all at the high end of the spectrum, have to hide \$3 trillion of income each and every year. That is \$30 trillion of hidden income every decade. They can't do it with U.S. dollars, so crypto is designed to fill that need.

Now, if you think it will be successful in doing that and you want to bet against America and facilitate the undermining of American laws while perhaps making a profit, you can buy crypto, but it is an asset whose very nature creates an additional risk. That risk needs to be shown in the financial statements of the custodian. This reso-

lution would prevent the SEC from causing that to be disclosed either on the balance sheet or in the footnotes.

□ 1245

If you doubt what the purpose is of crypto, then look at their latest invention: the mixer.

What is the mixer?

It is designed to mix up law enforcement. It is a facility available to every crypto owner to disguise their transactions and to hide from American law enforcement.

Not only that, of course, crypto aspires and claims that they will partially displace the dollar as the reserve currency. If it does that, that will be a tremendous decline in America's power in the world and the American economy.

So I see no reason for us to have rules that hide this risk from the shareholders of the custodian.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHERMAN. I see no reason for us to hide from those who are looking at bank balance sheets the unique risk that they take in order to facilitate a crypto ecosystem whose sole purpose and whose strategy is to defeat the American Government whether it tries to collect taxes or enforce our sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any doubt, look at what the proponents, the visionaries, behind crypto say. They say that they are innovative. They are trying to innovate a way to make sure that America cannot enforce its sanctions, cannot deal with drug dealers, cannot enforce its taxes, and, oh, by the way, particularly useful to Sam Bankman-Fried, cannot enforce its bankruptcy laws.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues that if they want to fix the Sam Bankman-Fried FTX fraud and their ability to do that again, then you need to pass the bill that we produced out of committee that regulates crypto and provides regulatory agencies power.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), who is the chairman of the Science Committee and a great leader on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bipartisan CRA to overturn the SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin 121.

SAB 121 has removed a bank's ability to offer custodial services for digital assets and has prevented banks from exploring the use of distributed ledger technologies.

The SEC issued SAB 121 unilaterally, outside the rulemaking process, and without the consultation of the banking regulators.

This policy is not for the SEC to decide, and certainly not for the SEC to

dictate through a broad interpretation of accounting practices.

The cost of and the availability of capital is dependent on the U.S. banking system's ability to adapt to new technologies and to compete in offering innovative products and services. SAB 121 has put up barriers to that essential responsibility.

This CRA is an important correction to the SEC's misstep. I thank Congressman FLOOD and Congressman NICKEL for leading this effort.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy from the White House.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.J. RES. 109—CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF “STAFF ACCOUNTING BULLETIN NO. 121” ISSUED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—REP. FLOOD, R-NE, AND FOUR CO-SPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes passage of H.J. Res. 109, which would disrupt the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) work to protect investors in crypto-asset markets and to safeguard the broader financial system. H.J. Res. 109 would invalidate SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 (SAB 121), which reflects considered SEC staff views regarding the accounting obligations of certain firms that safeguard crypto-assets. Moreover, as explained in staff's accompanying release, SAB 121 was issued in response to demonstrated technological, legal, and regulatory risks that have caused substantial losses to consumers. By virtue of invoking the Congressional Review Act, it could also inappropriately constrain the SEC's ability to ensure appropriate guardrails and address future issues related to crypto-assets including financial stability. Limiting the SEC's ability to maintain a comprehensive and effective financial regulatory framework for crypto-assets would introduce substantial financial instability and market uncertainty.

If the President were presented with H.J. Res. 109, he would veto it.

Ms. WATERS. The President states that the resolution before us would “disrupt the Securities and Exchange Commission's work to protect investors in crypto-asset markets and to safeguard the broader financial system.”

This statement not only explains how terrible this resolution is, but that the President of the United States of America will veto it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Digital Assets, Financial Technology and Inclusion.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 109.

This misguided resolution would eliminate the Securities and Exchange Commission's Staff Accounting Bulletin 121. This nonbinding, interpretive guidance advises companies that are holding crypto assets in custody for customers to record those assets as liabilities on their balance sheets. It also recommends that companies disclose the nature and the amount of their crypto-asset holdings. Simply put, it advises caution and transparency regarding crypto because it is so volatile.

The disapproval of SAB 121 would have severe consequences in the U.S. fi-

nancial services industry and be especially dangerous for banks, depositors, investors, and consumers. As underscored in the bulletin, the safeguarding of crypto assets presents unique technological, regulatory, and legal risks that could significantly impact a company's financial condition and its operations. For this same reason, the bulletin seeks to ensure that investors are informed about these risks in making investment and other capital allocation decisions.

The failure of Silicon Valley Bank, Signature Bank, First Republic Bank, and others have shown us that nervous depositors can cause a run on bank assets when crypto assets become unstable. They can also move money in the blink of an eye, which makes these banks less stable and subject to failure.

With the collapse of FTX, the violation of Federal anti-money laundering and sanctions laws by Binance, and legal issues facing several other crypto companies, Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 serves to protect investors.

Crypto is now in its 17th year, yet the primary use cases for crypto continue to be money laundering, tax avoidance, cybercriminal ransomware payments, and terrorist finance.

Regrettably, crypto has become a truly perfect example of a textbook case of an elegant idea that is being continually savaged by an ugly gang of facts.

Regrettably, the Republican leadership's efforts to curtail SEC regulation in the crypto sector are now even extending to staff bulletins that are simply advisory and designed to publicize staff views regarding accounting-related disclosure practices.

This resolution also undermines the practice of issuing Staff Accounting Bulletins for the benefit of small investors and firms that may not have the resources to engage directly with the SEC and obtain an individual opinion or advice.

As ranking member of the Digital Assets Subcommittee for the House Financial Services Committee, I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who is the chair of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Monetary Policy on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in front of you today to support my friend and colleague from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) and his CRA resolution to nullify the SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin Number 121 which would eviscerate financial institutions' ability to provide custodial services for digital asset firms.

In theory, under SAB 121, a bank could custody digital assets. However, the conditions set forth by SAB 121 make it impractical for any bank. This very fact has been noted by Federal Reserve Board Chair Powell who acknowl-

edged it shifts away from traditional custodial practices as custodial assets receive off-balance-sheet treatment.

SAB 121 overturns decades of precedent regarding the accounting assets for banks. If a bank decides to custody digital assets and adhere to SAB 121, then the on-balance-sheet requirement would have significant capital, liquidity, and other prudential consequences. This makes it difficult, at best, for regulated institutions to safeguard digital assets.

The fact is that technological, legal, and regulatory risks cited in SAB 121 are already addressed by the legal and regulatory framework that applies to banks' custodial activities. Yet, SAB 121 did not account for that.

Moreover, and disturbingly, the SEC did not consult with any of the prudential regulators before issuing this flawed guidance. Unfortunately, the failure to consult the regulators overseeing institutions that are largely impacted by an SEC proposal has become quite common under Chair Gensler.

The SEC does not have the expertise to assess the same risks as the prudential regulators, and it is not the role of Gary Gensler to propose misguided rulemakings and guidance that may have major adverse implications to the functioning of our financial institutions, and ultimately to the safety and soundness of our financial system.

Given the implications for financial institutions' ability to safeguard assets under this rule and the clear lack of understanding regarding their prudential standards and guidance from their primary regulators, this rule is fatally flawed.

The fact of the matter is to the extent there is concern about a lack of regulation, if there is concern about a lack of regulatory clarity or risk with crypto, then we should not make it impossible, as a practical matter, for well-regulated banks to protect Americans who own digital assets with custody services.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to protect customers and if you want to protect investors in digital assets, then we shouldn't be pushing crypto transactions into less transparent and more opaque, riskier offshore places, but that is exactly what SAB 121 would do.

I have to address this issue. Silicon Valley Bank's failure had to do with deposit concentration risk and interest rate mismanagement. It had nothing to do with the fact that many of its customers were technology firms or worked in the blockchain space. It had nothing to do with that. That is a red herring.

This is why I support Mr. FLOOD's measure, I support the bipartisan work, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter dated March 2, 2023, cosigned by Chairman MCHENRY and Senator LUMMIS sent to the Fed, OCC, FDIC, and NCUA asking them about SAB 121's impact on regulated entities, and also asking if they were consulted prior to SAB 121's issuance.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, March 2, 2023.

Re Prudential Impact of Staff Accounting Bulletin 121.

Hon. MICHAEL BARR,  
Vice Chair for Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC.

Mr. MICHAEL HSU,  
Acting Comptroller, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, DC.

Hon. MARTY GRUENBERG,  
Chairman of the Board, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, DC.

Hon. TODD HARPER,  
Chairman of the Board, National Credit Union Administration, Alexandria, VA.

DEAR VICE CHAIR BARR, CHAIRMAN GRUENBERG, CHAIRMAN HARPER, AND MR. HSU: We write regarding Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 ("SAB 121") published on April 11, 2022. SAB 121 was intended to clarify the accounting treatment of digital assets safeguarded by custodians, exchanges, and other platforms engaged in digital asset activities. However, SAB 121 places customer assets at greater risk of loss if a custodian becomes insolvent or enters receivership, violating the SEC's fundamental mission to protect customers.

Our concern stems from SAB 121's directive that companies recognize a liability and a corresponding offset on their balance sheets, measured at the fair value of the customer custodial digital assets. A recent decision in the Celsius bankruptcy, which classified all Celsius' customers as unsecured creditors, and therefore at the back of the line to recover their assets, highlights the legal risk of effectively forcing customer custodial assets to be placed on balance sheet. Additionally, SAB 121 upends decades of precedent regarding the accounting treatment of custodial assets for banks, credit unions and other regulated financial institutions.

Federal Reserve Board Chair Powell noted this shift away from traditional custodial practices in testimony before the Senate Banking Committee on June 22, 2022. Typically, custodial assets receive off-balance sheet accounting treatment. This is largely because customers retain ownership of their custodial assets and financial institutions are not permitted to conduct proprietary trading with customer assets. As emphasized in comment letters, SAB 121 "deviates from existing accounting treatment of safeguarded assets held in a custodial capacity, which does not result in assets or liabilities reported on the custodian's balance sheet."

Furthermore, the breadth of the "digital asset" definition in SAB 121 covers any "digital asset that is issued and/or transferred using distributed ledger or blockchain technology using cryptographic techniques." The scope of assets covered by this broad definition, whether virtual currency, stablecoins, or even tokenized equities, is unclear. This is concerning because a more nuanced hierarchy for this asset class which considers the opportunities and risks of digital assets with different functions is necessary. For example, the Bank for International Settlements' Prudential Treatment of Crypto Assets framework differentiates between various types of digital assets for bank capital purposes.

Since SAB 121 purports to require banks, credit unions and other financial institutions to effectively place digital assets on their balance sheets, it would trigger a massive capital charge. This in turn is likely to prevent these prudentially regulated entities from engaging in digital asset custody. To the contrary, we should be encouraging prudentially regulated financial institutions, like banks and credit unions, to provide digital asset services precisely because they are subject to the highest standards of capital, liquidity, recovery and resolution, custody, cyber-security, and risk management.

In sum, the effect of SAB 121 is to deny millions of Americans access to safe and secure custodial arrangements for digital assets. For these reasons, please respond to the following questions regarding the impact of SAB 121 on banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions:

(1) Was your agency contacted by the SEC prior to the issuance of SAB 121? If so, please identify the staff members consulted by the SEC and provide copies of written feedback, if any, provided to SEC staff.

(2) Has the SEC indicated that it will modify or withdraw SAB 121 in light of widespread comments that the Bulletin is flawed?

(3) What are the legal and supervisory reasons off-balance sheet treatment of custodial assets has historically been the norm for banks and credit unions?

(4) Has your agency directed banks and other financial institutions within your jurisdiction to comply with the terms of SAB 121 for the purposes of capital adequacy, business plan change approvals, reporting and other supervisory matters? If not, do you plan to do so?

(5) Does SAB 121 conflict with your agency's input regarding the Basel Committee on Bank Supervision's Prudential Treatment for Crypto Asset exposures, in so far as the definition of "digital asset" under SAB 121 also encompasses Group 1a, Group 1b, and Group 2 digital assets under the Prudential Treatment framework?

(6) Do you agree that the capital charge for banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions under SAB 121 is prohibitive?

(7) Do you agree that SAB 121 potentially weakens consumer protection by preventing well-regulated banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions from providing custodial services for digital assets?

We would appreciate a response no later than March 16, 2023. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

SEN. CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS,  
Senate Banking Committee.

REP. PATRICK MCHENRY,  
Chairman, House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter dated April 6, 2023, sent by OCC Acting Comptroller Hsu to Chairman MCHENRY and Senator LUMMIS in response to their March 2, 2023, letter.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER  
OF THE CURRENCY,  
April 6, 2023.

Hon. CYNTHIA LUMMIS,  
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,  
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LUMMIS AND CHAIRMAN MCHENRY: Thank you for your letter dated March 2, 2023, concerning the impact of the

Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin Number 121 (SAB 121) on institutions regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC).

The OCC recognizes that the SEC plays an important role in developing financial reporting standards applicable to publicly listed companies in the United States. Federal law (12 U.S.C.1831n) requires all national banks and federal savings associations to follow reporting standards that are no less stringent than U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), regardless of public listing status. We understand that these institutions, in consultation with their auditors, are analyzing the intersection of SAB 121 and GAAP. The OCC is monitoring these discussions.

Please see responses below to your specific questions.

(1) Was your agency contacted by the SEC prior to the issuance of SAB 121? If so, please identify the staff members consulted by the SEC and provide copies of written feedback, if any, provided to SEC staff.

The SEC did not consult with the OCC prior to the issuance of SAB 121.

(2) Has the SEC indicated that it will modify or withdraw SAB 121 in light of widespread comments that the Bulletin is flawed?

The OCC has not participated in any communications with the SEC in which the SEC indicated it would modify or withdraw SAB 121.

(3) What are the legal and supervisory reasons off-balance sheet treatment of custodial assets has historically been the norm for banks and credit unions?

Section 37(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831n(a)) requires that the Federal banking agencies prescribe accounting principles for regulatory reporting purposes that are no less stringent than U.S. GAAP. Under U.S. GAAP, custodial assets are generally not reported on the bank's balance sheet provided that client assets held in custody are properly segregated and held separately from the bank's assets

(4) Has your agency directed banks and other financial institutions within your jurisdiction to comply with the terms of SAB 121 for the purposes of capital adequacy, business plan change approvals, reporting and other supervisory matters? If not, do you plan to do so?

The OCC worked with the other members of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council to provide regulatory reporting instructions to banks that provide for each bank to determine whether it is appropriate to apply SAB 121 for financial reporting purposes. If a bank determines that it is appropriate to follow SAB for financial reporting purposes, the bank should also prepare its Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income in the same manner.

(5) Does SAB 121 conflict with your agency's input regarding the Basel Committee on Bank Supervision's Prudential Treatment for Crypto Asset exposures, in so far as the definition of "digital asset" under SAB 121 also encompasses Group 1a, Group 1b, and Group 2 digital assets under the Prudential Treatment framework?

The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) defines cryptoassets as "private digital assets that depend on cryptography and distributed ledger technologies (DLT) or similar technologies. Digital assets are a digital representation of value, which can be used for payment or investment purposes or to access a good or service."

While the final BCBS cryptoasset standard applies different capital treatments to Group 1 and Group 2 cryptoasset exposures, the standard states that custodial service activities are not considered "exposures" for the purposes of the standard.

(6) Do you agree that the capital charge for banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions under SAB 121 is prohibitive?

The OCC expects banks to hold capital commensurate with the nature and extent of the risks of their activities. For national trust banks, OCC Bulletin 2007-21, “Supervision of National Trust Banks: Revised Guidance: Capital and Liquidity,” provides that the minimum capital is informed by analysis of quantitative and qualitative factors including, but not limited to, financial projections, fixed and variable expenses, the nature of fiduciary products and services being proposed, and discussions with organizers.

(7) Do you agree that SAB 121 potentially weakens consumer protection by preventing well-regulated banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions from providing custodial services for digital assets?

The OCC will continue to monitor this issue and work to ensure that national banks and federal savings associations operate in a safe and sound manner, provide fair access to financial services, treat customers fairly, and comply with applicable laws and regulations, including consumer protection laws.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me or Carrie Moore, Director, Public Affairs and Congressional Relations.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. HSU,  
*Acting Comptroller of the Currency.*

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a letter dated March 16, 2023, sent by NCUA Chairman Harper in response to Chairman MCHENRY’s and Senator LUMMIS’ March 2, 2023, letter.

NATIONAL CREDIT  
UNION ADMINISTRATION,  
Alexandria, VA, March 16, 2023.

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,  
*Chairman, U.S. House Committee on Financial Services, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCHENRY: Thank you for contacting the National Credit Union Administration about the implementation of Staff Accounting Bulletin 121. The increase in consumers and businesses using digital assets, including cryptocurrency, has impacted the financial services industry, which includes both credit unions and banks. It is therefore important to develop a balanced policy approach to address emerging risks to the safety and soundness of federally insured credit unions.

Your letter requests responses to several questions, which reflect the NCUA’s supervisory role over federally insured credit unions. Our responses follow.

(1) Was your agency contacted by the SEC prior to the issuance of SAB 121? If so, please identify the staff members consulted by the SEC and provide copies of written feedback, if any, provided to SEC staff.

The NCUA was not contacted.

(2) Has the SEC indicated that it will modify or withdraw SAB 121 in light of widespread comments that the Bulletin is flawed?

The NCUA is not aware of the SEC’s intent to modify or withdraw SAB 121.

(3) What are the legal and supervisory reasons off-balance sheet treatment of custodial assets has historically been the norm for banks and credit unions?

The off-balance sheet treatment of custodial assets is rooted in generally accepted accounting principles, or GAAP for short. The GAAP standard evolved from the concept of the principal agent relationship, where the reporting of an asset belonged to the entity that controlled the asset and own-

ership rights were not passed to the custodian. As the custodian did not have ownership rights—that is, the ability to buy, sell, or leverage the asset—the custodian did not report those types of assets in its financial statements. The concept is codified in the Accounting Standards Codification Topic 860 Transfers and Servicing, where “transfers of the custody of financial assets for safe-keeping” is excluded from accounting for transfers and servicing of financial assets.

(4) Has your agency directed banks and other financial institutions within your jurisdiction to comply with the terms of SAB 121 for the purposes of capital adequacy, business plan change approvals, reporting and other supervisory matters? if not, do you plan to do so?

The NCUA has not directed credit unions to comply with SAB 121 for any purpose. SAB 121 is a requirement of public registrants and does not apply to credit unions, which are cooperatively owned by their members.

(5) Does SAB 121 conflict with your agency’s input regarding the Basel Committee on Bank Supervision’s Prudential Treatment for Crypto Asset exposures, in so far as the definition of “digital asset” under SAB 121 also encompasses Group 1a, Group 1b, and Group 2 digital assets under the Prudential Treatment framework?

The NCUA is neither a member of the Basel Committee nor does it provide input on Bank Supervision’s Prudential Treatment for Crypto Asset exposures.

(6) Do you agree that the capital charge for banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions under SAB 121 is prohibitive?

If SAB 121 is eventually applied to non-public entities, it will have implications for assessing the adequacy of an insured credit union’s net worth. If a credit union functions as a digital asset custodian and is required to reflect the digital assets held in custody on its balance sheet, the credit union’s net worth ratio would be negatively impacted as the institution’s assets would increase without a commensurate increase in the net worth.

(7) Do you agree that SAB 121 potentially weakens consumer protection by preventing well-regulated banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions from providing custodial services for digital assets?

Prior to the release of SAB 121, the NCUA issued a Letter to Credit Unions on Relationships with Third Parties that Provide Services to Digital Assets. As stated in that letter, the NCUA would not take exception to credit unions partnering with third parties to make digital asset services available to members. That letter also outlines the NCUA’s expectations that credit unions conduct adequate due diligence and ensure compliance with all applicable laws and regulations when engaging in any such activity. The NCUA is not able to determine the impact of adopting SAB 121 at publicly traded financial institutions that offer custody services of digital assets and cannot make a broad determination of the impact on consumer protection.

Thank you for raising this issue with the NCUA. If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact me or have your staff contact Elizabeth Eurgubian in our Office of External Affairs and Communications.

Sincerely,

TODD M. HARPER,  
*Chairman.*

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been opposed by the Biden administration. Further, this bill is opposed by the fol-

lowing organizations: Americans for Financial Reform, Better Markets, Public Citizen, Consumer Federation of America, United States Public Interest Research Group; New Jersey Citizen Action, Demand Progress, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Texas Appleseed, 20/20 Vision, and Bank of New York Mellon.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of H.J. Res. 109 which would repeal the SEC’s unnecessary regulations on cryptocurrency and the banking industry.

The SEC and its chairman, Gary Gensler, have repeatedly overstepped their authority and targeted cryptocurrencies.

The SEC’s latest unnecessary regulation was implemented outside of the regular rulemaking process and bypassed established procedures, and it shows.

This rule will limit banks’ ability to offer digital assets as part of their custodial services. This makes it more challenging for Americans to safely engage with digital assets under the advisement of their local banks who are able to accurately inform them of risks of investments.

Crypto is a legitimate market used by millions of Americans. Hundreds of thousands of those are in my district. Unfortunately, today they have been referred to as “criminals and drug dealers,” and I take offense to that.

We should be giving investors opportunities to take part in cryptocurrencies, not putting up artificial barriers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and repeal the regulation.

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

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have echoed calls from the crypto industry saying that legislation is needed to provide clarification on how securities laws apply to them, but their actions reveal their true motivation.

They don’t want clarity; they want broad exemption from securities laws.

Let’s look at their actions to date. The first crypto-related bill that Republicans marked up was the FIT 21 Act which they claimed was responsive to the need for clarity on crypto.

The only thing clear about this highly convoluted bill is that it would provide the crypto industry with broad exemptions from current securities.

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

□ 1300

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 14 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman

from California has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my friend and chair of the Digital Assets Subcommittee and the vice-chair of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MCHENRY and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) for this excellent work in this Congressional Review Act resolution to roll back the SEC's failure in their Staff Accounting Bulletin 121.

It would reshape the business of custody in this country. This is not just about crypto. This is a sweeping rule that the SEC has implemented without following the Administrative Procedures Act. The GAO says it is a rule. Well, if it is a rule, it needs to go through the Administrative Procedures Act and have a comment period and get people involved because, as Ranking Member WATERS noted, they did not consult with the banking regulators, who have the primary role of supervising custody in this country.

A custodian is someone who holds your assets for you, whether it is shares of a stock or acres of forest land or a rental house or 10 bitcoin. Holding reserves against the assets in custody is not standard financial services practice.

This staff accounting bulletin is misguided. It requires that money be set aside for that category of assets of digital assets in custody. It is part of a broader attack by the Biden administration to treat digital assets differently from all other assets.

That doesn't make any sense to House Republicans. Under Mr. MCHENRY's leadership and Mr. THOMPSON's leadership of the Ag Committee, we have a fit-for-purpose approach that, in fact, directs the SEC and the CFTC how to handle digital assets.

Unfortunately, this accounting bulletin is in the wrong direction. That is why we have the Congressional Review Act. That is why we are using Article I authority under the Constitution to say this is the wrong direction and that we will all come to this House floor and say it should be repealed and sent back.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my friends on the other side of the aisle, senior Biden official Vice Chairman Barr of the fed, Acting Comptroller Hsu all testified before our committee that they were not consulted by the SEC about this staff accounting bulletin. It is a significant change. It is a rule. It should have gone through the Administrative Procedures Act and be out for public comment.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) for leading the charge on this important resolution, and I urge adoption.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the industry, the custody industry, the big banks that hold these crypto assets simply asked for a little correction, a little clarity, a little information.

The Republicans are taking advantage of this, and this is the first crypto bill that Republicans are bringing to the floor today, and it would do what the majority always attempts to do, and this would actually reverse SEC guidance that provides clarity on accounting standards specifically for crypto assets. Not only that, but it would undermine the SEC's ability to provide clarity on crypto in the future.

That is why the administration sees this bill for what it is and has advised us that they would veto it.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), the chair of the Housing Subcommittee, the vice chair of the Digital Assets Subcommittee, and a longtime leader in digital innovation and digital assets.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this accounting bulletin has proven to be a barrier to publicly traded banks having an ability to meaningfully engage in distributed ledger products due to their overly broad definition of a crypto asset. SAB 121 makes no distinction between asset types in use cases, but, instead, generally states that crypto assets pose certain technological, legal, and regulatory risks, requiring special on-balance-sheet treatment.

All other assets, if you want to make a deposit at a bank, they are glad to hold custody of the assets, but somehow these assets qualify for special treatment.

Normally, if there was on-balance-sheet treatment, it would also just be a clean entry. There wouldn't be a mark to mark it that would require not just a balance sheet treatment that would be appropriate for a custody of a certain kind of asset, but you would have income statement flow throughs and all kinds of other risks.

Why would a bank need to cover extra risk up to 100 percent of the deposit of an asset simply to take custody of the asset? This is a special treatment that applies just to these assets, so applying on-balance-sheet treatment for crypto assets wrongly subjects customer assets to creditors' claims in the event there was a failure of a custodial institution.

In a traditional bankruptcy, assets are accounted for on balance sheet and are subject to creditor claims. Conversely, assets held in custody for customers are accounted for off balance sheet and, thus, are protected from creditor claims in bankruptcy because they remain the assets of the company.

We would see this distinction in a company like Fidelity, where the assets are off balance sheet, versus a company like Silicon Valley Bank when they went bankrupt. The depositors were literally at risk. Why would we change the standard with this out-of-jurisdiction rulemaking by the SEC?

Requiring custody crypto assets to be accounted for on balance sheets risks

losing the bankruptcy protections of custodial services. This is an important distinction from the treatment for a broker-dealer that would be subject to a different form of bankruptcy under the Securities Investor Protection Act. Distributor ledger technology does not change the underlying nature of risk of traditional assets, nor do they present risks that SAB 121 purports to address.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD three letters: A letter dated August 23, 2023, cosigned by Chairman MCHENRY and Representative HILL, sent to the Comptroller General at the Government Accountability Office, urging GAO to complete its assessment on whether the Congressional Review Act applies to SAB 121; a letter dated February 14, 2024, cosigned by the Bank Policy Institute, the American Bankers Association, the Financial Services Forum, and the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, sent to the SEC requesting a meeting with the SEC Chairman, Gary Gensler, urging him to reconsider SAB 121; and, lastly, a bipartisan, bicameral letter dated November 15, 2023, cosigned by five Representatives and two Senators, sent to the Federal Reserve, the OCC, the FDIC, NCUA, urging the agencies to withhold enforcement of SAB 121 in light of GAO's decision.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,  
Washington, DC, August 23, 2023.

Re SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121  
and the Congressional Review Act

Hon. GENE DODARO,  
*Comptroller General of the United States Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.*

DEAR COMPTROLLER DODARO: We write to inquire about the status of the Government Accountability Office (GAO)'s decision regarding the applicability of the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121 (SAB 121). We are concerned that SAB 121 is not guidance but rather should be considered a major action undertaken by the SEC. This letter underscores the request by Senator Lummis expressing her shared concern about the effect of SAB 121. To date, GAO has not rendered a decision.

To underscore Senator Lummis' position, SAB 121 should be construed as a rule for purposes of the CRA. SAB 121 is not an interpretive rule. It is not a general statement of policy. Rather SAB 121 is a major policy change that fundamentally impacts the way customer assets under custody are treated for balance sheet purposes. The Bulletin significantly impacts a number of entities within the SEC's purview but also state and nationally chartered banks and trust companies.

Separately, it is important to note that Congress continues to make progress on legislation establishing a regulatory framework to provide certainty for the digital asset ecosystem. The Committee's work to report out legislation governing both the issuance and use of payment stablecoins as well as the regulation of digital asset intermediaries is consistent with the recommendations made by GAO this past June. This legislative work should not be subverted by unelected bureaucrats through opaque and unaccountable processes such as SAB 121.

We encourage you to protect the prerogatives of the legislative branch by determining SAB 121 as a major rule and subject to the CRA. We appreciate your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

PATRICK McHENRY,  
Chairman, Committee  
on Financial Services.

FRENCH HILL,  
Chairman, Sub-  
committee on Digital  
Assets, Financial  
Technology, and In-  
clusion.

FEBRUARY 14, 2024.

Hon. GARY GENSLER,  
Chair, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR GENSLER: The Bank Policy Institute (“BPI”), the American Bankers Association (“ABA”), the Financial Services Forum (“the Forum”), and the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (“SIFMA”) (collectively, the “Associations”) write to request that the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) consider targeted modifications to Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121 (“SAB 121”) to address recent policy developments and the challenges that SAB 121 has posed for U.S. banking organizations since it was issued on March 31, 2022.

As the two-year anniversary of the issuance of SAB 121 approaches, the Associations believe now would be an appropriate time to examine and discuss the implications of SAB 121 for regulated banking organizations. There have been several relevant developments during this two year period, including the GAO report issued in October, approval of certain Spot Bitcoin ETPs, and the SEC’s proposed rule on Safeguarding Advisory Client Assets that would cover the custody of digital assets if finalized as proposed. The Associations believe that SAB 121 can be modified to mitigate the specific challenges identified herein without undermining the stated policy objectives of the Commission to enhance the information received by investors and other users of financial statements.

The Associations are happy to continue to serve as a resource and work collaboratively with the Commission to provide recommendations that would ensure that investors are provided the requisite disclosures while allowing responsible innovation to occur. The Associations and Commission share the common goals of ensuring the highest levels of investor protection and implementing policies that advance principles of market integrity and financial stability.

We believe the recommendations set forth in this letter are consistent with those principles and would remove unintended barriers for well-regulated U.S. banking organizations to engage in certain activities. Below we describe the drivers behind this request and suggest targeted modifications to SAB 121.

#### I. BACKGROUND

Since SAB 121 was issued in 2022, the Associations have articulated their concerns regarding the Bulletin to the Commission both in writing and in meetings with Commission staff. The foremost concern identified and discussed is how the on-balance sheet requirement of SAB 121 negatively impacts U.S. banking organizations and investors due to the associated prudential implications. The Associations have underscored that on-balance sheet treatment will preclude highly regulated banking organizations from providing a custodial solution for digital assets

at scale. Moreover, the Associations have highlighted that the on-balance sheet requirement, coupled with the overly-broad definition of “crypto-asset” in SAB 121, will have a chilling effect on banking organizations’ ability to develop responsible use cases for distributed ledger technology (DLT) more broadly.

U.S. banking organizations’ experience over the past two years has confirmed that SAB 121 has curbed the ability of the Associations’ members to develop and bring to market at scale certain digital asset products and services. In comparison, in-scope entities of SAB 121 other than U.S. banking organizations have not suffered the same effects. For example, digital asset custodial services are currently offered by various non-banking organizations, thereby keeping activity outside the prudential perimeter and avoiding the necessary oversight by regulators. Indeed, if regulated banking organizations are effectively precluded from providing digital asset safeguarding services at scale, investors and customers, and ultimately the financial system, will be worse off, with the market limited to custody providers that do not afford their customers the legal and supervisory protections provided by federally-regulated banking organizations. The Associations continue to urge the Commission to work with industry to adopt solutions that could mitigate the described challenges.

#### II. CONCRETE EXAMPLES OF THE IMPACT OF SAB 121 ON U.S. BANKING ORGANIZATIONS

The Associations highlight two specific examples of the negative impact of SAB 121 on banking organizations, investors, and the financial ecosystem:

(1) Spot Bitcoin ETPs: The Commission recently approved 11 Spot Bitcoin ETPs, allowing investors access to this asset class through a regulated product. However, notably absent from those approved products are banking organizations serving as the asset custodian, a role they regularly play for most other ETPs. These ETPs have already experienced billions of dollars in inflows, but it is practically impossible for banks to serve as custodian for those ETPs at scale due to the Tier 1 capital ratio and other reserve and capital requirements that result from SAB 121. This raises important questions about the safety and stability of this ecosystem. We believe that this result could raise concentration risk, as one nonbank entity now serves as the custodian for the majority of these ETPs. That risk can be mitigated if prudentially regulated banking organizations have the same ability to provide custodial services for Commission regulated ETPs as qualified nonbank asset custodians. SAB 121 does not appear to contemplate this type of concentration risk, in part perhaps because Spot Bitcoin ETPs or similar products were not an approved product at the time SAB 121 was issued.

(2) Use of DLT to record traditional financial assets: Banking organizations are increasingly exploring the use of DLT to record traditional financial assets, such as bonds. The use of DLT has the potential to expedite and automate payment, clearing, reconciliation and settlement services, and multiple central banks outside the United States are partnering with banks to explore the adoption of DLT. However, SAB 121 has proven to be a barrier to banking organizations’ ability to meaningfully engage in DLT-based projects due to the breadth of the definition of “crypto-asset” in SAB 121: “a digital asset that is issued and/or transferred using distributed ledger or blockchain technology using cryptographic techniques.” Under this definition, a traditional financial asset issued or transferred using DLT could

be considered a “crypto asset” and thus within scope of SAB 121, regardless of the applicable risks. SAB 121 makes no distinction between asset types and use cases, but instead generally states that crypto-assets pose certain technological, legal, and regulatory risks requiring on-balance sheet treatment. However, there are significant differences between a cryptocurrency like Bitcoin that exists on a public, permissionless network versus a traditional financial instrument that is recorded on a blockchain network where access is controlled and transactions can be cancelled, corrected, or amended. The past two years have underscored these differences, as the turmoil in the crypto market has been wholly unrelated to banks’ use of permissioned DLT. DLT does not change the underlying nature or risks of traditional assets, nor do they present the risks SAB 121 purports to address, and thus SAB 121’s application to those assets should be reconsidered. Clear indication from the Commission that the use of DLT to record or transfer traditional financial assets is consistently outside the scope of SAB 121 would alleviate associated challenges.

#### III. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

The Associations request that the Commission consider the following targeted modifications to SAB 121 to address the above concerns:

Narrow the definition of “crypto-assets” to clarify and confirm the exclusion of certain asset types and use cases. SAB 121 is premised on the risks posed exclusively by cryptocurrencies, and traditional financial assets recorded or transferred using blockchain networks should be excluded because they do not present the same risks as cryptocurrencies; the use of DLT does not change the underlying nature or risk of traditional assets. Moreover, certain exclusions for products wherein the underlying activity relates to the offering of a Commission-approved product should be clarified.

Exempt banking organizations from on-balance sheet treatment but maintain the disclosure requirements: As described previously, SAB 121 answers three questions, and the Associations’ and its members’ are primarily concerned with the first question: how an entity should account for its obligations to safeguard crypto-assets (the on-balance sheet treatment). We do not object to the requirements imposed in the answer to the second question (disclosures in financial statements). Exempting banking organizations from the on-balance sheet treatment but requiring them to make certain disclosures about their digital activity would mitigate the concerns raised by banking organizations without undermining the goal of SAB 121 to promote disclosures to investors. Balance sheet disclosure may be appropriate where the controls are not adequate to protect investors from the risk of custodied assets, which is not the case for banking organizations that are subject to robust oversight from the federal banking agencies. The required disclosures in the answer to the second question are broad and may include disclosures in the description of business, risk factors, and management’s discussion and analysis of financial condition and results of operation, and such information will still “enhance the information received by investors and other users of financial statements about these risks, thereby assisting them in making investment and other capital allocation decisions.”

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The Associations and their members appreciate your attention to the issues raised in this letter. Given the upcoming two-year anniversary of the issuance of SAB 121, certain

policy developments, the experience of U.S. banking organizations, and the evolution in technology since the guidance was first issued, we believe it is an appropriate time to reflect on the intended goals of SAB 121. We request a meeting with you and Commission staff to discuss the issues and proposed modifications set forth above.

We appreciate the Commission's attention to this important topic and look forward to engaging with you further. If you have any questions, please contact Paige Pidano Paridon.

Respectfully submitted,

*Bank Policy Institute,  
American Bankers  
Association,  
Financial Services Forum,  
Securities Industry and  
Financial Markets  
Association.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, November 15, 2023.

Hon. MARTIN GRUENBERG,  
*Chairman of the Board, Federal Deposit Insurance Commission, Washington, DC.*

Hon. MICHAEL BARR,  
*Vice Chair for Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC.*

Hon. MICHAEL HSU,  
*Acting Comptroller of the Currency, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, DC.*

Hon. TODD HARPER,  
*Chairman of the Board, National Credit Union Administration, Alexandria, VA.*

DEAR VICE CHAIR BARR, CHAIRMAN GRUENBERG, CHAIRMAN HARPER, AND ACTING COMPTROLLER HSU: We write regarding Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 ("SAB 121") published on April 11, 2022.

Last month, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a legal decision that SAB 121 is a rule for purposes of the Congressional Review Act. SAB 121 was issued without consultation with any of your respective agencies and would require custodians to recognize a liability and a corresponding offset on their balance sheets, measured at the fair value of the customer custodial digital assets. This accounting approach, which deviates from established accounting standards, would not accurately reflect the underlying legal and economic obligations of the custodian, and places consumers at greater risk of loss.

In its decision, GAO stated that "it is reasonable to believe that companies may change their behavior to comply with the staff interpretations found in the Bulletin" due to the SEC's responsibility and authority in monitoring public disclosures and pursuing enforcement actions against non-compliant entities.

SAB 121 meets the definition of a rule under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), and was never submitted to Congress or the GAO, nor was it subsequently published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD consistent with the requirements of the Congressional Review Act. Given that the SEC failed to meet these obligations, SAB 121 should have no legal effect and the Federal banking agencies and National Credit Union Administration should not require banks, credit unions and other financial institutions that provide custody services for digital assets to comply. This means that such entities need not recognize a liability and a corresponding asset offset on their balance sheets.

Enforcing this noncompliant rule would set a concerning precedent that would facilitate regulatory gamesmanship to cir-

cumvent the APA, effectively allowing the SEC to have regulatory authority over institutions which Congress did not authorize.

We therefore ask you to clarify, through guidance or other action, that SAB 121 is not enforceable in light of the recent GAO determination. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MCHENRY,  
*Member of Congress.*  
FRENCH HILL,  
*Member of Congress.*  
RITCHIE TORRES,  
*Member of Congress.*  
WILEY NICKEL,  
*Member of Congress.*  
CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS,  
*United States Senator.*  
KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND,  
*United States Senator.*  
MIKE FLOOD,  
*Member of Congress.*

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the sponsor of this bill, Mr. FLOOD, has asked what the alternative to this CRA resolution would be, and that answer is very simple: Draft a bill that narrowly addresses the current question about how this guidance applies to banks. The use of a CRA is dangerous and reckless.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, my friend says dangerous and reckless. Well, Democrats used the Congressional Review Act process just like Republicans have used the Congressional Review Act process. This is not reckless or dangerous. It is law, and we are trying to be a check and balance on overreach of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD), an esteemed member of the Financial Services Committee and Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 109. I don't want to be redundant on some of these points, but the SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 is a radical departure from how custodians account for all other assets. By requiring custodians to treat digital assets as both an asset and a liability on their balance sheets, SAB 121 makes it nearly impossible for banks to provide custody services for digital assets due to the prudential requirements that it would trigger.

Innovations like the tokenization of assets have the potential to dramatically improve our financial infrastructure, and tokenization will allow new innovations and traditionally illiquid assets to become available to more people more efficiently, like commercial bank deposits, government corporate bonds, money market fund shares, real estate, gold, and other commodities.

However, for tokenization to take hold, it is important for regulated financial institutions to be custodians in order to identify the entitlement holder and to mitigate any single point of failure in the record of the ownership.

Mr. Speaker, this misguided action from the SEC should be struck down, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for this resolution.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. NICKEL), my good friend and colleague, and a great leader in digital assets.

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan resolution I am leading with my colleague across the aisle, Congressman MIKE FLOOD.

Mr. Speaker, our Congressional Review Act resolution to disapprove of the SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 protects consumers, reinforces Congress' role in the rulemaking process, and pushes back on the SEC's hostility toward digital assets.

Mr. Speaker, SAB 121 makes the digital assets industry less safe for consumers. It prevents well-regulated banks from safeguarding digital assets that are owned by their clients. SAB 121 requires banks to place custody of digital assets on their balance sheets, contrary to how traditional assets are treated. This makes it nearly impossible for a bank to provide custody of digital assets at scale, leaving investors to rely on riskier, unregulated options.

Mr. Speaker, whether you love crypto or you hate it, you should want the most heavily supervised financial institutions who are experts at custodial banking to safeguard digital assets. We are also seeing this issue with SAB 121 play out in real time, the SEC's recent approval of spot bitcoin ETPs, which I pushed for, allows retail investors access to this asset class through a regulated product. However, most bitcoin ETPs are held by the same nonbank custodian. Notably, banks aren't serving as custodians for any of these products as they would with a traditional ETP. This could pose a risk to the safety and soundness of the financial system, a concentration of risk issue, for sure.

To make matters worse, Gary Gensler and the SEC deliberately sidestepped the customary regulatory process, amounting to an obvious overstep of the agency's authority.

Last October, the Government Accountability Office concluded that the SEC breached statutory rulemaking requirements by issuing SAB 121 as guidance rather than a rule, avoiding the notice and comment period. SABs are meant to serve as tools to interpret existing policies, not create brand-new policy like SAB 121.

Additionally, the SEC issued the rule without conferring with banking regulators, which is unacceptable given the SEC's lack of prudential authority over banking institutions. It is time for Congress to take action and conduct oversight of the SEC's missteps. We shouldn't have to resort to using a CRA to fix this issue, and Gary Gensler could re-issue this accounting bulletin

and work with stakeholders to find a solution, but, unfortunately, this is the only tool that we have left.

As with previously successful CRAs, the SEC will be able to re-issue its rule as long as it has made changes responding to statements made by Members in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support our bipartisan CRA of SAB 121, which will protect investors and the financial system, encourage innovation, bolster American competitiveness, and restore Congress' role in administrative rulemaking.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. DAVIDSON entered a letter into the RECORD from several bank trades. What he did not mention was that the banks only asked for target modifications when they wrote about this legislation. In fact, in that letter, they supported the transparency requirements this resolution would repeal.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to see this bill for what it is. It is a giveaway to one powerful special interest group in an effort to weaken the SEC, a crucial agency that protects investors and the functioning of our capital markets. This is the agency that is working to protect the retirement savings of millions of Americans. This is the agency that is crucial to making our capital markets the envy of the world. This is the agency at the forefront of ensuring that innovation, like in crypto, is done responsibly and in accordance with existing security laws. We simply cannot afford to weaken the SEC.

□ 1315

Moreover, this resolution harms investors by eliminating much-needed transparency on volatile crypto assets, making it harder for them to make informed investment decisions. It also harms crypto users because transparency also deters fraud and other mismanagement of assets that can lead to devastating losses for consumers.

Additionally, the resolution increases the likelihood of market volatility because a lack of transparency can result in more unexpected failures of crypto-related companies.

Finally, this resolution harms all public companies who benefit from the SEC's practice of providing timely guidance through Staff Accounting Bulletins.

If the Republicans would like to address the issue raised by large custody

banks, they should do that, but there is no need to cause broader harm to the SEC and all of the people and companies that rely on it to maintain safety and stability.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States would not be giving us this information this early about vetoing unless they saw this as a serious issue that must be dealt with right here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a May 7, 2024, letter from the American Bankers Association, Bank Policy Institute, the Financial Services Forum, and the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association supporting H.J. Res. 109.

MAY 7, 2024.

Re 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" (H.J. Res. 109)

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,  
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: The American Bankers Association, Bank Policy Institute, Financial Services Forum, and Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (Associations) write to express our support for H.J. Res. 109, the Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval for the Securities and Exchange Commission's "Staff Accounting Bulletin 121." H.J. Res. 109 was introduced by Reps. Mike Flood (R-NE) and Wiley Nickel (D-NC) and favorably reported by a bipartisan vote from the Financial Services Committee on February 29. The measure is scheduled for consideration by the House this week.

In March 2022, the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Office of the Chief Accountant released Staff Accounting Bulletin (SAB) 121, without consulting the prudential regulators or soliciting public comment, to address perceived risks to publicly traded companies that safeguard digital assets for their customers. Under SAB 121, an entity responsible for safeguarding digital assets for platform users must measure safeguarding assets and obligations on its balance sheet at the fair value of the related assets, which is a departure from accounting standards and the historical practice of treating custodial assets as off-balance sheet. As this effectively treats the custodied assets as those owned by a bank, SAB 121 effectively precludes banks from offering digital asset custody at scale since placing the value of client assets on their balance sheets will impact certain capital, liquidity, and other prudential requirements. Furthermore, SAB 121 undercuts the ability of banks to develop responsible use cases for distributed ledger technology (DLT) and encumbers regulated broker-dealers from custody services as a result of the net capital rule (Rule 15c3-1), which treats the on-balance sheet items as non-allowable assets.

On February 14, 2024, the Associations sent a joint letter to the SEC noting that over the past two years SAB 121 has curbed the ability of our member banks to develop and bring to market at scale certain digital asset products and services. This includes spot

bitcoin exchange traded products (recently approved by the Commission for investors) and the use of DLT to record traditional financial assets (i.e. tokenization).

SAB 121 represents a significant departure from longstanding accounting treatment for custodial assets and threatens the industry's ability to provide its customers with safe and sound custody of digital assets. Other, non-bank digital asset platforms subject to SAB 121 are not required to meet the same capital, liquidity, or other prudential standards as banks and therefore do not face the economically prohibitive implications of SAB 121. Limiting banks' ability to offer these services leaves customers with few well-regulated, trusted options for safeguarding their digital asset portfolios and ultimately exposes them to increased risk.

The Associations respectfully request that Members of the House vote in favor of H. J. Res. 109.

Sincerely,

*American Bankers Association,  
Bank Policy Institute,  
Financial Services Forum,  
Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.*

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

Mr. Speaker, the administration's approach to digital assets doesn't make a lot of sense.

The President has an executive order outlining work products that he wants from agencies. On one hand, they say we want to bring digital assets into regulated finance, and we need clear rules of the road.

On the other hand, the administration's appointees at the Securities and Exchange Commission have done everything they can to undermine that level of clarity, that is number one; number two, issuing guidance that undermines whatever the current clarity is and diminishing that; number three, thereby diminishing consumer protection.

It is a nonsensical approach. So the administration says they want to veto this resolution. Yet they have a whole workstream the President issued without any forcing mechanism and executive order asking for a regulated stable coin, which we have passed out of the House Financial Services Committee with bipartisan votes.

They have asked for a market regulation to give clarity of what is a digital asset, and a means of exchange so American consumers can participate in this innovation that is the basis of the new generation of internet technology that the globe is using and America is behind.

I think it is important that we engage, as best we can, whether it is with the stable coin bill that we passed out of committee—the market regulation bill we passed out of committee—that it brings that clarity the President's executive order asked for, and takes this first step to provide consumer protection so that their financial assets are protected.

If the firm goes bankrupt, they want to know they can get their asset back. Passing this repeal is the first step in that process.

This is very important for consumer protection. If you support consumer protection vote “yes” on this resolution. If you support safety and soundness for financial institutions vote “yes.” If you support reigning in rogue regulators vote “yes.” This should be a wide bipartisan vote and a statement that the House supports digital assets, digital innovation, and thoughtful policymaking from our regulators and regulated finance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution. I also thank my colleagues on the Democrat side, Mr. NICKEL, and on the Republican side, Mr. FLOOD, for their thoughtful approach to policymaking, and digital assets generally, but on developing this Congressional Review Act proposal, in particular.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. 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.

#### MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1194, 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 1194, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 118-416 is 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.—  
 “(I) 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 30

minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2925.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAUBER. 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 court’s decision revoking an approved mine plan for the Rosemont Copper Mine project in Arizona.

This determination commonly called the Rosemont decision upended decades of regulatory precedent and specific U.S. Forest Service regulations that allow approvals of operation on or off a mining claim so long as these operations meet environmental and regulatory standards.

Essentially, this court’s ruling puts the cart before the horse and fails to reflect the process of how a company actually develops a mine. I think there is some confusion about the mine approval process and what the term “valid” claim means.

First, when looking to develop a mine, an operator must submit something called a Mine Plan of Operations to the United States Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management. This plan must include the intended uses of the surface of the mining claim, including those for waste rock placements, mills, offices, and roads.

The Mine 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.

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.

Remember, a mine cannot move forward if the Federal Government does not approve any facet of the Mine Plan of Operations. Further, mineral validity cannot be determined until after the economic viability of a site—as is laid out in the Mine Plan of Operations—is verified by the Federal Government, as well.

H.R. 2925, Mr. Speaker, would reverse this backward determination of the court, allowing American mining to resume on Federal lands. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, 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 in strong opposition to H.R. 2925, and I will remind my friends across the aisle that mining is already happening on American lands and on our public lands.

However, this week, instead of working on meaningful legislation on behalf of the American people, our friends have opted instead to focus on a toxic free-for-all on our public lands and have opted to focus on legislation to rollback energy efficiency in home appliances.

In fact, they put forward a bill this week called Hands Off Our Home Appliances because they are so concerned about the American people that they want to regulate the efficiency of their toasters, their dishwashers, their refrigerators, and undermine the ability of our immigrant and our Hispano communities to have representation in the United States Census and, yes, to allow a free-for-all on our public lands.

Now, the American people are not asking us to do this. They are asking us to work on real problems: to work on the economy, inflation, helping families put food on the table and a roof over their head, protecting our reproductive rights and access to the ballot box, protecting our democracy, and dealing with the international crises that are happening on multiple continents.

My question is: Why the heck are we back on the House floor one week after we voted, on a bipartisan basis, to send this bad bill back to committee when it couldn't even be supported on the floor once?

Yet here we are, and our friends are trying to pass it once again, without revision, without changes because they think they found a few extra spare votes.

Let's talk about mining laws. The existing mining law of 1872 already gives our mining companies, including foreign-owned companies, the right to extract on our publicly-owned lands. They can also do so without having to pay even one cent in royalties. That includes companies that are controlled by governments of adversarial nations.

This is not only a shameful giveaway, but a huge national security vulnerability for the United States. This bill is not about clarifying a court decision, it is about giving more minerals away to those who would like unfettered access to our public lands. It would give opportunities for multinational corporations and adversarial nations to control even more of our resources without having to pay royalties to the U.S. Government, and to tie up claims on our public lands, whether or not there are minerals actually present there.

This would make it impossible to invalidate a mining claim, even if their real intent was other things, maybe to lock up development on other uses or buying them for other uses, including construction of transmission lines or other things that they would want to do.

This should be of deep concern to anyone who does not want adversarial nations or the companies that operate in them to control our public lands or minerals.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue that it is either mine here or mine abroad and create a false equivalency, but it is not that simple. Some of the countries that are trying to expand their mining operations here in the United States, in fact, many of these multinational corporations are owned as subsidiaries under countries like China and other countries that we have adversarial relationships with.

□ 1330

They also engage in practices that we know cause human rights abuses, things like slave labor elsewhere in the world. While my friends across the aisle have tried to claim that this is really about mining on American lands, it is about granting unfettered access to these corporations.

In fact, these entities can ship the minerals that they take from American lands anywhere in the world and smelt those materials on the cheap, often relying on human rights abuses abroad to cut costs.

As I said, we already had this debate last week. The outcome was the entire House, right here on this floor, voted to send this toxic bill back to the Natural Resources Committee. In fact, that hasn't happened in years because this bill was so flawed and such a give-away to foreign national owned companies and a threat to our national security that it was agreed that it wasn't ready for prime time and shouldn't be passed on the floor.

My colleague from New Mexico, Representative TERESA LEGER FERNANDEZ, offered to send the bill back to committee so that we could discuss amending the bill to ban these adversarial corporations operating in adversarial nations from mining and locking up our public lands.

I have to say, I was heartened. We had six Republicans join the Democrats to do just that. They said they were not going to vote for that bill. Well, it was about time. We need some bipartisan support to double down on protecting U.S. interests.

In fact, as I said, it has been decades since the House sent a bill back to committee like that, but as we see today, here we are. Republican leadership is trying once again to get the bill passed through brute force without addressing serious concerns, without sending it back to committee, without going through due process. Here we are, debating it and about to take a vote again.

These concerns aren't new. Last year, the bill was included in H.R. 1. At that time, one of my Republican colleagues offered a very similar amendment banning mining on our public lands by foreign companies with records of human rights violations. We are literally talking about companies that have child slave labor records. That amendment passed through committee on a bipartisan basis, yet they stripped it out and are trying to pass the bill without it here today on the floor.

I find it absolutely jaw-dropping and extremely telling that this was the amendment that was stripped out of the bill and that we are back here a week later after this bill failed on the floor.

I think it is very clear what is going on here. This is really about advancing the interests of corporations, interests on our public lands, and opening them up for exploitation.

I think it is important that we talk about how outrageous this is. We have to ensure that our public lands are not open to our adversaries, to these multinational corporations that will exploit our minerals for free. We need some bipartisan action to make sure that that cannot happen.

We should be back in committee discussing the vulnerabilities, discussing the national security implications, discussing American competitiveness, discussing energy policy, not trying to jam through a bill that will violate human rights and international trade.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I want to be very clear: This bill will not allow mining companies to do whatever they want on public land. That is a fact.

Mining activity will not occur if any facet of a mine plan of operations has not passed our strict Federal guidelines and our strict environmental guidelines.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act, offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI).

H.R. 2925 would resolve harmful permitting uncertainty and litigation delays caused by a harmful 2019 rogue court decision known as the Rosemont decision. This decision revoked a previously approved mine plan in my great State of Arizona, ignoring 40 years of Federal permitting and land management regulations.

The uncertainty caused by Rosemont threatens to add years of delays to any proposed mining project on Federal lands in the United States.

Congress should act to remedy the fallout created by Rosemont and must work to expedite mine permitting and build up domestic mineral supply chains.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill that will provide much-needed certainty for domestic mining projects.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, we have heard repeatedly from across the aisle that mining pollution is a thing of the past, that today's modern mining industry operates under the highest environmental standards, and that after the mining operations stop, the industry cleans up after itself. If that sounds too good to be true, it is because it is.

Our current regulations require companies to post financial assurances to cover the cost of cleanup after their mining operations stop, but it is not enough. Dangerous pollution still happens far too often. Depending on the mine type and location, between 74 and 82 percent of modern-day mines are polluting beyond what their permits allow.

The kicker? Taxpayers pay domestic and foreign mining companies for their subsidies and often the entire cost of cleanup. Given the \$54 billion backlog to clean up mines abandoned before our current reclamation regulations, which continue to pollute our lands, waters, and communities, the American taxpayer literally cannot afford new mining pollution.

That is why I filed an amendment to this bill to improve bonding requirements and make mining companies keep up with the new mining rush that this bill would enable.

This is a commonsense amendment. If we are going to allow a toxic mining free-for-all, we should at least make sure that taxpayers are not footing the bill. After all, this bill opens up our lands to our foreign adversaries, and I don't expect them to clean up after themselves out of the goodness of their hearts.

My amendment would make sure operators post financial assurances to fully cover reclamation of all mining activities. It would correct for inconsistencies in both BLM and Forest Service regulations and codify those corrections into law. It would have made sure these financial assurances were real money, like surety bonds, irrevocable letters of credit, certificates of deposit, or cash, not insurance policies that lapse if the mining company goes bankrupt.

It is time we hold industry accountable and make sure they cannot pass on the costs of cleaning up after themselves, the costs of their earning profits, to the American people.

Guess what? The Republican majority refused to even consider my amendment. They blocked it from getting a debate on the House floor and even from getting a simple up-or-down vote.

It is outrageous, and it paints a dark picture of the House Republican's priorities: polluters over people, and China over the American taxpayer.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), my good friend, for his words of support for this legislation.

Again, this legislation would correct a misguided court decision revoking an approved mine for the Rosemont Copper Mine Project in Arizona.

Arizona produced the second-most amount of minerals in the United States in 2023. It also has over 30 million acres of Federal lands. If the Rosemont decision stands, over 40 percent of Arizona's lands will be taken offline in the U.S. in the battle to produce enough minerals to meet our ever-growing needs.

As a member of the Natural Resources Committee, the Democrats brought an expert forward, Madam Speaker, an anti-mining expert. In fact, she said we have to stop hard-rock mining because the reclamation process doesn't work. I invited her to our great State of Minnesota to show her a reclaimed mine where we have deer hunting, bears, eagles, bees, birds, haymaking. We have drinking water that comes from mines that are not in operation. We have recreation in our mines in Minnesota and elsewhere in this country.

This hard-rock mining expert said it is too dry in Arizona and too wet in Minnesota to mine. I asked where she would like us to mine these minerals for our national security. She said the quiet part out loud. She said nowhere. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to allow mining to happen in this country.

The Communist country of China was just mentioned. This administration today, Madam Speaker, is in consultation with Congo, where 15 of the 19 industrial mines use child slave labor owned by the Chinese Communist country.

The Biden administration is entering into memorandums of understanding to have critical minerals mined by child slave labor in Congo, where there are zero environmental standards and zero labor standards, to meet their green agenda, Madam Speaker. They are okay with that but will not allow mining to happen in this country that follows our environmental and labor standards.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, I live in the heart of mining country, and the best water in Minnesota is in the heart of mining country. We can drink it right out of the ground in Buhl, Minnesota.

I can tell you that this country better take part in mining domestically. Otherwise, we are going to find ourselves, Madam Speaker, in deep, deep trouble.

The Department of Energy and the Department of Defense say we need more domestic mining. We cannot rely on China and other adversarial nations. This is a simple fix.

We believe the court erred, so it is our job to re-legislate this part of mining that is so important to the United

States of America. It is so important to our communities where we are blessed to have these natural resources.

For my good friends and colleagues from California, let's go back many years. California started on a gold rush. It began because of mining. Safe to say, we don't want to follow California much longer, with what is happening in that great State.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, I believe this is going to pass in a bipartisan fashion. It is a good piece of legislation. I look forward to passing it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Madam Speaker, yes, California is a great State.

Madam Speaker, six Republicans joined Democrats in voting to stop this bill and send it back to committee, something that hasn't happened in 32 years. Of the Republicans who voted to send the bill back to committee, one had an amendment to say that if a company is guilty of human rights abuses, including slave labor in other countries, than they are not welcome to our land and minerals for free.

By the time the bill came to the House floor last week, Republican leaders had stripped the amendment right out. I guess Republicans want to take the win on supporting drug cartels and child sex traffickers, groups that benefit from human rights violations.

In addition, the Republican chair of the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party also filed an amendment to close the loophole. That one was blocked twice by Republican leaders.

Republicans have voted to keep foreign adversaries from accessing our oil and gas. How are our minerals different? Insert side eye here because it doesn't add up.

Pardon my skepticism that there is not bipartisan concern here. This bill is a toxic national security giveaway to our foreign adversaries. It undercuts our competitiveness, and it is unconscionable on human rights. That is why we are seeing some Republicans buck their party on it, and I hope they will stand strong.

□ 1345

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert my side eye, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The disastrous results of the Rosemont decision will redirect the huge amounts of capital needed to mine domestically to countries like the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Indonesia.

When we choose this out-of-sight, out-of-mind mentality approach to

mining, development flows to other nations with significantly lower environmental and labor standards. Indonesia, for example, is currently the world's largest nickel producer and its dominance is only expected to grow in the coming years.

Indonesian mining is accomplished with sweeping deforestation and pollution, many of which are financed, again, by the Chinese Communist Party. These operations consistently ignore environmental impacts on local communities and leave the land far worse off than they found it.

On the other hand, American mines, like this mine project in Nevada, adhere to the best standards in the world and are committed to restoring the land after minerals are extracted.

In fact, again, mines are not even permitted until the Federal Government approves a full Mine Plan of Operations, which must include a robust plan and financial assurance for reclamation after the project is complete.

Madam Speaker, this is simple. Either we do it here or we let foreign adversarial nations take over. This is a strategic national security interest.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, last week, House Republicans tried to pass H.R. 2925 to make it easier for the biggest mining corporations to take our public lands and mineral resources without giving the American people a dime.

I filed a motion to send the bill back to the committee to consider my amendment, which would have prevented companies owned or controlled by our adversaries from taking our gold, copper, and precious rare earth minerals to use against us in the market or in national security.

Fortunately, last week, a bipartisan majority, including six Republicans, passed my motion. We stood up together for our national security. However, the Republican leadership ignored last week's bipartisan vote, and here we are again.

What is worse, the Rules Committee Republicans rejected Chairman MOOLENAAR's amendment to ban foreign entities of concern from conducting mining operations on our public lands.

Let me remind everybody, Chairman MOOLENAAR heads the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party. It is his job to know how dangerous China's mining of our precious minerals is to our economy and national security.

The Republicans blocked their own Republican chair's amendment. I believe in bipartisanship, so when I see an amendment I like and recognize is good, I support it.

Madam Speaker, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit

this bill back to committee once again. If House rules permitted, I would offer the motion with Chairman MOOLENAAR's amendment, which would block foreign entities of concern from mining our public lands.

When Republicans block even consideration of an amendment which would ban China from taking away the precious metals that belong to the American people, Republicans are putting the interests of wealthy foreign corporations over the American people.

I hope the six Republicans who were courageous enough to stand up for American security interests last week stand for America today.

Madam 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 (Mrs. BICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I urge support for my motion so that the Natural Resources Committee can consider this amendment, this time in good faith.

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

Federal lands account for as much as 86 percent of the land area in certain Western States, and these same States account for 75 percent of our Nation's metals production.

The Mining Regulatory Clarity Act is needed to ensure that we have certainty of access to these essential mineral deposits.

If we want to encourage investment in safe, responsible, clean mining practices that provide billions in taxes that support our roads, bridges, schools, and other essential services, along with the essential materials to the American people, then we also need to support H.R. 2925.

Madam Speaker, really quick, you are hearing the other side of the aisle not necessarily debate the actual legislation. We have heard them talk about the process. When you can't debate the legislation, then you go after the process.

This is a very, very good piece of legislation, and I look forward to it passing in just the next hour or so.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2925, which rolls out the welcome mat to our foreign adversaries to exploit our minerals and violate human rights as well as national security.

We must defeat this bill. We did last week. We debated the merits. It is bad for America. It is bad for national security. It is bad for our economy. It is bad for American mining. It is bad for the environment, and that is why we must send it back.

Madam Speaker, I support the gentlewoman's motion to recommit. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let's be clear: There are no mines operating on Federal lands that are owned by the Chinese Communist Party. Zero. Zero. Anybody that mines in the United States will follow our environmental standards and our labor standards. It doesn't matter which company it is. They are going to follow our rules.

For this administration to turn a blind eye to the atrocities and the human rights violations to meet their green agenda, it is unconscionable. We can do it here in the United States with the best labor standards, the best environmental standards, with our technology, and be proud of these minerals that we produce. We can lead the rest of the world on how to do it. Nobody does it better than the United States of America and our workers, period.

Madam Speaker, let me address some of the misinformation we have heard about this bill. This bill does not allow mining companies to continue to operate under conditions that don't follow our labor and environmental standards.

If the outlandish circumstances that my friends on the other side of the aisle have been telling you will happen if this bill is enacted could have actually happened all along, including land lock-ups and subversion of environmental and governmental oversight, then why didn't it happen?

It is because the harm they claim this bill could inflict upon our Federal lands is actually not true. It is inaccurate.

This bill would, however, allow America to become a global leader in mineral production once again.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Governor of Nevada in support of H.R. 2925.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
May 1, 2024.

Hon. DINA TITUS,  
*House of Representatives*,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. STEVEN HORSFORD,  
*House of Representatives*,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. SUSIE LEE,  
*House of Representatives*,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES TITUS, HORSFORD, AND LEE: I write in support of the Congressman Amodei's Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024 (H.R. 2925) and encourage you to vote in favor of this critical bill when it reaches the House floor. In doing so you will stand in solidarity with Senator Cortez Masto and Senator Rosen, sponsors of the Senate companion bill (S. 1281), and the State of Nevada to support a key pillar of our economy. Since the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals issued its decision in *Center for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service*, also known as the Rosemont decision, the future of hardrock mining in Nevada and the West has been plagued by uncertainty. This matter must be favorably resolved for the Silver State and bipartisan, bicameral legislation must be signed by the

President to help ensure the economic viability of our robust mining industry.

The Mining Regulatory Clarity Act (MRCA) simply reinstates the contemporary mining policy and permitting practices that were upended by the Rosemont decision. Contrary to the scare tactics of critics, the MRCA does not open the door to unrestricted use of public lands, block renewable energy, recreation, or conservation, or allow mining in National Parks, wilderness areas, and other special areas. Rather, it provides much-needed business certainty and protects the 14,700 direct high-paying jobs and an additional 20,000 indirect jobs that are supported by the mining industry in the state. In addition to providing employment with high, family supporting salaries averaging over \$100,000, the industry provides \$4.9 billion of our state's gross domestic product and \$12.7 billion in economic output.

Schools and local governments in each of your districts also benefit from the \$389 million the industry paid in state and local taxes. More than half of the mining Net Proceeds of Minerals (NPOM) tax revenue goes to the Nevada State Education Fund. The other half goes to the county where the minerals were produced. Gold and silver operators further contribute to the State Education Fund through the Gold and Silver Excise Tax, or Mining Education Tax which was established during the 81st Nevada Legislative Session; and in fiscal year 2023, contributed approximately \$68 million to the State. Beginning in fiscal year 2024, revenue from the Mining Education Tax will go directly into the State Education Fund. The Rosemont decision ends hardrock mining as we know it and threatens the livelihoods and institutions that rely on it.

Nevada is counting on you to unite and join Senators Cortez Masto and Rosen and Congressman Amodei to provide certainty to one of Nevada's critical industries. I look forward to continuing to work collaboratively to ensure Nevada remains well positioned as a leader in domestic mineral production, from lithium and other critical materials to precious metals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JOE LOMBARDO,  
Governor.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I support fair labor standards, high environmental standards, and increasing our national security. In short, I support domestic mining. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same and support H.R. 2925.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, 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. Madam 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. FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.

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) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A claimant shall be barred from the right described in subsection (e)(1)(B) if the claimant—

“(A) is a foreign entity of concern; or

“(B) is a subsidiary of a foreign entity of concern.

##### “(2) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In this subsection, the term ‘foreign entity of concern’ has the meaning given the term in section 40207(a)(5) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 18741(a)(5)).

“(B) CLARIFICATION.—In this subsection, a foreign entity of concern is subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a government of a foreign country that is a covered nation (as that term is defined in section 2533c(d) of title 10, United States Code) within the meaning of section 40207(a)(5)(C) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 18741(a)(5)) if such entity is more than 10 percent owned, directed, controlled, financed, directly or indirectly, individually or in aggregate, by any individual that is the citizen, national or permanent resident or is an entity subject to the jurisdiction of the government of a covered 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 noes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-138)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to

the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004—as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011, Executive Order 13582 of August 17, 2011, Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012, and Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012—is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2024.

The regime's brutality and repression of the Syrian people, who have called for freedom and a representative government, not only endangers the Syrian people themselves, but also generates instability throughout the region. The Syrian regime's actions and policies, including with respect to chemical weapons and supporting terrorist organizations, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13338 with respect to Syria.

In addition, the United States condemns the brutal violence and human rights violations and abuses of the Assad regime and its Russian and Iranian enablers. The United States calls on the Assad regime, and its backers, to stop its violent war against its own people, enact a nationwide ceasefire, facilitate the unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance to all Syrians in need, and negotiate a political settlement in Syria in line with United Nations Security Council Resolution 2254. The United States will consider changes in policies and actions of the Government of Syria in determining whether to continue or terminate this national emergency in the future.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 2024.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SECURING THE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES SUPPLY CHAIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-139)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides

for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019, with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain, is to continue in effect beyond May 15, 2024.

The unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries augments the ability of these foreign adversaries to create and exploit vulnerabilities in information and communications technology or services, with potentially catastrophic effects. This threat continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 2024.

□ 1400

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-140)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, is to continue in effect beyond May 12, 2024.

The situation in and in relation to the Central African Republic has been

marked by a breakdown of law and order; intersectorial tension; the pervasive, often forced recruitment and use of child soldiers; and widespread violence and atrocities, including those committed by Kremlin-linked and Yevgeniy Prigozhin-affiliated entities such as the Wagner Group. These dynamics threaten the peace, security, or stability of the Central African Republic and neighboring states, and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13667 with respect to the Central African Republic.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 2024.

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1515

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

## AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2024, PART II

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8289) to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8289

*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 “Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2024, Part II”.

### SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

## TITLE I—FEDERAL AVIATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 101. Extension of airport improvement program; discretionary fund.

Sec. 102. Extension of expiring authorities; miscellaneous authorizations.

## TITLE II—AIRPORT REVENUE PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Expenditure authority from Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

Sec. 202. Extension of taxes funding Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

## TITLE I—FEDERAL AVIATION PROGRAMS

### SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM; DISCRETIONARY FUND.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 48103(a)(7) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting “\$2,105,191,256 for the period beginning October 1, 2023, and ending on May 17, 2024.” for “\$2,041,120,218 for the period beginning October 1, 2023, and ending on May 10, 2024.”.

(b) OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Subject to limitations specified in advance in appropriations Acts, sums made available pursuant to subsection (a) may be obligated at any time through September 30, 2024, and shall remain available until expended.

(c) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting “May 17, 2024” for “May 10, 2024”.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR APPORTIONMENTS.—Section 47114(c)(1)(J) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting “May 17, 2024” for “May 10, 2024”.

(e) SUPPLEMENTAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDS.—Section 47115(j)(4)(A) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting “\$334,563,279 for the period beginning on October 1, 2023, and ending on May 17, 2024.” for “\$340,321,762 for the period beginning on October 1, 2023, and ending on May 10, 2024.”.

### SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES; MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) The following provisions of law shall be applied by substituting “May 17, 2024” for “May 10, 2024”:

(1) Section 44310(b) of title 49, United States Code.

(2) Section 44803(h) of title 49, United States Code.

(3) Section 44807(d) of title 49, United States Code.

(4) Section 44810(h) of title 49, United States Code.

(5) Section 47115(i) of title 49, United States Code.

(6) Section 47141(f) of title 49, United States Code.

(7) Section 186(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (Public Law 108-176).

(8) Section 409(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 41731 note).

(9) Section 411(h) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 42301 note).

(10) Section 822(k) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 47141 note).

(11) Section 161(a)(10) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 47104 note).

(12) Section 162 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 47102 note).

(13) Section 372(d) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 44810 note).

(14) Section 424(e) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 42302 note).

(15) Section 439(g) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 41705 note).

(16) Section 547(e) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 40103 note).

(b) The following provisions of law shall be applied by substituting “May 18, 2024” for “May 11, 2024”:

(1) Section 47107(r)(3) of title 49, United States Code.

(2) Section 47143(c) of title 49, United States Code.

(3) Section 50905(c)(9) of title 51, United States Code.

(4) Section 210G(i) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124n(i)).

(5) Section 2306(b) of the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-190; 130 Stat. 641).

(c) Section 48105 of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting “\$24,508,197 for the period beginning on October 1, 2023, and ending on May 17, 2024.” for “\$23,762,295 for the period beginning on October 1, 2023, and ending on May 10, 2024.”.

## TITLE II—AIRPORT REVENUE PROVISIONS

### SEC. 201. EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY FROM AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) Sections 9502(d)(1) and 9502(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied by substituting “May 18, 2024” for “May 11, 2024”.

(b) Section 9502(d)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “or the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2024, Part II;”.

### SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) Sections 4043(d), 4081(d)(2)(B), 4261(j), 4261(k)(1)(A)(ii), and 4271(d)(1)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied by substituting “May 17, 2024” for “May 10, 2024”.

(b) Section 4083(b) of such Code shall be applied by substituting “May 18, 2024” for “May 11, 2024”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 8289.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8289 extends the statutory authorities of the Federal Aviation Administration, FAA, through May 17, 2024. While this extension provides for key extensions of FAA authorities, such as the continued collection of aviation excise taxes that the safe operation of the national airspace is very dependent on, it is largely needed to accommodate the Senate’s inability to successfully pass the conferenced FAA bill in time for the House to take a final vote before Friday.

The House did its part to provide for a long-term reauthorization of the FAA on time and well ahead of schedule when we passed H.R. 3935 last summer in an overwhelming bipartisan

fashion with more than 350 votes. It is unfortunate that the Senate’s process for considering its FAA bill continues to be plagued by delays necessitating this extension.

I know my colleagues in the House are ready to send the compromise bill to the President once and for all. The good news is that we are so close to doing that.

Setting aside the Senate’s ability to act in a timely manner, the stark reality is that the FAA is set to expire on May 10, and we must act to pass another extension to maintain safety in the National Airspace System.

The Senate and House have worked tirelessly since the Senate Commerce Committee marked up its FAA bill in February. We have worked tirelessly to reconcile differences and produce a comprehensive FAA bill that provides certainty to the agency and the entire aviation community for the next 5 years.

The negotiated bill provides the long-term certainty to ensure the safety and prosperity of the American aviation industry for decades to come. Extensions don’t provide any certainty, nor do they provide for the robust investments airports across the country need to ensure the continued transportation of goods and services to our communities.

For those reasons, both Chambers remain committed to passing a long-term bill.

In the meantime, this extension buys the Senate a little bit more time to do their job while keeping the national airspace safe and ensuring that airlines don’t get a \$50 million-a-day tax break.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this extension so that we can consider the conferenced bill next week.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8289, which extends the authorization to FAA and its related authorities for 1 week to give the Senate the time it needs to wrap up its consideration of this bicameral and bipartisan comprehensive FAA reauthorization bill.

This legislation reflects an agreement between the House and Senate. It will protect the safety of the flying public and ensure the future of the U.S. aviation industry.

Think back to last July, Mr. Speaker, when the House passed its version of this bill 351-69, a strong bipartisan bill.

Since then, I am actually pleased with the progress that we have made and that we were able to come to an agreement with our Senate counterparts last Sunday. We have been in close contact with the Senate as they have continued to consider this legislation.

This is, and will be next week, a bipartisan, bicameral product, and Mem-

bers should not be surprised about what is included in it.

Unfortunately, the Senate is still working through its process and may not be able to send us the bill before the current authorization expires on Friday.

Nonetheless, I want to assure Members that Chairman GRAVES and I have fought hard for House Member priorities. I am very pleased to report that the vast majority of those priorities remain intact in the final package. Members’ voices were heard as we worked hard to address the longstanding issues in our aviation system.

The Senate just needs a little bit more time. I fully expect the Senate to complete consideration and send the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2024 to the House well before May 17, the time at which this extension expires.

Mr. Speaker, I support the short-term extension, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, new and persistent challenges facing the U.S. aviation system have made clear the status quo is unsustainable. We have to avoid a lapse in authorities of FAA. This current extension does that for 1 week and gives the Senate the short time it needs to deliberate and vote on the final bill.

Mr. Speaker, I support this extension, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, again, I urge all Members to support this must-pass bill so we can keep our aviation system operating safely and focus on passing a long-term FAA bill next week.

H.R. 8289 provides for a clean extension of FAA authorities. It does not include policy riders.

Failure to extend FAA’s authorities will cost the Federal Government more than \$50 million a day in lost revenues. Enacting a long-term comprehensive FAA bill is the goal of both the House and Senate, and I look forward to presenting that critical piece of legislation to you next week.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8289.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BERGMAN. 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 motion will be postponed.

## EQUAL REPRESENTATION ACT

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1194, I call up the bill (H.R. 7109) to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all persons, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 7109

*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 “Equal Representation Act”.*

**SEC. 2. CITIZENSHIP STATUS ON DECENTNIAL CENSUS.**

*Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended—*

*(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and*  
*(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:*

*“(g)(1) In conducting the 2030 decennial census and each decennial census thereafter, the Secretary shall include in any questionnaire distributed or otherwise used for the purpose of determining the total population by States a checkbox or other similar option for the respondent to indicate, for the respondent and for each of the members of the household of the respondent, whether that individual is a citizen of the United States.*

*“(2) Not later than 120 days after completion of a decennial census of the population under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make publicly available the number of individuals per State, disaggregated by citizens of the United States and noncitizens, as tabulated in accordance with this section.”.*

**SEC. 3. EXCLUSION OF NONCITIZENS FROM NUMBER OF PERSONS USED TO DETERMINE APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES AND NUMBER OF ELECTORAL VOTES.**

*(a) EXCLUSION.—Section 22(a) of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress”, approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2(a)), is amended by inserting after “not taxed” the following: “and individuals who are not citizens of the United States”.*

*(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the apportionment of Representatives carried out pursuant to the decennial census conducted during 2030 and any succeeding decennial census.*

**SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY CLAUSE.**

*If any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provision or amendment to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.*

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 Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

## GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7109 has three components.

Number one, it requires the Census Bureau to include a citizenship question on the decennial census questionnaire.

Number two, the bill directs that this information be used to ensure fair representation by requiring only citizens be included in the apportionment base.

Number three, it has a severability clause.

Currently, the Census Bureau estimates the noncitizen population using data collected annually in the American Community Survey. We are going to call that ACS as I go, just to help you out. That data is not necessarily accurate.

Further, there are no reports that asking a citizenship question on the ACS every year suppresses illegal, alien, or other noncitizen participation on the ACS questionnaire.

The constitutionally iterated rationale for a decennial census is to apportion electoral districts for Congress.

In *Commerce v. New York*, the Supreme Court noted that a host of various questions over the years that are tangential to apportionment had been included in the decennial censuses, “race, sex, age, health, education, occupation, housing, and military service,” and “radio ownership, age at first marriage, and native tongue,” et cetera.

The citizenship question is no stranger to the Census questionnaire. Commerce also noted: “Every Census between 1820 and 2000 (with the exception of 1840) asked at least some of the population about their citizenship or place of birth. Between 1820 and 1950, the question was asked of all households. Between 1960 and 2000, it was asked of about one-fourth to one-sixth of the population.” That is another quote from the Commerce case.

This isn’t a uniquely American practice. Even the United Nations recommends collecting citizenship information via a census, as noted by, again, the Commerce Court. Australia,

Canada, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Germany, Mexico, Spain, and the United Kingdom ask about citizenship in their respective censuses.

Is the United States to be the only North American country not to inquire about citizenship in its Census protocols?

The Commerce Court held, regarding the posing of a citizenship question on the Census, as follows: “In light of the early understanding of and long practice under the Enumeration Clause, we conclude that it permits Congress, and by extension the Secretary [of Commerce], to inquire about citizenship on the Census questionnaire.”

Section 2 of H.R. 7109 simply asks whether a person is a citizen of the United States, yes or no. That is it, but everyone gets counted.

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

□ 1530

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

The last President tried to include a citizenship question on the decennial Census in 2020 and tried to count only U.S. citizens for the purpose of Census and reapportionment, and the effort failed miserably in court, for obvious reasons.

Section 2 of the 14th Amendment states that apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives is based on “the whole number of persons in each State,” persons being the all-encompassing category, much larger than that of citizens.

When the Framers wanted to impose a citizenship requirement in the text of the Constitution, they knew how to do it. Take the President of the United States, for example. It says that you have got to be a born U.S. citizen in order to run for President. Some of the historians tell us that was because Thomas Jefferson was trying to block Alexander Hamilton from running for President. He was foreign born. In any event, however, it was very clear that you needed to be a born U.S. citizen to run for President. For those of us in the House, it says we must have been a citizen for at least 7 years.

There are lots of citizenship requirements in the Constitution. There is no citizenship requirement for being counted in the Census and for purposes of reapportionment. On the contrary, the Census and reapportionment have included all persons, including noncitizens, like permanent resident green card holders, since 1790. That has been the unbroken practice since the beginning of the Republic.

This point was made even more clearly and emphatically by the Supreme Court in its unanimous 2016 decision in *Evenwel v. Abbott*, rejecting precisely the argument my distinguished friend is trying to make. Like this legislation itself, *Evenwel* involved a challenge to congressional apportionment based on a total count of the entire population

instead of a limited count of the total citizen or voter population. Justice Ginsburg held for a unanimous court that section 3 of the 14th Amendment “retained total population as the congressional apportionment base.” She cited the speech made on the floor of the Senate by Senator Jacob Howard upon introduction of section 2 of the 14th Amendment:

“The basis of representation is numbers . . . . The committee adopted numbers as the most just and satisfactory basis, and this is the principle upon which the Constitution itself was originally framed, that the basis of representation should depend upon numbers; and such, I think, after all, is the safest and most secure principle upon which the government can rest. Numbers, not voters; numbers, not property; this is the theory of the Constitution.”

My colleague needs to remember that when the Republic was founded, the vast majority of people were not citizens who could vote. Women could not vote, children could not vote, enslaved Americans, obviously, could not vote. So the Census and apportionment was for everybody who was here. That was the whole basis of the three-fifths compromise. Because enslaved Americans were being counted, too, what percentage should they count for purposes of reapportionment? Well, Congress arrived at 60 percent, three-fifths. It was the Southern States who were saying they should count completely for these purposes because they wanted the enslaved Americans to be enlarging and inflating the congressional delegations from the slave states. For these purposes, the Northern States said: No, they shouldn’t count at all; they should count zero percent in the apportionment. They arrived at three-fifths. In any event, everybody agreed that everybody would be counted.

Justice Ginsburg included lots of decisive legislative authority like this, including the floor statement here in the House of Representative James Blaine, who stated: “No one will deny that population is the true basis of representation; for women, children, and other nonvoting classes may have as vital an interest in the legislation of the country as those who actually deposit the ballot.”

For all of you constitutional textualists out there, the plain reading of the text is clear as day.

For all of you constitutional originalists out there, the original purposes of the passage of the 14th Amendment have been carefully articulated by the Supreme Court on a unanimous basis and never rebutted.

For all of you Members who like to follow precedent, every apportionment since 1790 has included every single person residing in the United States, not just those lucky enough to have been given the right to vote. As the Evenwel Court noted, the 14th Amendment contemplates that “Representatives serve all residents, not just those eligible or registered to vote.”

The constitutional meaning is indisputable, a point which settles this for those who actually want to follow the Constitution in all cases, not just when it favors our own preferred policy outcome.

The House should be getting real work done instead of wasting more time on another MAGA bill that will never pass the Senate, let alone get signed by the President, much less approved by the courts. The bill is an insult, and it is an affront to the great radical Republicans who wrote the 14th Amendment. Their party was a profreedom, pro-union, proimmigrant, anticonspiracy theory, anti-Know Nothing Party that wanted to make sure everybody in the country was counted and made visible.

The Census is essential to democracy. Just as the Framers endorsed Thomas Paine’s “Common Sense,” they endorsed a common Census, but this bill would destroy the accuracy of the Census, which may have something to do with its actual legislative motivation.

In the 2010 Census, the undercount of Hispanic citizens was 1.4 percent. In 2020, that number grew to 5 percent, with many observers crediting that jump to the Trump administration’s simple attempt to add a citizenship question to the Census and all of the intense publicity and rumor surrounding it.

The addition of a question about citizenship will indeed deter many immigrants, including people who are permanent residents, including citizens, from completing the Census. Many noncitizen immigrants who are seeking asylum or are refugees will avoid responding because of uncertainty over their status and fear of arbitrary law enforcement action.

Extensive research over the last decade shows that many residents wrongly believe the Census Bureau will share their responses with other agencies. To be clear on this point, it does not. Federal law prohibits it. However, that pervasive worry has prevented some people from answering questions about immigration status or responding to the Census at all.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly oppose this legislation as unconstitutional and unwise. It dishonors our own history and the values of the Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As my friend knows, the Commerce case held specifically you can ask the citizenship question on the Census. That is true. You can do that. That is what we are proposing.

Additionally, he misstated the rationale on why the Commerce case went the way it did. They said you can ask the question, but that the Secretary had contrived his rationale and was in violation of the APA, and that is why that happened.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BIGGS for leading this debate, and I thank Mr. DAVIDSON for his co-leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what is an insult. The current situation is an insult to the American people, the citizens who live here whose voice and vote are being degraded because of the horrendous immigration problem that we have at our southern border through illegal aliens coming across the border, and that not being addressed here in Washington, D.C.

One of the lesser acknowledged, but equally alarming, side effects of this administration’s failure to secure the southern border is the illegal immigration population’s influence in America’s electoral process.

Our democracy depends on accurate representation and electoral integrity. Voting is a coveted privilege held by American citizens, and elected Representatives are responsible for serving the interests of the voters in their district.

Even if not a single illegal alien casts a vote, the mere presence of illegal immigrants in the United States is having a profound impact on the outcomes of elections, skewing the representation of Americans.

Mr. BIGGS points out that the U.S. Constitution mandates that a Census be carried out every 10 years where everyone who is present in the United States, regardless of their citizenship and immigration status, is counted. The Constitution does not specify whether noncitizens or illegal aliens must be counted for the purpose of apportioning House seats.

You may recall that in 2016, President Trump through executive order added a citizenship question back to the 2020 Census, the same question that had been legally asked on nearly every Census since 1820 until it was removed in 1960, not because there was anything found wrong with that question, but because the effect of illegal immigration was negligible at that time. However, there is no doubt today, Mr. Speaker, the effect of illegal immigration is significant. I won’t waste my time making that case here. We all know it. It is a top concern of about 70 percent of all Americans.

Though common sense dictates that only citizens should be counted for the apportionment process, illegal aliens have nonetheless recently been counted toward the final tallies that determine how many House seats that each State is allocated and the number of electoral votes that it will wield in Presidential elections.

Since the illegal alien population is not evenly distributed through the Nation, American citizens in some States are losing representation in Congress to illegal aliens in other States.

A 2019 study by the Center for Immigration Studies estimates illegal immigrants and noncitizens who have not naturalized and do not have the right to vote impact the distribution of 26

House seats. My bill, the Equal Representation Act, would finally address this alarming undermining of American democracy by requiring a citizenship question be added back to the 2030 Census, creating reporting requirements for data gathered from citizenship questions and requiring that only U.S. citizens be counted for the purpose of congressional apportionment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will no doubt and has no doubt drawn criticism from those who don't want to fix this problem and who seek to gain political influence by not fixing it. They will claim to have become experts on our Constitution. I don't see any black robes in this Chamber today. They will point to the word "persons" in section 2 of the 14th Amendment as a reason why this bill should not pass, but this word carries no definition in our Constitution, and it offers multiple meanings in current law.

Allow me to argue, in 1992, in *Franklin v. Massachusetts*, a Supreme Court case on apportionment of Representatives opined the term "persons" to mean an individual who not only has a physical presence but some element of allegiance to a particular place.

The Census Bureau does not include foreigners who visit the United States for a vacation or a business trip in the population count since they have no political or legal allegiance to any State or the Federal Government.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. EDWARDS. Similarly, illegal aliens who are deportable have no allegiance or enduring tie to the United States. Foreigners here on visas have an allegiance politically and legally to their home countries, not to the United States, so the same logic applies to them.

My bill is a commonsense solution to a chronic problem impacting the very governance and democracy of this country.

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

The gentleman from North Carolina observes that we don't have anybody wearing a black robe in the House of Representatives today, but you don't have to wear a black robe in order to read the Constitution, interpret the Constitution, and follow it.

If you need people with black robes, then I would urge the gentleman to read the Supreme Court's decision in *Evenwel v. Abbott*, where the Supreme Court unanimously found that the Census and reapportionment must include the entire population, all persons; not all citizens, not all voters, the alternative suggestions that are being made today.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, what do we have here? Since 1790, all persons have been included in the Census, in every Census

on a decennial basis since the beginning of the Republic.

The Supreme Court rejected the theory that is being advanced by my friends in the majority today in *Evenwel v. Abbott* that the Constitution requires citizens rather than persons, and the gentleman from North Carolina invites us to think it has something to do with immigration.

We actually had an immigration deal coming out of the Senate for hundreds of new Border Patrol officers and asylum officers and asylum judges and fentanyl detection machinery, and it was vetoed by the fourth branch of government, Donald Trump, who said he didn't want a border solution, he wanted a border crisis to run on.

Despite the fact that Senator LANKFORD, perhaps one of the most conservative Senators that we have in the Republican Party, said that this was a great deal and the best that he had ever seen coming out of the Senate, and despite the fact that Senator MCCONNELL was for it, they blew it all up.

You judge for yourself the seriousness of the claims that they want to do something about immigration. This is another useless and needless distraction.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise today to oppose H.R. 7109. It is a bill that threatens equal and fair representation of immigrant communities.

This bill requires a citizenship question on the U.S. Census, which directly undermines the Constitution's mandate for a fair and accurate count of all residents.

This requirement would deprive tens of millions of immigrants their rightful access to representation and resources, even though they pay taxes and contribute to our economy.

A citizenship question would have a chilling effect on participation in the Census. Its accuracy would be destroyed.

The Census count affects where the Federal Government appropriates funds and resources to our communities.

Republicans are effectively saying: If you are not a citizen in this country, you don't count. Even legal permanent residents, you don't count. This is absurd.

Let me be clear. Immigrants are the backbone of this economy. They work the fields, they build our cities, and they contribute tirelessly to the fabric of our society.

They pay over half a trillion dollars in taxes, including taxes for Social Security and Medicare, even though undocumented immigrants can't receive benefits.

Despite their invaluable contributions, Republicans want to deny immigrant communities access to even more

vital services and resources that they help fund through their hard-earned tax dollars.

As Representatives of the people, it is our duty to ensure that all members of our communities are treated with dignity and respect.

Every individual, regardless of their immigration status, should have the opportunity to thrive, but H.R. 7109 does the opposite.

A citizenship question on the Census threatens to further marginalize immigrant communities. An undercount of the immigrant population would not only result in an unfair distribution of resources, but it will also undermine the very foundation of our democracy—that is fair representation from our government.

I urge our colleagues to reject this extreme Republican bill and instead focus on policies that uplift and empower all members of our society.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, of course, every single Democrat voted against the great border security bill, H.R. 2. That is how serious they are not. Every person is counted under this bill. Why can't we ask them what their citizenship is?

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland stated that this bill is perhaps unconstitutional. Under our Constitution, he has every right to lead an article III challenge to the constitutionality of this bill, which I expect that they will. My Democrat colleagues love to sue Americans and pursue legislation through the courts.

This is actual legislation presented by conservative Republicans to correct a horrible wrong. I rise in support of H.R. 7109, the Equal Representation Act.

While this bill will continue to count every person in the United States, it adds a simple question to the Census: Are you a United States citizen?

While the decennial Census must count every person in the United States, which I agree with, Mr. Speaker, the problem is the level of illegal persons that now live in our country because of President Biden's failures at the southern border.

It took 240 years to accumulate 30 million illegals living in the United States. In 4 short years, President Biden, under his policies, will have added 15 million. We are talking about 45 million illegal persons living in the United States. That is the equivalent to 60 congressional seats.

Now, most of those illegal aliens will be drawn to live primarily in sanctuary states and cities. This thwarts the fair representation of American citizens in the House of Representatives, foundationally altering our representative Republic.

This important piece of legislation enables us to fairly and accurately apportion congressional districts based upon equal representation of American citizens.

I urge my colleagues to seek the truth and to support this bill.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ).

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 7109. I mean, think about it. It is another Republican attempt to attack immigrant communities in this country.

So many of us, our children, and our grandchildren are immigrants, and we have the hypocrisy to stand in this room here and continue to attack immigrant communities.

Republicans are trying to amend the Constitution through unconstitutional means. The Census Bureau has constitutionally mandated responsibility to count the number of persons in the United States, to count every single person, because as the Member prior from this side said, they are here. They are contributing. They are paying taxes. They make it possible for us to be able to retire and then be able to have the benefits that we have worked so hard for because they are paying those taxes, and they serve our communities.

Republicans are adding Census questions to have a chilling effect, to keep people afraid, to make them nervous, to discourage their participation in the Census.

The ultimate effect that it is going to have on these communities, like mine, is undercounted and underrepresented. Our democracy grows weaker every single time these kind of actions are brought to this floor.

We must ensure that the Census remains as accurate as possible and free from the political interference that would rob whole communities of the resources and the representation they are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage a “no” vote.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will make reference to a couple documents before I discuss the bill.

First of all, our Pledge of Allegiance, which we say every day, we pledge allegiance to the Republic for which we stand, right, the flag and the Republic for which we stand.

Benjamin Franklin, after our Constitution was ratified, he talked about giving us a Republic if we can keep it, and I think people should analyze those two little quotes and wonder why there were references to the Republic in both of them. In any event, it kind of bugs me when people around here don’t understand that.

Now, back to the bill at hand. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for introducing this bill.

I think it is fairly obvious that when we take a Census, there are certain questions you expect to appear on the Census, right?

One thing they want to know is if you are a permanent citizen here or

whether you are not a citizen. There is a difference between the two.

There is a reason why we swear certain people in as citizens. There is a reason why we treat citizens differently than other people.

I think it is absolutely bizarre that to this point, we have been sending out Census forms and not asking the first question that you would figure would pop into your head: Are you a citizen? It is kind of embarrassing it has not happened up to this point.

We have another problem in that there are some States declaring themselves sanctuary States or some sanctuary cities in which they seem to be encouraging people to come here who really shouldn’t be in the country at all under current law.

In any event, I think this is a great bill. First of all, we should, in apportioning congressional seats, take into account people who are citizens, not people who are noncitizens, many of which I assume are going to return to the country they came from.

Secondly, we expect on the form—the first thing I look at, they put things on, their race. Sometimes in the surveys they put on, do you own a TV or that sort of thing.

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona again for giving me 2 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am about to yield to my friend from New York (Ms. MENG), but I am inspired by the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, especially about the word “Republic” which, of course, comes from *res publica*, the public thing.

He happened upon a subject that is of a lot of interest to me because I wrote a paper about it when I was in sixth grade.

The Pledge of Allegiance was written by a radical Baptist minister named Francis Bellamy—I am not sure if the gentleman is aware of that—on the 400th anniversary of Columbus’ arrival in the new world.

Reverend Bellamy, who was an abolitionist in Vermont, was concerned about the continuing salute of the Confederate battle flag in the southern States.

He wanted to write a flag salute that would be unifying for the union, and he wrote: I pledge allegiance to my flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, with liberty and justice for all.

You notice what is not in there. He did not have “under God.” That was added in 1954 by Congress several weeks after the Supreme Court’s decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

In any event, I am not quite sure what the relevance is of the gentleman’s invocation of the Republic or of Ben Franklin and the famous vignette about him saying: If you can keep it.

Ben Franklin was, of course, a big supporter of immigration to the country, although he did display an anti-German bias in some of his writings.

I will tell you a little story about Ben Franklin that might be of relevance to what the gentleman is talking about because I just did a tour in Philadelphia with the Ben Franklin people up there, and we learned this wonderful story.

He made a loan to a friend of his for \$100, and then he recorded in his diary that this gentleman he made the loan to for \$100, Josiah, was always disappearing behind a tree or a building whenever Ben came along.

He finally caught up with him, and he said: Josiah, I loaned you a hundred bucks, and I am wondering, am I going to be able to get my principal back or at least the interest?

Josiah said: Well, Ben, look. The \$100 is well invested somewhere else, so you don’t have to worry about that.

Franklin said: Well, what about the interest?

Josiah said: Well, I forgot to tell you that it is against my religion to pay interest, so I can’t pay you the interest.

Franklin said: You mean to tell me it is against your principle to pay me the interest, and it is against your interest to pay me the principal?

Josiah said: That’s right.

Franklin said: Well, I can see I am not going to get either.

Well, here our principles and our interests converge very much. The principles are set forth in the Constitution, which is we count everybody, and everybody is part of the Census, and everybody is part of the reapportionment process.

It has been like that since 1790. We don’t need to start finger painting on the Constitution with this silly election year proposal.

It is also in our interest because, as my colleagues have said, this is a land that is built on immigration. Except for the Native Americans who are already here and the people who were brought over as slaves, all of us are the descendants of immigrants to this country.

Tom Paine, when he got to America in 1774, 2 years before the Revolution, he said: This land, if it lives up to its principles, will become an asylum to humanity—not an insane asylum, mind you—an asylum to humanity, a place of refuge for people seeking freedom from religious, political, and economic oppression. That is who we are.

Every day I have in my office people from the hotel industry, people from the construction industry, and people from the restaurant industry saying: We have huge labor shortages. We need people in America.

I am for a whole lot more lawful immigration to America, less unlawful immigration to America like the deal that was worked out in the Senate that was rejected by the Republicans, and a lot less demagoguery about who we are as a country because the Census and reapportionment provisions in the 14th Amendment tell it all.

This is a country that is for everybody seeking opportunity and hope,

willing to follow the law and follow our Constitution.

□ 1600

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 7109, the Equal Representation Act.

The U.S. Constitution requires a count of the whole number of persons in each State. Counting has been the legal, historical, and constitutional practice ever since the first Census was conducted in 1790.

A citizens-only Census, as this legislation intends, is reckless, cynical, and, frankly, illegal. It is not the Census Bureau's job to keep track of immigration status. It is also not the Census Bureau's job to determine one's allegiance, just like the insurrectionists on January 6. We have agencies for both of those tasks.

The Census guides how more than \$2.8 trillion a year in Federal funding is distributed to States, cities, and towns. This includes funding for Medicare, Medicaid, schools, roads, and other critical public services. Not counting every whole person may decrease Federal money, even in some of my colleagues' districts.

Noncitizens make up about 6.7 percent of our Nation's population of 333 million people. They are our loved ones, friends, neighbors, and those who have been actively contributing to and participating in our communities for many years.

Pretending that noncitizens do not live in our communities—that is exactly what this bill would do, pretend—will only instill fear, force people into the shadows, and take critical Federal funding away from the areas that need it most.

Throughout our Nation's history, there have been several attempts at adding a citizenship question to the Census, all of which have failed.

As a daughter of immigrants and as the Representative of a diverse community of constituents who have arrived from many corners of the world, I have adamantly fought against these attempts.

In 2018, the previous administration attempted to add a citizenship question to the Census, which Senator HIRONO and I and others fought against in Congress.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, this was subsequently blocked by the Supreme Court.

We cannot let this latest attempt succeed. Calling this legislation the Equal Representation Act is an oxymoron, and I am voting "no" and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish we were hearing not deflective statements but the actual truth here.

Here is the way it works. There is nothing in this bill that says you don't count everybody. You do count everybody. The thing they really don't want us to know is how many illegal aliens are in the country, so we are going to ask a citizenship question, which has been asked in 22 of 25 Censuses. They don't want that.

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, it is always good to see Ranking Member RASKIN with a good, healthy head of hair. God does listen to our prayers. We are glad he is with us and healthy.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I know Mr. BURCHETT's prayers go right to the top.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, my mama's prayers did. Mine don't get quite that close.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7109, the Equal Representation Act. This legislation will require U.S. citizens to include a question that asks if the person is a United States citizen. It is just a question.

This bill passed through the House Oversight Committee on a straight party-line vote, 22–20. Not a single Democrat supported it.

The Census informs how our government divides up congressional districts and electoral college votes. Mr. Speaker, it helps to ensure American voters have equal representation. That process should not factor in people who are not citizens or not eligible to vote.

You can see why my Democratic colleagues would have a problem with this bill. Factoring illegal aliens into the process skews things in their favor. In fact, it wasn't very long ago that a Member from the minority party was on the news claiming that they wish more illegals would come to their district for the Census.

If the Census does not include the citizenship question, States with more illegal aliens will get more congressional districts and more electoral college votes.

We have a history of saying that elections are sacred and that free, fair, and secure elections are the cornerstone of this great Republic, Mr. Speaker. It is time to act like it and prioritize the dadgum representation of our people.

Americans are sick and tired of this administration weaponizing different parts of our government, and they don't want to see something like the Census being used against them when it is so hard to get American citizens to even take the Census.

Leaders in States like California and New York are taking pride in harboring illegal aliens. In fact, the people of California have offered free

healthcare to their illegals, and New York has kicked combat veterans out of housing to house illegals.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, States should not be rewarded with more congressional seats or electoral college votes, which would end up distorting the will of the American people.

I thank my colleagues, Congressman WARREN DAVIDSON and Congressman CHUCK EDWARDS, for introducing this legislation. I am proud to support it.

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

It is always great to be with my friend from Tennessee. Just two quick points on his always trenchant remarks.

One is that one should be clear that under this legislation, they are not roping out of the reapportionment just undocumented people. They are also roping out of the reapportionment permanent residents, people who are green card holders who are on the pathway to citizenship already. They are talking about disenfranchising from the Census reapportionment process millions of people who are lawfully within it. They should be aware of that.

Also, if we were being cynical politically, we would embrace this legislation because it is the red States like Texas and Florida whose congressional delegations are inflated by virtue of counting people who are not citizens. We are simply trying to follow what the Constitution says, which I know is kind of a radical proposition around here these days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. MANNING).

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I thank my cousin, Representative RASKIN, for yielding me time.

We have wasted another legislative week on ludicrous messaging bills to defend the liberty of laundry and freedom for the fridge. Today, they are pushing a bill to upend our Nation's process for collecting Census data.

Let's be clear. The so-called Equal Representation Act does nothing to live up to its name. In fact, their bill would result in the opposite. It will reduce participation in the Census, which our government relies on for a host of data to inform our decisionmaking.

What is more, this bill will violate our Constitution, which states that all persons be counted in the Census. Instead of wasting time on deeply unserious messaging bills, Congress should be focused on what really matters to the American people, particularly reproductive freedoms.

Right now, across the country, women are suffering from extreme abortion bans that are endangering their health and limiting their ability to make private medical decisions. Women in America are worried about

their reproductive freedoms and deeply concerned about what extremist politicians will attack next. We know that radical judges and politicians are not stopping with abortion bans. They are now attacking fertility treatments and attempting to restrict birth control methods like plan B and IUDs.

If far-right extremists really cared about women, they would want to make the full range of birth control readily available, not restrict access to it.

This Sunday is Mother's Day. How about giving moms and potential moms the gift they really want: the right to decide whether, when, and with whom to have children. Instead of flowers, let's guarantee the right to use the full range of FDA-approved birth control.

In honor of Mother's Day and 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 strike the text of H.R. 7190 and replace it with my Right to Contraception Act, a bill to protect the right to access all forms of FDA-approved birth control and protect women's reproductive health from political interference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of this amendment immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

For full text, please see H.R. 4121.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, right now, our Nation is grappling with a border crisis that has been manufactured by Democratic policies that brazenly reward those who break our laws to enter our country illegally. My home State of New York is drowning due to policies that transformed our State into a sanctuary for illegal immigration.

Democratic leaders in New York City, Albany, here in Congress, and the White House have turned their backs on lawful Americans, choosing instead to roll out the red carpet for illegal immigrants with housing, clothing, and financial incentives all paid for by the American taxpayers. The gravy train is alive and well.

Throughout this process, we are learning that it is a calculated effort to boost their own political power by inflating their population counts and skewing congressional representation. We are talking millions of people who are not American citizens having a major say in American elections.

They are not even hiding it anymore. One of my colleagues on the other side

of the aisle, who happens to represent New York City in this body, openly called for more illegal immigration to her district because she said she "needs more people in her district for redistricting purposes."

This absurd notion, pushed by my colleagues across the aisle, that these noncitizens should shape the future of our Nation is completely unconstitutional. They are corroding the essence of American citizenship, turning it into a political commodity.

The Equal Representation Act is our line in the sand. It is time to end the charade of rewarding States like New York and California for their reckless sanctuary antics that undermine our laws.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to rise above partisan manipulation, protect the sanctity of our democracy, and support the Equal Representation Act. Let's send a clear message that the value of American citizenship is absolute and our elections are not for sale.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes remaining.

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

If you strip away all the bombast and all the rhetoric, the gentleman just basically delivered a tirade about immigration but never addressed the fact that their legislation is totally unconstitutional.

If you want to deal with immigration, we had a bill, and the bill would have added hundreds of Border Patrol officers, asylum officers, and judges. The Republican leadership in the Senate said it was a great deal. They got most of what they wanted. It was a great compromise. Yet, who didn't want it? Donald Trump, still the putative leader of those who are left in the GOP, Lincoln's party. Donald Trump didn't want it because he didn't want a border solution. He wants a border crisis.

They are left with a bunch of completely superficial, empty bills like this one, which I doubt will even pass the House. If it does pass the House, it certainly won't pass the Senate. It will never be signed by the President, and it would be struck down immediately by the Supreme Court.

Why are we wasting our time on that instead of getting to the legislation that actually a majority of the Senate was behind? I wish one of my colleagues would address that.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. Boebert).

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BIGGS for leading on this issue.

I rise in support of the Equal Representation Act, which will add a citizenship question to the Census and exclude illegal aliens from the apportion-

ment base. It is past time we put America and Americans first.

Joe Biden and his regime are shelling out benefits to illegal immigrants like Oprah Winfrey on her show: Everyone gets a vote. Everyone gets recognized, even if you are here illegally.

In New York, aliens are receiving \$53 million in free, prepaid debit cards. In Denver, Colorado, aliens get 6 free months of housing. Now, they want to hand them seats in Congress to buy their lifelong allegiance to the Democratic Party.

□ 1615

Since Biden took office, we have seen more than 9 million illegal aliens cross our borders and more than 1.8 million got-aways evade Border Patrol agents. That is larger than the population of 32 States, Mr. Speaker.

There are now at least 16.8 million illegal aliens living in the United States, enough to account for roughly 22 seats in the House of Representatives.

Including these aliens in the apportionment of congressional districts impacts representation in Congress and undermines the constitutional principle of one person, one vote. Americans deserve to have their voices fully represented, not diluted by illegal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is always delightful to hear my friend from Colorado speak. One thing that I do want to point out, however, because there might be some students in the gallery today, is that there can be no illegal aliens and there can be no green card holders in Congress because the Constitution very clearly specifies that you must have been a citizen for 7 years before you run for the House, you must have been a citizen for 9 years before you run for the Senate, and you must be a born U.S. citizen in order to run for President of the United States, which some historians, as I think I mentioned before, attribute to Thomas Jefferson trying to write Alexander Hamilton out of the Presidential sweepstakes.

In any event, I think that my colleagues should probably relax with some of the hyperbole and exaggeration here. After all, all we are saying is: Let's keep doing what we have done since 1790 in the country.

This is the way that the Census and the reapportionment have always been run in the United States of America, and what they are proposing is obviously a radical departure from what the Constitution ordains.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to simply explain what we are talking about here.

Mr. Speaker, you could have a citizen of Russia who illegally crosses our southern border, pays cartels, comes across our southern border, and decides to set up shop in California. That citizen of Russia, who can still vote for Vladimir Putin all day long, also is counted in the distribution of electoral votes in the United States, therefore having influence and therefore shaping who is President of the United States.

I don't know what else could possibly be foreign interference in elections than what we are talking about today.

Mr. Speaker, I am from the State of Louisiana. We have six Members of Congress. We have six. By some calculations, the State of California alone has six Members of Congress entirely attributable to citizens of other countries, therefore, just offsetting all of the votes of all of the citizens of Louisiana.

This is outrageous.

To listen to people across the aisle talk about how this is inappropriate, I say: No, this is exactly appropriate. This is exactly appropriate.

As a matter of fact, regarding the way that we count American citizens in our territories, you are giving a greater status to an illegal alien in the United States, a citizen of a foreign country, than you are giving to an American citizen.

It is absolutely outrageous to listen to people who try to argue and justify this. This is 100 percent about stacking the vote, about foreign interference in elections, and about allowing and incentivizing sanctuary cities. That is what this does.

It actually takes American taxpayer dollars through the formula funding influenced by the Census, and it gives it to States that have illegal aliens.

This is completely outrageous. I can't even believe we are standing here having this debate.

Mr. Speaker, vote "yes" if you want Americans to be represented, and vote "no" if you think Russians, Chinese, and others should be represented.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear someone on that side of the aisle denounce Vladimir Putin, and I thank him for his remarks. We should definitely avoid putting in a President of the United States who looks up to Vladimir Putin and calls him a genius.

In any event, I could be persuaded by the gentleman's policy arguments, but then we have got to amend the Constitution. This is the way it has been done since the beginning of the Republic. The language in the 14th Amendment is perfectly clear, that it is all of the persons of the State who have to be counted.

Mr. Speaker, I thought you guys were constitutional textualists. I thought you followed the language of the Constitution, the original intent of the Constitution, and the precedent that

has been set. I could be persuaded by it. I don't like the fact that Texas and Florida, or any State for that matter, gets an inflated congressional delegation because of this reason or that. Let's have that discussion, but you have got to amend the Constitution. You can't just say: Well, I don't like what is in the Constitution, and therefore I am going to ignore it.

The point about the territories I am not sure I understood. That undercut the gentleman's argument because, of course, the people in the territories are not represented in the House of Representatives except by nonvoting delegates whose votes ultimately don't count and can't count according to a D.C. circuit court decision called *Michel v. Anderson*.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

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

Those are a lot of words from the opposition to this bill to say that citizenship does not matter. That is basically their argument: We don't care if you are a citizen.

In fact, they encourage you to not be a citizen. Sanctuary cities and States invite everyone from the world to flood their cities, and they need it. They have said as much in interviews that their population is fleeing their horrible policies in States like California, Illinois, Maryland, New York, and elsewhere, and they are going to places that have more freedom and less government.

So what do they do?

They import new people who don't know better, and, yes, the conditions are better there than the places they are fleeing, but as my colleague, Mr. GRAVES, was pointing out, California has six to seven Members. That is more than many of our States. Yes, Texas has Representatives because they, too, have a large illegal population, and the Biden administration is doing everything possible to prevent them from stopping this invasion of our country.

It is willfully and purposefully, and I will add skillfully, undermining the value of U.S. citizenship to flood this country with noncitizens.

I want to tell some great news to my colleagues: Foreign nationals do have representation in the United States at embassies or consulates. Their representative is not here in the United States Congress. I represent United States citizens, and so do my colleagues.

Nonetheless, noncitizens do not vote, and they should not vote, but don't let that stop them. They are working to change that too so that they can vote. We found that noncitizens are voting,

and they found loopholes to do that with the Motor Voter Act.

We have to defend the value and right of U.S. citizens. The only way to do that is to do the very purpose of the Census, which is to apportion Representatives.

Now, we get a lot of other ancillary benefits from the Census, but the constitutional purpose of it is to know who is here.

Now, they want to know everything else about you, Mr. Speaker, how many hyphens you have in your ethnicity, national origin, what you believe about your religion, how much you make, and every other way they can invade your privacy, but they don't give a rip whether or not you are a United States citizen.

The American people deserve to be fairly and equally represented, and the only way that is going to be done is if we know who is a citizen, and the apportionment is based on United States citizens.

This amendment needs to be passed.

For assurance, for the previous three Congresses, I have introduced a constitutional amendment. In this Congress that is H.J. Res. 37. I assume Mr. RASKIN will run down and cosponsor it immediately because he knows that he could amend the Constitution and defend the principle that is at stake here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to sponsor this bill and to vote "yes" on this bill and get it passed.

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

Mr. Speaker, why do you need to amend the Constitution if you can just go ahead and do it by statute here?

That is rather curious. I think the gentleman doth protest just a little bit too much. I admire the intellectual honesty in putting forth a constitutional amendment, because that is precisely what needs to be done. I am happy to look at that. I appreciate his candor in admitting that the Constitution needs to be amended in order to overturn more than 2 centuries of practice and everything the Supreme Court has ever said about the issue.

It also should be clear to everybody that only U.S. citizens of majority may vote in Federal elections, that is Federal law, but everybody, including children, who are U.S. citizens are counted even though they can't vote in Federal elections.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), who is the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, if you went out on the street today and asked someone, almost anybody on the street, and said: Do you know that we do a Census every 10 years and we count up the number of people in the country, and do you think it is okay if we found out how many of these people are citizens?

That person would say: Well, yes, but aren't you already doing that.

That is what they would think.

All this bill says is: Let's count persons, like the Constitution says, but let's also find out how many are citizens because that is what should determine how congressional representation, how apportionment is done.

It is so darn simple.

By the way, to my good friend from Maryland on the other side, we ask all kinds of other questions on the Census anyway.

What is wrong with asking the fundamental question: Are you a citizen of this great country, the greatest country ever?

That is all this does, and that is an important number to get. It is important information to get when you are figuring out who is going to represent and how many congressional Members there will be from each of the respective States.

This couldn't be more simple. I don't know why they oppose it, but they always do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be in the position of lecturing my colleagues about something that they often like to say, but the Constitution is the Constitution, and nobody yet has laid a glove on the Constitution or explained how the Supreme Court erred in the unanimous Evenwel decision.

None of them has been able to explain away the very plain language of the 14th Amendment, that it is all the persons of the States who are counted, not the citizens, and that has been the basis for both the Census and the re-apportionment since the country began.

So the rest of it just strikes me like election year political rhetoric. To the extent that we want to deal with immigration, we had a great bargain that came out of the Senate, which everybody in this body and that body seemed to be behind, until they heard from Donald Trump that no, he didn't want to see any legislative progress, he wanted to be able to demagogue the immigration issue out on the campaign trail, although he has been severely undermined by all of the exposure that went into that decision.

Again, I haven't heard anyone either explain why their legislation is constitutional, nor have I heard anybody explain what is wrong with the immigration package that we have for hundreds of new Border Patrol officers, hundreds of new Border Patrol and asylum judges and a crackdown of drugs at the border.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to debate here about this. Let me tell you some-

thing, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, by far, most Americans would agree with the proposition that those illegally in the United States and noncitizens should not be counted for purposes of creating or modifying congressional legislative districts. That is probably what they think, and that is exactly what section 3 of this bill leads to.

Foreign nationals here legally who have not naturalized and cannot vote in Federal elections, together with illegal aliens who cannot vote in Federal elections, comprise a substantial portion of our population, by some accounts in excess of 15 percent of our populations.

Noncitizens are not evenly distributed among the States, and some States end up with greater representation in Congress based on a higher concentration of noncitizens. Perhaps that is what one New York Congresswoman meant when, in response to a question regarding illegal aliens, she said: "I need more people in my district just for redistricting purposes."

The provision of this bill would ensure a fair apportionment based on equal representation of citizens.

Now, my colleague has relied on *Evenwel v. Abbott*, a case that they relied on wrongfully. Their reliance is totally misplaced.

First of all, they are dealing with State apportionment issues in Evenwel, not Federal, but State. Let's go ahead, and let's see what Justice Ginsburg did. She cited with approval the district court holding in Evenwel that the Supreme Court allows jurisdictions to use any neutral, non-discriminatory baseline, including total population, when drawing State and local legislative districts.

That has never been overturned, nor did Justice Ginsburg overturn it in Evenwel. In Evenwel, the plaintiffs that came before the Court wanted apportionment based on the citizen voting age population. That is what they were asking for.

□ 1630

Although Evenwel deals with State and local apportionment, we can fairly extrapolate that rationale to Federal apportionment, as well. Justice Ginsburg's holding in Evenwel turns on the idea that voter equality in a district is not required. It is not required. However, she also lays out that neither is it the total population metric that is implied by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is not required either.

For instance, Justice Ginsburg referred to *Burns v. Richardson*. In that case, it held that districts may be apportioned on the basis of registered voters or voter-eligible populations, that that is permissible.

In the *Burns* case, they give the example of Hawaii, which could rationally justify its use of voter-eligible apportionment because of the large number of transients and military personnel it had. The *Burns* court noted

that apportioning using registered voters was permissible because of the conditions in which Hawaii found itself.

Now, what has happened since then? What has happened since then is this administration will admit that 9.2 million illegal aliens have come in under their control. They will also admit that there is another 1.8 million known got-aways. That is 11 million people that the administration will admit to have come in, in 3½ years. It has distorted the population. It skewed the one-person, one-vote standard, which is the canon upon which the commerce case was founded. It is the one-person, one-vote rule.

Our colleagues on the other side don't want to acknowledge that there is a constitutional basis, as I have just cited, to allow section 3 to go forward, but Democrats are perfectly content with California, which is a sanctuary State, hauling in people. The minority is perfectly content with New York bringing in people through sanctuary policies, or Illinois. That skews exactly what the Founders intended to make straight and clear.

Let's go to the 14th Amendment for just one second to actually read the second part of the 14th Amendment, or get to that. I am not going to read it. The first clause, that is what my colleague across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, has relied on exclusively, but he didn't bother to tell you about the second clause.

In the second clause itself, it deals with every Federal election and every State election for State Governor, judicial body, and State legislatures. What they do there in the second clause of the 14th Amendment is provide a way to reduce apportionment when those individuals may be disqualified.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are saying here. That is why this bill needs to pass, and I urge a passage.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 7109 is postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 8289;

Passage of H.J. Res. 109;

The motion to recommit H.R. 2925;

Passage of H.R. 2925, if ordered;

The motion to recommit H.R. 7109, if ordered;

Passage of H.R. 7109, if ordered; and

Motions to suspend the rules with respect to:



72 hours to review a 1,000-plus page bill, to which no amendments could be offered, rather than ensure “total transparency, open processes, and regular order.”

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON worked with Democrats to produce appropriations text, NDAA text, and other legislative items rather than with Republicans “to understand and emphasize each Member’s unique strengths” and engage with them.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON relied on majority Democrat support to pass a two-part omnibus spending bill rather than advancing a “policy agenda supported by Conference consensus.”

Whereas, on December 1, 2023, Speaker JOHNSON failed to protect the Republican majority when he allowed multiple votes to remove another Republican from the House of Representatives.

It was unprecedented for a Member to be removed from Congress by a two-thirds vote prior to conviction of a crime. To this day, the Republican expelled from the House under Speaker JOHNSON has not been convicted of a crime. Meanwhile, a Democrat now holds that seat.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON supported fully funding abortion, the trans agenda, the climate agenda, foreign wars, and Biden’s border crisis rather than ensuring “liberty, opportunity, and security for all Americans.”

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON relied on Democrat votes on at least two occasions, with the first transgression occurring on March 22, 2024, with the House passage of H. Res. 1102—part 2 of the Johnson-Schumer omnibus—and the second transgression occurring on April 20, 2024, with House passage of H.R. 8035—the \$61 billion Ukraine funding bill. On both occasions, the “majority of the majority”—112 Republicans—voted against the measures, while only 101 voted in favor.

Whereas, before Kevin McCarthy was ousted as Speaker, our Conference had passed seven appropriations bills, which were some of the strongest Conservative bills passed in decades. Speaker JOHNSON refused to continue this important process. He, instead, led us to another CR on January 18, 2024, and got it passed with the support of 207 Democrats and only 107 Republicans, while 106 Republicans voted against it.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON passed a third CR, this time calling it a “process CR,” as if that made continuing NANCY PELOSI’s budget, yet again, any different from the previous CRs.

Whereas, with little to no communication with our Conference, Speaker JOHNSON passed the first minibus appropriations bill on March 6 and passed the second minibus appropriation bill 2 weeks later on March 22.

Whereas, a two-part omnibus split into two minibuses was crammed down our throats and passed under suspension of the rules with only one day to review it.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON’s omnibus did nothing to stop Biden’s deadly border invasion—it fully funded it. Speaker JOHNSON did nothing to stop the energy-killing Green New Deal climate agenda—he fully funded it. He did nothing to stop the weaponized Department of Justice and FBI—he fully funded them. He did nothing to stop the trans agenda on kids—he fully funded it. He did nothing to stop full-term abortions—he fully funded them. He did nothing to stop the fueling of forever foreign wars—he fully funded them.

Whereas, on April 18, 2024, the Rules Committee passed H. Res. 1160—the rule providing for consideration of the \$95 billion foreign funding package—by a vote of 9-3. Notably, all Democrat Members of the committee voted to advance the measure to the floor while three Republicans opposed it. It is unprecedented for Members of the minority party to advance a resolution out of the Rules Committee. Since 1995, there have been a few instances of rules advancing out of committee with minority support. However, H. Res. 1160 is the only instance where this was done to bypass opposition from the Members of the majority party.

Whereas, the last instance an appropriations measure which passed the House failed to include a “majority of the majority” was on final passage of the fiscal year 2015 Department of Homeland Security House Appropriations bill during the 114th Congress. In the months following this failure, Speaker Boehner announced his resignation.

Whereas, in a January 26, 2024, “Dear Colleague,” Speaker JOHNSON called the Senate supplemental and border security legislation “dead on arrival in the House.” Likewise, in January 2024, Speaker JOHNSON took a trip to the U.S.-Mexico border where he said, “If President Biden wants a supplemental spending bill focused on national security, it better begin by defending America’s national security.”

Whereas, in the months following his border trip, Speaker JOHNSON introduced a \$95 billion foreign aid supplemental with no border security attached.

Whereas, excuses like “this is just how you have to govern in divided government” are pathetic, weak, and unacceptable. Even with our razor-thin Republican majority, we could have at least secured the border, with it being the number one issue in the country and the issue that is actually causing Biden to trail President Trump in poll after poll.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON’s capitulation on his promise to secure the border came on the heels of Laken Riley being brutally murdered, women and children being raped by illegal alien monsters, and our own Border Patrol and Texas National Guard being run over by hordes of military-aged illegals.

Whereas, great legislation, like H.R. 2 and the Laken Riley Act, are only

messaging bills unless we fight to enforce them in our government funding bills.

Whereas, while serving on the House Judiciary Committee, MIKE JOHNSON was a strong defender of individual liberties and was the chair of the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Limited Government. Despite his history as a defender of civil liberties, on April 12, 2024, MIKE JOHNSON cast the deciding vote against requiring a warrant for U.S. person queries of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) section 702 data.

Whereas, our Conference could have also taken out funding for abortion and the trans agenda on kids, if our own Speaker would have allowed us to offer amendments. Instead, MIKE JOHNSON worked with CHUCK SCHUMER rather than the Conference and gave Joe Biden and the Democrats everything they wanted, no different from how a Speaker HAKEEM JEFFRIES would have done.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON fully funded Special Counsel Jack Smith’s witch hunt and 91 indictments against President Trump, our Republican Presidential nominee. House Republicans could have used our power of the purse to stop this, but Speaker JOHNSON didn’t even let us try.

Whereas, Joe Biden’s weaponized DOJ is arresting a new January 6th election protestor every single day and putting nonviolent political enemies, including veterans, mothers and fathers, and grandparents in jail for years, and the fifth January 6th defendant has now committed suicide.

Whereas, our pro-life Christian Conservative Republican Speaker MIKE JOHNSON fully funded the Department of Justice as it is prosecuting and convicting peaceful pro-life activists who are facing 11 years in jail, again refusing to allow Republicans to offer amendments to stop these injustices.

Whereas, actions are the only thing that matter, and words are meaningless without following through on them. By passing the Democrats’ agenda and handcuffing Republicans’ ability to influence legislation, our elected Republican Speaker, MIKE JOHNSON, has aided and abetted the Democrats and the Biden administration in destroying our country.

Whereas, removing this uniparty Speaker will not give the Speaker’s gavel to the Democrats, which would only happen if Republicans actually vote for HAKEEM JEFFRIES. In fact, Minority Leader JEFFRIES, NANCY PELOSI, and other high-ranking Democrats have publicly stated they will save MIKE JOHNSON from a vote to vacate him. In a recent interview, Minority Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES said: “Even though we are in the minority . . . we effectively have been governing as if we were in the majority.”

Whereas, our country is nearly \$35 trillion in debt and about \$40 billion are added to the debt every day, our border is overrun by illegal invaders

and terrorists from over 160 countries, our people are being killed by the hundreds every single day by fentanyl, and MIKE JOHNSON refuses to do anything about it.

Whereas, MIKE JOHNSON is ill-equipped to handle the rigors of the job of Speaker of the House and has allowed a Uniparty—one that fuels foreign wars, tramples on civil liberties, and increases our disastrous national debt—to take complete control of the House of Representatives.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON's tenure is defined by one self-serving characteristic: When given a choice between advancing Republican priorities or allying with the Democrats to preserve his own personal power, JOHNSON regularly chooses to ally himself with Democrats.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby declared to be vacant.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY). The Chair would now recognize the gentlewoman from Georgia to offer the resolution just noticed.

Does the gentlewoman offer the resolution?

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Yes.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1209

Whereas, the House Republican Conference elected Mike Johnson on October 25, 2023, after three-and-a-half weeks of trying to decide on a new Speaker of the House.

Whereas, Mike Johnson sent the Republican Conference a letter making promises as to what type of Speaker he would be and outlining his plans going forward. Mike Johnson put forth seven tenets that would guide the Conference under his speakership:

1. Restore trust by ensuring total transparency, open processes, and regular order.

2. Advance a comprehensive policy agenda supported by Conference consensus.

3. Promote individual Members, and thus the whole team, by working to understand and emphasize each Member's unique strengths, district dynamics and challenges, and individual goals and objectives.

4. Engage Members in productive working groups to formulate solutions in key policy areas and enhance our internal communications and team building.

5. Effectively message to persuasively inform the Republican base and the American people of our policy agenda, why we are pursuing it, and how it will ensure liberty, opportunity, and security for all Americans.

6. Build and utilize external coalitions in the conservative ecosystem, including think tanks, policy groups, and other allied organizations that can contribute to our efforts.

7. Develop and grow our majority by building upon our resources and expanding the base to successfully advance our conservative vision and agenda.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson has not lived up to a single one of his self-imposed tenets.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson allowed the Conference only one day, rather than 72 hours, to review a 1000-plus page bill to which no amendments could be offered, rather than "ensure total transparency, open processes, and regular order."

Whereas, Speaker Johnson worked with Democrats to produce appropriations texts,

NDAA text, and other legislative items, rather than with Republicans "to understand and emphasize each Member's unique strengths and [engage with] them."

Whereas, Speaker Johnson relied on majority Democrat support to pass a two-part omnibus spending bill, rather than "advancing a policy agenda supported by Conference consensus."

Whereas, on December 1, 2023, Speaker Johnson failed to protect the Republican majority when he allowed multiple votes to remove another Republican from the House of Representatives. It was unprecedented for a Member to be removed from Congress by a two-thirds vote prior to conviction of a crime. To this day, the Republican expelled from the House under Speaker Johnson has not been convicted of a crime. Meanwhile, a Democrat now holds that seat.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson supported fully funding abortion, the trans agenda, the climate agenda, foreign wars, and Biden's border crisis, rather than "ensuring liberty, opportunity, and security for all Americans."

Whereas, Speaker Johnson relied on Democrat votes on at least two occasions, with the first transgression occurring on March 22, 2024, with House passage of H. Res. 1102—Part 2 of the Johnson/Schumer omnibus—and the second transgression occurring on April 20, 2024, with House passage of H.R. 8035—the 61-billion-dollar Ukraine funding bill. On both occasions, the "majority of the majority"—112 Republicans—voted against the measures, while only 101 voted in favor.

Whereas, before Kevin McCarthy was ousted as Speaker, our Conference had passed seven appropriations bills, which were some of the strongest conservative bills passed in decades. Speaker Johnson refused to continue this important process. He instead led us to another CR on January 18, 2024, and got it passed with the support of 207 Democrats and only 107 Republicans, while 06 Republicans voted against it.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson passed a third CR, this time calling it a "process CR," as if that made continuing Nancy Pelosi's budget yet again any different from the previous CRs.

Whereas, with little to no communication with our conference, Speaker Johnson passed the first minibus appropriations bill on March 6, and passed the second minibus appropriations bill two weeks later, on March 22.

Whereas, a two-part omnibus, split into two minibuses, was crammed down our throats and passed under suspension of the rules, with only one day to review it.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson's omnibus did nothing to stop Biden's deadly border invasion—it fully funded it. Mike Johnson did nothing to stop the energy-killing Green New Deal climate agenda—he fully funded it. He did nothing to stop the weaponized DOJ and FBI—he fully funded them. He did nothing to stop the trans agenda on kids—he fully funded it. He did nothing to stop full term abortions—he fully funded them. He did nothing to stop the fueling of foreign forever wars—he fully funded them.

Whereas, on April 18, 2024, the Rules Committee passed H. Res. 1160—the rule providing for consideration of the 95-billion-dollar foreign funding package—by a vote of 9 to 3. Notably, all Democrat members of the Committee voted to advance the measure to the floor while three Republicans opposed it. It is unprecedented for members of the minority party to advance a resolution out of the Rules Committee. Since 1995, there have been a few instances of rules advancing out of Committee with minority support; however, H. Res. 1160 is the only instance where this was done to bypass opposition from members of the majority party.

Whereas, the last instance an appropriations measure which passed the House failed to include a "majority of the majority" was on final passage of the FY2015 Department of Homeland Security House appropriations bill during the 114th Congress. In the months following this failure, Speaker Boehner announced his resignation.

Whereas, in a January 26, 2024, "Dear Colleague," Speaker Johnson called the Senate supplemental and border security legislation, "dead on arrival in the House." Likewise, in January 2024, Speaker Johnson took a trip to the U.S.-Mexico border where he said, "If President Biden wants a supplemental spending bill focused on national security, it better begin by defending America's national security."

Whereas, in the months following his border trip, Speaker Johnson introduced a 95-billion-dollar foreign aid supplemental with no border security attached.

Whereas, excuses like, "this is just how you have to govern in divided government," are pathetic, weak, and unacceptable. Even with our razor-thin Republican majority, we could have at least secured the border, with it being the number one issue in the country, and the issue that is causing Biden to trail President Trump in poll after poll.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson's capitulation on his promise to secure the border came on the heels of Laken Riley being brutally murdered, women and children being raped by illegal alien monsters, and our own Border Patrol and Texas National Guard being run over by hordes of military-aged illegals.

Whereas, great legislation like H.R. 2 and the Laken Riley Act are only messaging bills unless we fight to enforce them in our government funding bills.

Whereas, while serving on the House Judiciary Committee, Mike Johnson was a strong defender of individual liberties and was the Chair of the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Limited Government. Despite his history as a defender of civil liberties, on April 12, 2024, Mike Johnson cast the deciding vote against requiring a warrant for U.S. person queries of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Section 702 data.

Whereas, our Conference could have also taken out funding for abortion and the trans agenda on kids if our own Speaker would have allowed us to offer amendments. Instead, Mike Johnson worked with Chuck Schumer rather than with the Conference, and gave Joe Biden and the Democrats everything they wanted—no different from how a Speaker Hakeem Jeffries would have done.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson fully funded Special Counsel Jack Smith's witch hunt and 91 indictments against President Trump, our Republican Presidential nominee. House Republicans could have used our power of the purse to stop this, but Speaker Johnson didn't even let us try.

Whereas, Joe Biden's weaponized DOJ is arresting a new January 6th election protestor every single day and putting nonviolent political enemies, including veterans, mothers and fathers, and grandparents in jail for years.

Whereas, our pro-life Christian conservative Republican Speaker Mike Johnson fully funded the DOJ as it is prosecuting and convicting peaceful pro-life activists who are facing eleven years in jail, again refusing to allow Republicans to offer amendments to stop these injustices.

Whereas, actions are the only thing that matter, and words are meaningless without following through on them. By passing the Democrats' agenda and handcuffing Republicans' ability to influence legislation, our elected Republican Speaker Mike Johnson has aided and abetted the Democrats and the Biden administration in destroying our country.

Whereas, removing this Uniparty Speaker will not give the Speaker's gavel to the Democrats, which would only happen if Republicans actually vote for Hakeem Jeffries. In fact, Minority Leader Jeffries, Nancy Pelosi, and other high-ranking Democrats have publicly stated they will save Mike Johnson from a vote to vacate him. In a recent interview, Minority Leader Hakeem Jeffries said, "Even though we're in the minority . . . We effectively have been governing as if we were in the majority."

Whereas, our country is nearly 35 trillion dollars in debt, and about 40 billion dollars are added to the debt every day. Our border is overrun by illegal invaders and terrorists from over 160 countries. Our people are being killed by the hundreds every single day by fentanyl. And Mike Johnson refuses to do anything about it.

Whereas, Mike Johnson is ill-equipped to handle the rigors of the job of Speaker of the House and has allowed a Uniparty—one that fuels foreign wars, tramples on civil liberties, and increases our disastrous national debt—to take complete control of the House of Representatives.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson's tenure is defined by one self-serving characteristic: When given a choice between advancing Republican priorities or allying with Democrats to preserve his own personal power, Johnson regularly chooses to ally himself with Democrats.

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby declared to be vacant.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. MASSIE. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

#### MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Scalise of Louisiana moves to lay the resolution on the table.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 359, nays 43, answered "present" 7, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—359

Adams	Armstrong	Barr
Aderholt	Arrington	Bean (FL)
Aguilar	Auchincloss	Beatty
Alford	Babin	Bentz
Allen	Bacon	Bera
Allred	Baird	Bergman
Amo	Balderson	Beyer
Amodei	Balint	Bice

Bilirakis	Gonzales, Tony	Meng	Swalwell	Underwood
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez, Vicente	Meuser	Sykes	Webster (FL)
Bishop (NC)	Good (VA)	Mfume	Tenney	Wenstrup
Blumenauer	Gooden (TX)	Miller (IL)	Thanedar	Westerman
Blunt Rochester	Gottheimer	Miller (OH)	Thompson (CA)	Van Orden
Boebert	Miller (WV)	Miller-Meeks	Thompson (PA)	Wild
Bonamici	Graves (LA)	Tiffany	Vargas	Williams (NY)
Bost	Graves (MO)	Mills	Timmons	Williams (TX)
Boyle (PA)	Green (TN)	Molinaro	Titus	Wilson (FL)
Brecheen	Green, Al (TX)	Moolenaar	Tonko	Wilson (SC)
Brown	Griffith	Moore (UT)	Torres (NY)	Wittman
Brownley	Grothman	Moore (WI)	Trahan	Womack
Buchanan	Guest	Moran	Trone	Yakym
Buchanon	Guthrie	Morelle	Turner	Zinke

#### NAYS—43

Budzinski	Harris	Moskowitz	Barragán	Garamendi
Burchett	Harshbarger	Moulton	Biggs	Garcia (TX)
Calvert	Hayes	Mrvan	Bowman	Garcia, Robert
Cammack	Hern	Murphy	Burlison	Gomez
Caraveo	Higgins (LA)	Nadler	Castro (TX)	Harder (CA)
Carbalaj	Hill	Napolitano	Clarke (NY)	Jackson (IL)
Cárdenas	Himes	Neal	Connolly	Jayapal
Carey	Hinson	Neguse	Crane	Kamlager-Dove
Carl	Horsford	Nehls	Davidson	Lee (CA)
Carter (GA)	Houchin	Newhouse	DeGette	Lee (PA)
Carter (LA)	Houlihan	Nickel	Doggett	Massie
Cartwright	Hoyer	Norcross	Escobar	Menendez
Case	Hoyle (OR)	Norman	Frost	Williams (GA)
Casten	Hudson	Nunn (IA)		
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Obernolte		
Chavez-DeRemer	Huizenga	Ogles		
Cherifius	Hunt	Owens		
McCormick	Issa	Pallone		
Ciscomani	Ivey	Palmer		
Clark (MA)	Jackson (NC)	Panetta		
Cline	Jackson (TX)	Pappas		
Cloud	James	Pascrall		
Clyburn	Jeffries	Pelosi		
Clyde	Johnson (GA)	Peltola		
Cohen	Johnson (LA)	Pence		
Collins	Johnson (SD)	Perez		
Comer	Jordan	Perry		
Correa	Joyce (OH)	Peters		
Costa	Joyce (PA)	Pettersen		
Courtney	Kaptur	Pfluger		
Craig	Kean (NJ)	Phillips		
Crawford	Keating	Pingree		
Crenshaw	Kelly (IL)	Porter		
Crockett	Kelly (MS)	Posey		
Crow	Kelly (PA)	Quigley		
Cuellar	Kennedy	Raskin		
Curtis	Khanna	Reschenthaler		
D'Esposito	Kiggans (VA)	Rodgers (WA)		
Davids (KS)	Kildee	Rogers (AL)		
Davis (IL)	Kiley	Rogers (KY)		
Davis (NC)	Kilmer	Rose		
De La Cruz	Kim (CA)	Rosendale		
Dean (PA)	Kim (NJ)	Ross		
DeLauro	Krishnamoorthi	Rouzer		
DelBene	Kuster	Ruiz		
Deluzio	Kustoff	Ruppersberger		
DeSaulnier	LaHood	Rutherford		
DesJarlais	LaLota	Salazar		
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Salinas		
Dingell	Langworthy	Sánchez		
Donalds	Larsen (WA)	Barbanes		
Duarte	Larson (CT)	Scalise		
Duncan	Latta	Sciff		
Dunn (FL)	LaTurner	Schneider		
Edwards	Lawler	Scholten		
Ellzey	Lee (FL)	Schrir		
Emmer	Lee (NV)	Schweikert		
Eshoo	Leger Fernandez	Scott (VA)		
Espaillet	Lesko	Scott, Austin		
Estes	Letlow	Scott, David		
Evans	Levin	Self		
Ezell	Lieu	Sewell		
Fallon	Loftgren	Sherman		
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Sherrill		
Ferguson	Lucas	Simpson		
Finstad	Luettkemeyer	Slotkin		
Fischbach	Luttrell	Smith (MO)		
Fitzgerald	Lynch	Smith (NE)		
Fitzpatrick	Mace	Smith (NJ)		
Fleischmann	Malliotakis	Smith (WA)		
Fletcher	Maloy	Smucker		
Finstad	Mann	Sorensen		
Foster	Manning	Soto		
Fox	Mast	Spanberger		
Frankel, Lois	Matsui	Stansbury		
Franklin, Scott	McBath	Stanton		
Fry	McClain	Stauber		
	Fulcher	McClellan	Steel	
	Gaetz	McClintock	Stefanik	
	Gallego	McCullom	Steil	
	Garbarino	McCormick	Steube	
	Garcia, Mike	McGarvey	Stevens	
	Gimenez	McGovern	Strickland	
	Golden (ME)	McHenry	Strong	
	Bice	Meeks	Suozzi	

Swalwell Valadao Tenney Van Duyne Van Orden Wild Williams (NY) Williams (TX) Wilson (FL) Wenstrup Westerman Wexton Wild Williams (NY) Williams (TX) Wilson (SC) Wittman Yakym Zinke

Underwood Webster (FL) Webster (AL) Ocasio-Cortez Pressley Ramirez Ramire

Moore (AL) Garcia (TX) Garcia, Robert Garamendi Gómez Casar Greene (GA) Harder (CA) Jackson (IL) Spartz Tlaib Velázquez

Scanlon Watson Coleman Frost Mooney Luna Magaziner McCaul Sessions Thompson (MS) Tokuda

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Chu Pocan Torres (CA) Garcia (IL) Schakowsky Omar Takano

#### NOT VOTING—21

Banks	Granger	Luna
Burgess	Grijalva	Magaziner
Carson	Hageman	McCaul
Carter (TX)	Jackson Lee	Mullin
Cleaver	Jacobs	Sessions
Cole	LaMalfa	Thompson (MS)
Foushee	Landsman	Tokuda

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

#### □ 1743

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote No. 188 on the motion to table H. Res. 1209, I mistakenly recorded my vote as YEA when I should have voted NAY.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION RELATING TO "STAFF ACCOUNTING BULLETIN NO. 121"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) 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", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 182, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Gaetz	Moore (A)
Alford	Gallego	Moore (U)
Allen	Garbarino	Moran
Amodei	Garcia, Mike	Moskow
Armstrong	Gimenez	Moulton
Arrington	Gonzales, Tony	Murphy
Auchincloss	Good (VA)	Nehls
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Newhouse
Bacon	Gosar	Nickel
Baird	Gottheimer	Norman
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Nunn (L)
Barr	Graves (MO)	Obernolz
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Ogles
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Owens
Bergman	Griffith	Palmer
Bice	Grothman	Pappas
Biggs	Guest	Pence
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Pfluger
Boebert	Harshbarger	Phillips
Bost	Hern	Posey
Boyle (PA)	Higgins (LA)	Reschen
Brecheen	Hill	Rodgers
Buchanan	Hinson	Rogers (C)
Bucshon	Houchin	Rogers (O)
Burchett	Houlahan	Rose
Burlison	Hudson	Rosendahl
Calvert	Huizenaga	Rouzer
Cammack	Hunt	Roy
Caraveo	Issa	Rutherford
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Salazar
Carl	James	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Chavez-DeRemer	Jordan	Scott, A.
Ciscomani	Joyce (OH)	Self
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Sherrill
Cloud	Kean (NJ)	Simpson
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Slotkin
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Smith (D)
Collins	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (I)
Comer	Kiley	Smith (R)
Costa	Kim (CA)	Smuckler
Craig	Kustoff	Soto
Crane	LaHood	Spartz
Crawford	LaLota	Stauber
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Steel
Cuellar	Langworthy	Stefanik
Curtis	Latta	Steil
D'Esposito	LaTurner	Steube
Davidson	Lawler	Strong
Davis (NC)	Lee (FL)	Swalwell
De La Cruz	Lesko	Tenney
DesJarlais	Letlow	Thompson
Diaz-Balart	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Donalds	Lucas	Timmons
Duarte	Luetkemeyer	Torres (C)
Duncan	Luttrell	Turner
Dunn (FL)	Mace	Valadao
Edwards	Malliotakis	Van Drew
Ellzey	Maloy	Van Duyne
Emmer	Mann	Van Orden
Estes	Massie	Veasey
Ezell	Mast	Wagner
Fallon	McClain	Walberg
Feeenstra	McClintock	Waltz
Ferguson	McCormick	Weber (C)
Finstad	McHenry	Webster
Fischbach	Meuser	Wenstrup
Fitzgerald	Miller (IL)	Western
Fitzpatrick	Miller (OH)	Williams
Fleischmann	Miller (WV)	Williams
Flood	Miller-Meeks	Wilson (D)
Foxx	Mills	Wittman
Franklin, Scott	Molinaro	Womack
Fry	Moolenaar	Yakym
Fulcher	Mooney	Zinke

NAYS—182

Adams	Carbajal	Courtney
Aguilar	Cárdenas	Crockett
Allred	Carter (LA)	Crow
Amo	Cartwright	Davids (KS)
Balint	Casar	Davis (IL)
Barragán	Case	Dean (PA)
Beatty	Casten	DeGette
Bera	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Beyer	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Bishop (GA)	Cherfilus-	Deluzio
Blumenauer	McCormick	DeSaulnier
Blunt Rochester	Chu	Dingell
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Bowman	Clarke (NY)	Escobar
Brown	Clyburn	Eshoo
Brownley	Cohen	Espallat
Budzinski	Connolly	Evans
Bush	Correa	Fletcher

Foster	Lieu	Salinas
Frankel, Lois	Lofgren	Sánchez
Frost	Lynch	Sarbanes
Garamendi	Manning	Scanlon
Garcia (IL)	Matsui	Schakows
Garcia (TX)	McBath	Schiff
Garcia, Robert	McClellan	Schneider
Golden (ME)	McCollum	Scholten
Goldman (NY)	McGarvey	Schrier
Gomez	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Gonzalez,	Meeks	Scott, Dav
Vicente	Menendez	Sewell
Green, Al (TX)	Meng	Sherman
Harder (CA)	Mfume	Smith (W.)
Hayes	Moore (WI)	Sorensen
Himes	Morelle	Spanberger
Horsford	Mrvan	Stansbury
Hoyer	Mullin	Stanton
Hoyle (OR)	Nadler	Stevens
Huffman	Napolitano	Strickland
Ivey	Neal	Suozzi
Jackson (IL)	Neguse	Sykes
Jackson (NC)	Norcross	Takano
Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez	Thanedar
Jeffries	Omar	Thompson
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Titus
Kamlager-Dove	Panetta	Tlaib
Kaptur	Pascrall	Tonko
Keating	Pelosi	Torres (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Peltola	Trahan
Kennedy	Perez	Throne
Khanna	Peters	Underwood
Kildee	Petersen	Vargas
Kilmer	Pingree	Vasquez
Kim (NJ)	Pocan	Velázquez
Krishnamoorthi	Porter	Wasserman
Kuster	Pressley	Schultz
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Waters
Larson (CT)	Ramirez	Watson
Lee (CA)	Raskin	Wexton
Lee (NV)	Ross	Wild
Lee (PA)	Ruiz	Williams
Leger Fernandez	Ruppersberger	Wilson (F)
Levin	Ryan	

### NOT VOTING—19

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1749

So the joint resolution 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.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The

question is on the motion

This is a 5-minute vote.  
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 203, nays 208, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—203

s	Golden (ME)	Pappas
ar	Goldman (NY)	Pascrell
l	Gomez	Pelosi
ncloss	Gonzalez,	Peltola
t	Vicente	Perez
gán	Gottheimer	Peters
y	Green, Al (TX)	Pettersen
p (GA)	Harder (CA)	Phillips
neauer	Hayes	Pingree
Rochester	Himes	Pocan
nici	Horsford	Porter
nan	Houlahan	Pressley
(PA)	Hoyer	Quigley
iley	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
nski	Huffman	Raskin
right	Ivey	Ross
er (LA)	Jackson (IL)	Ruiz
right	Jackson (NC)	Ruppersberger
n	Jayapal	Ryan
r (FL)	Jeffries	Salinas
o (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez
llus	Kamager-Dove	Sarbanes
Cormick	Kaptur	Scanlon
(MA)	Keating	Schakowsky
e (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
rn	Kennedy	Schneider
lly	Khanna	Scholten
a	Kildee	Schrier
ney	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
ett	Kim (NJ)	Scott, David
ar	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell
s (KS)	Kuster	Sherman
(IL)	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
(NC)	Larson (CT)	Slotkin
(PA)	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
ette	Lee (NV)	Sorensen
uro	Lee (PA)	Soto
one	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
io	Levin	Stansbury
mlnier	Lieu	Stanton
ll	Lofgren	Stevens
ar	Lynch	Strickland
ett	Manning	Suozzi
l	Matsui	Swalwell
orelle	McBath	Sykes
McClellan	McClellan	Takano
(NC)	McCollum	Thanedar
ette	McGarvey	Thompson (CA)
uro	McGovern	Titus
one	Meeks	Tlaib
io	Menendez	Tonko
Mfume	Meng	Torres (CA)
Moore (WI)	Moore (WI)	Torres (NY)
Morelle	Morette	Trahan
Moskowitz	Moskowitz	Trone
Moulton	Moulton	Underwood
Mrvan	Mrvan	Vargas
Mullin	Mullin	Vasquez
Nadler	Nadler	Veasey
Napolitano	Napolitano	Velázquez
Neal	Neal	Wasserman
Neguse	Neguse	Schultz
Nickel	Nickel	Waters
Norcross	Norcross	Watson Colema
Ocasio-Cortez	Ocasio-Cortez	Wexton
Omar	Omar	Wild
Pallone	Pallone	Williams (GA)
Panetta	Panetta	Wilson (FL)
NAYS—208		
holt	Calvert	Dunn (FL)
l	Cammack	Edwards
ei	Carey	Ellzey
strong	Carl	Emmer
ton	Carter (GA)	Estes
	Chavez-DeRemer	Ezell
	Ciscomani	Fallon
	Cline	Feenstra
	Cloud	Ferguson
	Clyde	Finstad
	Cole	Fischbach
	Collins	Fitzgerald
	Comer	Fitzpatrick
	Crane	Fleischmann
	Crawford	Flood
	Crenshaw	Foxx
	Curtis	Franklin, Scot
	D'Esposito	Fry
	Davidson	Fulcher
	De La Cruz	Gaetz
	DesJarlais	Garbarino
	Diaz-Balart	Garcia, Mike
	Donalds	Gimenez
	Duarte	Gonzales, Tony
	Duncan	Good (VA)



Strike section 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Right to Contraception Act”.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) CONTRACEPTION.—The term “contraception” means an action taken to prevent pregnancy, including the use of contraceptives or fertility-awareness-based methods and sterilization procedures.

(2) CONTRACEPTIVE.—The term “contraceptive” means any drug, device, or biological product intended for use in the prevention of pregnancy, whether specifically intended to prevent pregnancy or for other health needs, that is approved, cleared, authorized, or licensed under section 505, 510(k), 513(f)(2), 515, or 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355, 360(k), 360c(f)(2), 360e, 360bbb-3) or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

(3) GOVERNMENT.—The term “government” includes each branch, department, agency, instrumentality, and official of the United States or a State.

(4) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—The term “health care provider” means any entity or individual (including any physician, certified nurse-midwife, nurse, nurse practitioner, physician assistant, and pharmacist) that is licensed or otherwise authorized by a State to provide health care services.

(5) STATE.—The term “State” includes each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and each territory and possession of the United States, and any political subdivision of any of the foregoing, including any unit of local government, such as a county, city, town, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State.

**SEC. 3. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The right to contraception is a fundamental right, central to an individual’s privacy, health, well-being, dignity, liberty, equality, and ability to participate in the social and economic life of the Nation.

(2) The Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized the constitutional right to contraception.

(3) In *Griswold v. Connecticut* (381 U.S. 479 (1965)), the Supreme Court first recognized the constitutional right for married people to use contraceptives.

(4) In *Eisenstadt v. Baird* (405 U.S. 438 (1972)), the Supreme Court confirmed the constitutional right of all people to legally access contraceptives regardless of marital status.

(5) In *Carey v. Population Services International* (431 U.S. 678 (1977)), the Supreme Court affirmed the constitutional right to contraceptives for minors.

(6) The right to contraception has been repeatedly recognized internationally as a human right. The United Nations Population Fund has published several reports outlining family planning as a basic human right that advances women’s health, economic empowerment, and equality.

(7) Access to contraceptives is internationally recognized by the World Health Organization as advancing other human rights such as the right to life, liberty, expression, health, work, and education.

(8) Contraception is safe, essential health care, and access to contraceptive products and services is central to people’s ability to participate equally in economic and social life in the United States and globally. Contraception allows people to make decisions about their families and their lives.

(9) Contraception is key to sexual and reproductive health. Contraception is critical

to preventing unintended pregnancy, and many contraceptives are highly effective in preventing and treating a wide array of medical conditions and decrease the risk of certain cancers.

(10) Contraception has been associated with improved health outcomes for women, their families, and their communities and reduces rates of maternal and infant mortality and morbidity.

(11) The United States has a long history of reproductive coercion, including the child-bearing forced upon enslaved women, as well as the forced sterilization of Black women, Puerto Rican women, indigenous women, immigrant women, and disabled women, and reproductive coercion continues to occur. This history also includes the coercive testing of contraceptive pills on women and girls in Puerto Rico.

(12) The right to make personal decisions about contraceptive use is important for all Americans, and is especially critical for historically marginalized groups, including Black, indigenous, and other people of color; immigrants; LGBTQ+ people; people with disabilities; people paid low wages; and people living in rural and underserved areas.

(13) Many people who are part of the marginalized groups described in paragraph (12) already face barriers, exacerbated by social, political, economic, and environmental inequities, to comprehensive health care, including reproductive health care, that reduce their ability to make decisions about their health, families, and lives.

(14) State and Federal policies governing pharmaceutical and insurance policies affect the accessibility of contraceptives and the settings in which contraception services are delivered.

(15) People engage in interstate commerce to access contraception services.

(16) To provide contraception services, health care providers employ and obtain commercial services from doctors, nurses, and other personnel who engage in interstate commerce and travel across State lines.

(17) Congress has the authority to enact this Act to protect access to contraception pursuant to—

(A) its powers under the Commerce Clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States;

(B) its powers under section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enforce the provisions of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment; and

(C) its powers under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

(18) Congress has used its authority in the past to protect and expand access to contraception information, products, and services.

(19) In 1970, Congress established the family planning program under title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300 et seq.), the only Federal grant program dedicated to family planning and related services, providing access to information, products, and services for contraception.

(20) In 1972, Congress required the Medicaid program to cover family planning services and supplies and the Medicaid program currently accounts for 75 percent of Federal funds spent on family planning.

(21) In 2010, Congress enacted the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) (referred to in this section as the “ACA”). Among other provisions, the ACA included provisions to expand the affordability and accessibility of contraception by requiring health insurance plans to provide coverage for preventive services with no patient cost-sharing.

(22) As of June 2023, at least 4 States tried to ban access to some or all contraceptives

by restricting access to public funding for these products and services. Furthermore, Arkansas, Mississippi, Missouri, and Texas have infringed on people’s ability to access their contraceptive care by violating the free choice of provider requirement under the Medicaid program.

(23) Providers’ refusals to offer contraceptives and information related to contraception based on their own personal beliefs impede patients from obtaining their preferred method of contraception, with laws in 12 States as of the date of introduction of this Act specifically allowing health care providers to refuse to provide services related to contraception.

(24) States have attempted to define abortion expansively so as to include contraceptives in State bans on abortion and have also restricted access to emergency contraception.

(25) Justice Thomas, in his concurring opinion in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization* (142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022)), stated that the Supreme Court “should reconsider all of this Court’s substantive due process precedents, including *Griswold*, *Lawrence*, and *Obergefell*” and that the Court has “a duty to correct the error established in those precedents” by overruling them.

(26) In order to further public health and to combat efforts to restrict access to reproductive health care, congressional action is necessary to protect access to contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception for everyone, regardless of actual or perceived race, ethnicity, sex (including gender identity and sexual orientation), income, disability, national origin, immigration status, or geography.

**SEC. 4. PURPOSES.**

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to provide a clear and comprehensive right to contraception;

(2) to permit individuals to seek and obtain contraceptives and engage in contraception, and to permit health care providers to facilitate that care; and

(3) to protect an individual’s ability to make decisions about their body, medical care, family, and life’s course, and thereby protect the individual’s ability to participate equally in the economic and social life of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 203, nays 207, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—203

Adams	Blunt Rochester	Cartwright
Aguilar	Bonamici	Casar
Allred	Bowman	Case
Amo	Boyle (PA)	Casten
Auchincloss	Brown	Castor (FL)
Balint	Brownley	Castro (TX)
Barragán	Budzinski	Cherifius
Beatty	Bush	McCormick
Bera	Caraveo	Chu
Beyer	Carbajal	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Clarke (NY)
	Blumenauer	Clyburn
	Carter (LA)	

Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Quigley	Loudermilk	Nunn (IA)	Stauber	Gooden (TX)	Letlow	Rouzer
Connolly	Kennedy	Ramirez	Lucas	Obernolte	Steel	Gosar	Loudermilk	Roy
Correa	Khanna	Raskin	Luetkemeyer	Ogles	Stefanik	Graves (LA)	Lucas	Rutherford
Costa	Kildee	Ross	Luttrell	Owens	Steil	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer	Salazar
Courtney	Kilmer	Ruiz	Mace	Palmer	Steube	Green (TN)	Luttrell	Scalise
Craig	Kim (NJ)	Ruppersberger	Malliotakis	Pence	Strong	Greene (GA)	Mace	Schweikert
Crockett	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan	Maloy	Perry	Tenney	Griffith	Malliotakis	Scott, Austin
Crow	Kuster	Salinas	Mann	Pfluger	Thompson (PA)	Grothman	Maloy	Self
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez	Massie	Posey	Tiffany	Guest	Mann	Simpson
Davids (KS)	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes	Mast	Reschenthaler	Timmons	Guthrie	Massie	Smith (MO)
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Scanlon	McClain	Rodgers (WA)	Turner	Harris	Mast	Smith (NE)
Davis (NC)	Lee (NV)	Schakowsky	McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Valadao	Harshbarger	McClain	Smith (NJ)
Dean (PA)	Lee (PA)	Schiff	McCormick	Rogers (KY)	Van Drew	Hern	McClintock	Smucker
DeGette	Leger Fernandez	Schneider	Meuser	Rose	Van Duyne	Higgins (LA)	McCormick	Spartz
DeLauro	Levin	Scholten	Miller (IL)	Rosendale	Van Orden	Hill	Meuser	Stauber
DelBene	Lieu	Schriner	Miller (OH)	Rouzer	Wagner	Hinson	Miller (IL)	Steel
Deluzio	Lofgren	Scott (VA)	Miller (WV)	Roy	Walberg	Houchin	Miller (OH)	Stefanik
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Scott, David	Miller-Meeks	Rutherford	Waltz	Hudson	Miller (WV)	Steil
Dingell	Manning	Mills	Salazar	Weber (TX)	Huizinga	Miller-Meeks	Weber (TX)	Steube
Doggett	Matsui	Sewell	Molinaro	Scalise	Webster (FL)	Hunt	Mills	Strong
Escobar	McBath	Sherman	Moolenaar	Schweikert	Wenstrup	Issa	Molinaro	Tenney
Eshoo	McClellan	Sherrill	Mooney	Scott, Austin	Westerman	Jackson (TX)	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)
Espaillat	McCollum	Slotkin	Moore (AL)	Self	Williams (NY)	James	Mooney	Tiffany
Evans	McGarvey	Smith (WA)	Moore (UT)	Simpson	Williams (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Moore (AL)	Timmons
Fletcher	McGovern	Sorensen	Moran	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)	Johnson (SD)	Moore (UT)	Turner
Foster	Meeks	Soto	Murphy	Smith (NE)	Wittman	Jordan	Moran	Valadao
Frankel, Lois	Menendez	Spanberger	Nehls	Smith (NJ)	Womack	Joyce (OH)	Nehls	Van Drew
Frost	Meng	Stansbury	Newhouse	Smucker	Yakym	Joyce (PA)	Newhouse	Van Duyne
Gallego	Mfume	Stanton	Norman	Spartz	Zinke	Kean (NJ)	Norman	Van Orden
Garamendi	Moore (WI)	Stevens				Kelly (MS)	Nunn (IA)	Wagner
Garcia (IL)	Morelle	Strickland				Kelly (PA)	Obernolte	Walberg
Garcia (TX)	Moskowitz	Suozzi	Banks	Grijalva	Magaziner	Kiggans (VA)	Ogles	Waltz
Garcia, Robert	Moulton	Swalwell	Burgess	Hageman	McCaull	Kiley	Owens	Weber (TX)
Golden (ME)	Mrvan	Sykes	Carson	Jackson Lee	McHenry	Kim (CA)	Palmer	Webster (FL)
Goldman (NY)	Mullin	Takano	Carter (TX)	Jacobs	Sessions	Kustoff	Pence	Wenstrup
Gomez	Nadler	Thanedar	Cleaver	LaMalfa	Thompson (MS)	LaHood	Perry	Westerman
Gonzalez,	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)	Foushee	Landsman	Tokuda	LaLota	Pfluger	Williams (NY)
Vicente	Neal	Titus	Granger	Luna		Lamborn	Posey	Williams (TX)
Gottheimer	Neguse	Tlaib				Langworthy	Reschenthaler	Wilson (SC)
Green, Al (TX)	Nickel	Tonko				Latta	Rodgers (WA)	Wittman
Harder (CA)	Norcross	Torres (CA)				LaTurner	Rogers (AL)	Womack
Hayes	Ocasio-Cortez	Torres (NY)				Lawler	Rogers (KY)	Yakym
Himes	Omar	Trahan				Lee (FL)	Rose	Rosendale
Horsford	Pallone	Trone						Zinke
Houlahan	Panetta	Underwood						
Hoyer	Pappas	Vargas						
Hoyle (OR)	Pascrell	Vasquez						
Huffman	Pelosi	Veasey						
Ivey	Peltola	Velázquez						
Jackson (IL)	Perez	Wasserman						
Jackson (NC)	Peters	Schultz						
Jayapal	Pettersen	Waterson						
Jeffries	Phillips	Watson Coleman						
Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Wexton						
Kamlager-Dove	Pocan	Wild						
Kaptur	Porter	Williams (GA)						
Keating	Pressley	Wilson (FL)						

## NAYS—207

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

## NOT VOTING—20

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

## □ 1809

Ms. DE LA CRUZ changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 202, not voting 22, as follows:

## [Roll No. 193]

## YEAS—206

Aderholt	Calvert	Dunn (FL)	Castor (FL)	Hoyer
Alford	Cammack	Edwards	Castro (TX)	Hoyle (OR)
Allen	Carrey	Ellzey	Cherilus-	Huffman
Amodei	Carl	Emmer	McCormick	Ivey
Armstrong	Carlyle	Estes	Chu	Jackson (IL)
Arrington	Chavez-DeRemer	Ezell	Clark (MA)	Jackson (NC)
Babin	Ciscomani	Fallon	Clarke (NY)	Pelosi
Bacon	Bacon	Cline	Clyburn	Pallone
Baird	Cloud	Feenstra	Cohen	Panetta
Balderson	Clyde	Ferguson	Connolly	Patterson
Barr	Cole	Finstad	Correa	Kaptur
Bean (FL)	Fischbach	Fitzgerald	Costa	Keating
Bentz	Collins	Fitzgerald	Courtney	Kelly (IL)
Bergman	Comer	Fitzpatrick	Craig	Kennedy
Bice	Crane	Fleischmann	Crockett	Khanna
Biggs	Crawford	Flood	DeGette	Pressley
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Foxx	Cuellar	Kilmer
Bishop (NC)	Dickinson	Garcia, Mike	Franklin, Scott	Ramirez
Boebert	Donalds	Gimenez	Davids (KS)	Raskin
Bost	Duarte	Gosar	Fry	Ross
Brecheen	Fugate	Good (IL)	Davidson	Ruster
Buchanan	Gutierrez	Gooden (TX)	Fulcher	Larsen (WA)
Bucshon	Hawkins	Goodwin	De La Cruz	Ruiz
Burchett	Hawkins	Goodwin	Gaetz	Larson (CT)
Burlison	Hawkins	Goodwin	Dean (PA)	Ruppersberger
Calvert	Hawkins	Goodwin	Lee (CA)	Ryan
Cammack	Hawkins	Goodwin	DeLauro	Salinas
Carey	Hawkins	Goodwin	Lee (NV)	Sánchez
Carl	Hawkins	Goodwin	Lee (PA)	Sarbanes
Carter (GA)	Hawkins	Goodwin	Letlow	
Chavez-DeRemer	Hawkins	Goodwin		
Ciscomani	Hawkins	Goodwin		
Cline	Hawkins	Goodwin		
Cloud	Hawkins	Goodwin		
Clyde	Hawkins	Goodwin		
Cole	Hawkins	Goodwin		
Collins	Hawkins	Goodwin		
Comer	Hawkins	Goodwin		
Crane	Hawkins	Goodwin		
Crawford	Hawkins	Goodwin		

Scanlon	Stansbury	Trone	Bean (FL)	Flood	Lieu	Schiff	Stefanik	Van Orden
Schakowsky	Stanton	Underwood	Beatty	Foster	Lofgren	Schneider	Steil	Vargas
Schiff	Stevens	Vargas	Benzt	Frankel, Lois	Loudermilk	Scholten	Steube	Vasquez
Schneider	Strickland	Vasquez	Bera	Franklin, Scott	Lucas	Schriner	Stevens	Veasey
Scholten	Suozzi	Veasey	Bergman	Frost	Luttrell	Schweikert	Strickland	Velázquez
Schrirer	Swalwell	Velázquez	Beyer	Fry	Lynch	Scott (VA)	Strong	Wagner
Scott (VA)	Sykes	Wasserman	Bice	Fulcher	Mace	Scott, Austin	Suozzi	Walberg
Scott, David	Takano	Schultz	Bilirakis	Gaetz	Mailiotakis	Scott, David	Swalwell	Waltz
Sewell	Thanedar	Waters	Bishop (GA)	Gallego	Maloy	Self	Sykes	Wasserman
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman	Bishop (NC)	Garamendi	Mann	Sewell	Takano	Schultz
Sherrill	Titus	Wexton	Blumenauer	Garbarino	Manning	Sherman	Tenney	Waters
Slotkin	Tlaib	Wild	Blunt Rochester	Garcia (IL)	Mast	Sherrill	Thanedar	Watson Coleman
Smith (WA)	Tonko	Williams (GA)	Boebert	Garcia, Mike	McBath	Simpson	Thompson (CA)	Weber (TX)
Sorenson	Torres (CA)	Wilsons (FL)	Bonamici	Garcia, Robert	McClain	Smith (MO)	Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)
Soto	Torres (NY)	Wilsons (FL)	Bost	Gimenez	McClellan	Smith (NE)	Tiffany	Wenstrup
Spanberger	Trahan	Boyd	Bowman	Golden (ME)	McClintock	Smith (NJ)	Timmons	Westerman
NOT VOTING—22								
Banks	Hageman	McCaull	Brown	Gomez	Mccormick	Smith (WA)	Tonko	Wild
Burgess	Jackson Lee	McHenry	Brownley	Gonzales, Tony	McGarvey	Smucker	Torres (CA)	Williams (GA)
Carson	Jacobs	Murphy	Buchanan	Gonzalez,	McGovern	Sorenson	Torres (NY)	Williams (NY)
Carter (TX)	Krishnamoorthi	Sessions	Buchanon	Vicente	McHenry	Soto	Trahan	Williams (TX)
Cleaver	LaMalfa	Thompson (MS)	Burchett	Good (VA)	Meeks	Spanberger	Trone	Wilson (FL)
Foushee	Landsman	Tokuda	Bush	Gooden (TX)	Menendez	Spartz	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Luna	Tokuda	Calvert	Gosar	Meng	Stansbury	Underwood	Wittman
Grijalva	Magaziner	Tokuda	Cammack	Gottheimer	Meuser	Stanton	Valadado	Womack
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE								
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.								
□ 1815								
So the bill was passed.								
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.								
The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all individuals."								
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.								
Stated against:								
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 193.								

#### FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 870) to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 13, answered “present” 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—393

Adams	Amo	Bacon	Finstad	Lee (NV)	Salinas	
Aderholt	Amodei	Baird	Fischbach	Lee (PA)	Sánchez	
Aguilar	Armstrong	Balderson	Fitzgerald	Leger Fernandez	Sarbanes	
Alford	Arrington	Balint	Fitzpatrick	Lesko	Scalise	
Allen	Auchincloss	Barr	Fleischmann	Lettlow	Scanlon	
Allred	Babin	Barragán	Fletcher	Levin	Schakowsky	

Scanlon	Stansbury	Trone	Bean (FL)	Flood	Lieu	Schiff	Stefanik	Van Orden
Schakowsky	Stanton	Underwood	Beatty	Foster	Lofgren	Schneider	Steil	Vargas
Schiff	Stevens	Vargas	Benzt	Frankel, Lois	Loudermilk	Scholten	Steube	Vasquez
Schneider	Strickland	Vasquez	Bera	Franklin, Scott	Lucas	Schriner	Stevens	Veasey
Scholten	Suozzi	Veasey	Bergman	Frost	Luttrell	Schweikert	Strickland	Velázquez
Schrirer	Swalwell	Velázquez	Beyer	Fry	Lynch	Scott (VA)	Strong	Wagner
Scott (VA)	Sykes	Wasserman	Bice	Fulcher	Mace	Scott, Austin	Suozzi	Walberg
Scott, David	Takano	Schultz	Bilirakis	Gaetz	Mailiotakis	Scott, David	Swalwell	Waltz
Sewell	Thanedar	Waters	Bishop (GA)	Gallego	Maloy	Self	Sykes	Wasserman
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman	Bishop (NC)	Garamendi	Mann	Sewell	Takano	Schultz
Sherrill	Titus	Wexton	Blumenauer	Garbarino	Manning	Sherman	Tenney	Waters
Slotkin	Tlaib	Wild	Blunt Rochester	Garcia (IL)	Mast	Sherrill	Thanedar	Watson Coleman
Smith (WA)	Tonko	Williams (GA)	Boebert	Garcia, Mike	McBath	Simpson	Thompson (CA)	Weber (TX)
Sorenson	Torres (CA)	Wilsons (FL)	Bonamici	Garcia, Robert	McClain	Smith (MO)	Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)
Soto	Torres (NY)	Wilsons (FL)	Bost	Gimenez	McClellan	Smith (NE)	Tiffany	Wenstrup
Spanberger	Trahan	Boyd	Bowman	Golden (ME)	McClintock	Smith (NJ)	Timmons	Westerman
NOT VOTING—22								
Banks	Hageman	McCaull	Brown	Gomez	McCormick	Smith (WA)	Tonko	Wild
Burgess	Jackson Lee	McHenry	Brownley	Gonzales, Tony	McGarvey	Smucker	Torres (CA)	Williams (GA)
Carson	Jacobs	Murphy	Buchanan	Gonzalez,	McGovern	Sorenson	Torres (NY)	Williams (NY)
Carter (TX)	Krishnamoorthi	Sessions	Buchanon	Vicente	McHenry	Soto	Trahan	Williams (TX)
Cleaver	LaMalfa	Thompson (MS)	Burchett	Good (VA)	Meeks	Spanberger	Trone	Wilson (FL)
Foushee	Landsman	Tokuda	Bush	Gooden (TX)	Menendez	Spartz	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Luna	Tokuda	Calvert	Gosar	Meng	Stansbury	Underwood	Wittman
Grijalva	Magaziner	Tokuda	Cammack	Gottheimer	Mooney	Stanton	Valadado	Womack

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1815

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all individuals."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 193.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 870) to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all individuals."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 193.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 13, answered “present” 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—393

Adams	Amo	Bacon	Finstad	Lee (NV)	Salinas	
Aderholt	Amodei	Baird	Fischbach	Lee (PA)	Sánchez	
Aguilar	Armstrong	Balderson	Fitzgerald	Leger Fernandez	Sarbanes	
Alford	Arrington	Balint	Fitzpatrick	Lesko	Scalise	
Allen	Auchincloss	Barr	Fleischmann	Lettlow	Scanlon	
Allred	Babin	Barragán	Fletcher	Levin	Schakowsky	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all individuals."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 193.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 13, answered “present” 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—393

Adams	Amo	Bacon	Finstad	Lee (NV)	Salinas	
Aderholt	Amodei	Baird	Fischbach	Lee (PA)	Sánchez	
Aguilar	Armstrong	Balderson	Fitzgerald	Leger Fernandez	Sarbanes	
Alford	Arrington	Balint	Fitzpatrick	Lesko	Scalise	
Allen	Auchincloss	Barr	Fleischmann	Lettlow	Scanlon	
Allred	Babin	Barragán	Fletcher	Levin	Schakowsky	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all individuals."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 193.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 13, answered “present” 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—393

Adams	Amo	Bacon	Finstad	Lee (NV)	Salinas	
Aderholt	Amodei	Baird	Fischbach	Lee (PA)	Sánchez	
Aguilar	Armstrong	Balderson	Fitzgerald	Leger Fernandez	Sarbanes	
Alford	Arrington	Balint	Fitzpatrick	Lesko	Scalise	
Allen	Auchincloss	Barr	Fleischmann	Lettlow	Scanlon	
Allred	Babin	Barragán	Fletcher	Levin	Schakowsky	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all individuals."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 193.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 13, answered “present” 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—393

Adams	Amo	Bacon	Finstad	Lee (NV)	Salinas	
Aderholt	Amodei	Baird	Fischbach	Lee (PA)	Sánchez	
Aguilar	Armstrong	Balderson	Fitzgerald	Leger Fernandez	Sarbanes	
Alford	Arrington	Balint	Fitzpatrick	Lesko	Scalise	
Allen	Auchincloss	Barr	Fleischmann	Lettlow	Scanlon	
Allred	Babin	Barragán	Fletcher	Levin	Schakowsky	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all individuals."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

&lt;p

the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 358, nays 41, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—358

Adams	Duarte	Kilmer	Pingree	Slotkin	Trone
Aderholt	Duncan	Kim (CA)	Pocan	Smith (MO)	Turner
Aguilar	Dunn (FL)	Kim (NJ)	Pressley	Smith (NE)	Underwood
Alford	Edwards	Krishnamoorthi	Ramirez	Smith (NJ)	Valadao
Allen	Ellzey	Kuster	Raskin	Smith (WA)	Van Drew
Allred	Emmer	Kustoff	Reschenthaler	Smucker	Van Duyne
Amo	Escobar	LaHood	Rodgers (WA)	Sorensen	Van Orden
Amodei	Eshoo	LaLota	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
Arrington	Espaiat	Lamborn	Rosen	Spanberger	Vasquez
Auchincloss	Estes	Langworthy	Ross	Stansbury	Veasey
Babin	Evans	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz	Stanton	Velázquez
Bacon	Ezell	Larson (CT)	Rutherford	Stauber	Wagner
Baird	Fallon	Latta	Ryan	Walberg	Walberg
Balderson	Feenstra	LaTurner	Scanlon	Steel	Waltz
Balint	Ferguson	Lawler	Schakowsky	Stefanik	Wasserman
Barr	Fitzgerald	Lee (CA)	Schiff	Salazar	Schultz
Barragán	Fitzpatrick	Lee (FL)	Schneider	Sánchez	Strickland
Bean (FL)	Fleischmann	Lee (NV)	Scholten	Stevens	Waterson
Beatty	Fletcher	Lee (PA)	Schrier	Scalise	Watson Coleman
Bentz	Flood	Leger Fernandez	Sewell	Strong	Weber (TX)
Bera	Foster	Letlow	Sherman	Suozzi	Webster (FL)
Bergman	Foxx	Levin	Sherrill	Sykes	Wenstrup
Beyer	Frankel, Lois	Lieu	Simpson	Takano	Westerman
Bice	Franklin, Scott	Lofgren		Tenney	Wexton
Bilirakis	Frost	Loudermilk		Thanedar	Wild
Bishop (GA)	Gallego	Lucas		Thompson (CA)	Williams (GA)
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Luttrell		Thompson (PA)	Williams (NY)
Blunt Rochester	Garbarino	Lynch		Timmons	Williams (TX)
Bonamici	Garcia (IL)	Mace		Titus	Wilson (FL)
Bost	Garcia, Mike	Malliotakis		Tlaib	Wilson (SC)
Bowman	Gimenez	Maloy		Tonko	Wittman
Boyle (PA)	Golden (ME)	Mann		Torres (CA)	Womack
Brown	Goldman (NY)	Manning		Torres (NY)	Yakym
Brownley	Gomez	Massie		Trahan	
Buchanan	Gonzales, Tony	Mast			
Bucshon	Gonzalez,	McBath			
Bush	Vicente	McClain			
Calvert	Gooden (TX)	McClellan			
Caraveo	Gottheimer	McClintock			
Carbajal	Graves (MO)	McCollum			
Cárdenas	Green (TN)	McCormick			
Carey	Green, Al (TX)	McGarvey			
Carl	Greene (GA)	McGovern			
Carter (GA)	Grothman	McHenry			
Carter (LA)	Guest	Meeks			
Cartwright	Guthrie	Menendez			
Casar	Harder (CA)	Meng			
Case	Harshbarger	Meuser			
Casten	Hayes	Mifune			
Castor (FL)	Hern	Miller (OH)			
Castro (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Miller (WV)			
Chavez-DeRemer	Hill	Miller-Meeks			
Cherifilus-	Himes	Molinaro			
McCormick	Hinson	Moore (UT)			
Chu	Horsford	Moore (WI)			
Ciscomani	Houchin	Moran			
Clark (MA)	Houahan	Morelle			
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Moskowitz			
Clyburn	Hoyle (OR)	Hudson			
Cohen	Huffman	Moulton			
Cole	Huizenga	Mrvan			
Collins	Issa	Mullin			
Comer	Ivey	Nadler			
Connolly	Jackson (IL)	Napolitano			
Correa	Jackson (NC)	Neal			
Costa	Jackson (TX)	Neguse			
Courtney	Jackson (TX)	Newhouse			
Craig	James	Nickel			
Crenshaw	Jayapal	Norcross			
Crockett	Jeffries	Nunn (IA)			
Crow	Johnson (GA)	Obernolte			
Cuellar	Johnson (SD)	Ocasio-Cortez			
D'Esposito	Jordan	Omar			
Davids (KS)	Joyce (OH)	Owens			
Davis (IL)	Joyce (PA)	Pallone			
Davis (NC)	Kamlager-Dove	Palmer			
De La Cruz	Kaptur	Panetta			
Dean (PA)	Kean (NJ)	Pappas			
DeGette	Keating	Pascrill			
DeLauro	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi			
DelBene	Kelly (MS)	Peltola			
Deluzio	Kelly (PA)	Pence			
DeSaulnier	Kennedy	Perez			
DesJarlais	Khanna	Peters			
Diaz-Balart	Kiggans (VA)	Pettersen			
Dingell	Kildee	Pfleuger			
Doggett	Kiley	Phillips			

NAYS—41

NOT VOTING—30

□ 1828

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present to cast my vote on Roll Call No. 195 today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

YEA on Roll Call No. 187, YEA on Roll Call No. 188, NAY on Roll Call No. 189, YEA on Roll Call No. 190, NAY on Roll Call No. 191, YEA on Roll Call No. 192, NAY on Roll Call No. 193, YEA on Roll Call No. 194, and YEA on Roll Call No. 195.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, due to a medical procedure and at the advice of my doctor, I was unable to cast my votes today in the House of Representatives. Had I been

present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 187, on suspending the Rules and passing H.R. 8289; YEA on Roll Call No. 188, on the motion to table H. Res. 1209; NAY on Roll Call No. 189, on passage of H.J. Res. 109; YEA on Roll Call No. 190, on the motion to recommit H.R. 2925; NAY on Roll Call No. 191, on passage of H.R. 2925; YEA on Roll Call No. 192, on the motion to recommit H.R. 7109; NAY on Roll Call No. 193, on passage of H.R. 7109; YEA on Roll Call No. 194, on suspending the Rules and passing the House Amendment to S. 870; and YEA on Roll Call No. 195, on suspending the Rules and passing H.R. 4143, as amended.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS TO WILLIAM D. OWENS FOR ACTS OF VALOR AT LA FIÈRE BRIDGE

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8063) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to posthumously award the Distinguished Service Cross to William D. Owens for his valorous actions from June 6, 1944, to June 8, 1944, during World War II at La Fiere Bridge in Normandy, France, while serving with the 505th Parachute Infantry and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8063

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

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS TO WILLIAM D. OWENS FOR ACTS OF VALOR AT LA FIÈRE BRIDGE.

(a) WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 7274 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of the Army may award the Distinguished Service Cross under section 7272 of such title to William D. Owens for the acts of valor at La Fiere Bridge described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTS OF VALOR DESCRIBED.—The acts of valor referred to in subsection (a) are the actions of William D. Owens from June 6, 1944, to June 8, 1944, at La Fiere Bridge for which he was previously awarded the Bronze Star Medal.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2024, TO FRIDAY, MAY 10, 2024; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 10, 2024 TO TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2024

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Friday, May 10, 2024; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, May 14, 2024, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

#### PRESIDENT BIDEN'S EV MANDATE WILL HURT AMERICANS

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, President Biden's latest effort to push electronic vehicle mandates for truck usage is completely nonsensical.

Thanks to current administrative policy, we do not have the capability to implement the massive grid expansion needed to support the electrification of heavy-duty trucks. These vehicles consume about the same amount of electricity in just one charge as a typical American home uses in a week. The industry would need to invest upwards of \$620 billion in charging infrastructure alone.

Then there is the question of where would the electricity come from. The administration has famously prosecuted its war on fossil fuels, nuclear, and hydropower generation. It is even impossible for wind and solar facilities to produce domestically because restrictions the administration has placed on American mining means the needed raw materials have to come from foreign adversaries. It is China that dominates the supply chain.

Mr. Speaker, the President needs to look at the facts and stop prioritizing irresponsible energy ideology over Americans.

#### CELEBRATING MARY EATON DEAN THIS MOTHER'S DAY

(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. Mr. Speaker, with Mother's Day coming, I am thinking about the one-in-a-million woman who raised my six siblings and me.

I have never before spoken about my mother on the House floor, but today I celebrate our beautiful mom, Mary Eaton Dean, here in a photo taken many years ago by my grandfather, William Dean.

Mary Dean was an only child who went on to become the mother of seven—five boys, two girls, one for every day's grace, and grandmother to 16. She gave freely of her kindness, her wisdom, and her friendship throughout our Glenside community.

Mary Dean was a woman of love. She loved our dad. She loved her life. She

was a woman of faith, of adventure, and of loyalty. When our father, Bob Dean, died at 58, my mom was our anchor, determined to live the best life for herself and for us.

Mr. Speaker, I will say to my siblings, Bob, Harry, Michael, Jim, Chris, Maryann, aren't we lucky?

This Mother's Day, may we celebrate the mothers in our lives and honor those no longer with us knowing their lessons of love are forever imprinted on our hearts.

#### RECOGNIZING CHIEF MAGISTRATE JUDGE JENNIFER LEWIS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief Magistrate Judge Jennifer Lewis.

Jennifer has recently been awarded the 2024 Magistrate of the Year award from the Georgia Council of Magistrate Judges.

The magistrate court functions as Georgia's small claims court, which allows residents to proceed with a case with or without an attorney.

Winning this award is a testament to Jennifer's character and it shows how seriously she takes her judicial service.

Like myself, Judge Lewis was a Georgia Bulldog. After school at Georgia, she later went to Florida Coastal School of Law. Following her education, Judge Lewis started working at the Camden County Magistrate Court in 1998.

In 2008, she was elected as chief magistrate and took office the following year. I look forward to witnessing Judge Lewis' future accomplishments and thank her for her service.

#### MOURNING THE LOSS OF W. CHARLES WELCH

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, northwest Ohio mourns the passing of W. Charles Welch, who passed on Sunday, April 21, 2024.

He became known far and wide simply as "Charlie Chuck."

Born in 1938 in Talladega, Alabama, he later moved to Detroit and joined Greater St. Peter AME Zion Church where he met his wife Marjorie Chester at choir rehearsal.

They became sweethearts at 13 and 14, eventually marrying and raising five children—Rosalind, Katrina, Debra, Charles Bernard, and Trina.

Charles played piano at Detroit nightclubs, but his true calling came when he started his radio career in the 1960s. He was working for free at WJLB when he was hired by Toledo's WKLR in 1969.

Charlie Chuck was off and running. He spent years in radio, later founding

The Juice FM 107.3 WJUC, the first African-American radio station in Ohio in 1997. It became known as the People's Station.

He lived by the credo that if you have a good idea about a dream, think of the three P's: prayer, perseverance, and patience.

May his inspiration bring comfort to his dear family, friends, and listening audience for whom he created a beloved community.

#### NURSES MAKE THE DIFFERENCE

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

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Nurses Week.

This year's theme is Nurses Make the Difference. Nurses fulfill diverse roles as caregivers, advocates, educators, and leaders, leaving a profound impact on their patients and communities.

In Congress, I am dedicated to strengthening America's nursing workforce. I have supported increased funding to title VIII nursing workforce programs, which include crucial funding to Nurse Corps Loan Repayment and Scholarship programs.

These programs will make nursing schools more accessible and help bolster the nursing workforce, especially in rural areas. I have also cosponsored the National Nursing Workforce Center Act, which seeks to curb burnout and address nurse retention issues.

I am also fighting to close the pay gap between clinical nurses and nursing educators.

Mr. Speaker, this week, let's thank a nurse in Pennsylvania's Ninth from Sayre to Pottsville, to Sunbury to Williamsport. We are so very grateful for our great nurses.

#### HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

(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, this week we recognize Yom HaShoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day, and the month of May as Jewish Heritage Month.

We honor the 6 million Jewish lives lost to anti-Semitism, hatred, and violence. The Holocaust is not a distant memory. It happened within the lifetime of many Jewish people.

We also must acknowledge that this year marks the first Holocaust Remembrance Day since the attacks on October 7. This remembrance day feels different and raw for many of our Jewish brothers and sisters.

Let us take the month of May to celebrate Jewish culture, history, and people. Let us also begin this month remembering the millions of souls lost to the Holocaust, acknowledging the many survivors of the horrific events

of October 7, and standing with the Jewish community and those who have experienced lasting trauma as a result of anti-Semitism.

Let us vow to fight together and say “never again” for anyone.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. JOYCE BENNETT JUSTUS

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Joyce Bennett Justus, who was called home on April 12.

A beloved and gifted academic, as well as a dedicated educator and administrator, Joyce touched the lives of many people in San Diego and beyond.

Joyce was born in Jamaica and immigrated to the United States. She believed in excellence and pushed herself to earn a Ph.D. in anthropology from UCLA in 1971.

She devoted her life to teaching, especially higher education, from her time as an assistant professor of anthropology, to coordinator of urban and royal studies, to vice chancellor at UCSD.

She also served as Vice Provost of Academic Affairs with the University of California Office of the President, Peace Corps Advisor, and Assistant Director of Social and Behavioral Science in the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the Clinton White House.

Joyce loved her church, St. Peter's, especially the choir and the organ music. She also loved her Bible study and her friends there.

Joyce was loved by all her family and friends, and they look forward to reuniting with her in Heaven.

May she rest in peace.

□ 1845

#### ELIMINATING MEDICAL DEBT

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, today, Senator BERNIE SANDERS and I introduced a historic bill to eliminate medical debt for every American.

Over 100 million Americans have medical debt. That is criminal in a country as wealthy as ours. No American should go into debt because they go to the ER or because they go to a doctor.

Our bill eliminates all medical debt for families. It eliminates the credit card damaging reports on medical debt, and it stops hospitals from sticking debt collectors on vulnerable patients.

Can we not agree in America that no one should have to give up their dream of owning a home because they have medical debt? No one should have to create GoFundMe pages to get medical attention. No one should have to decide between curing their cancer and medical bankruptcy.

This bill stands up for every American's right to healthcare. I thank Senator MERKLEY and Representative RASHIDA TLAIB for co-leading this effort.

#### CELEBRATING BONITA SHELBY

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to celebrate the 60th birthday of Lady Bonita Shelby, a community leader in Michigan's 12th District.

Lady Shelby is a leader of the Burning Bush International Ministries, along with her husband, Bishop Don Shelby, Jr.

As the leader of Burning Bush's Flare Women's ministry, she has spearheaded the Good Days women's weekend of events to serve the incredible women in our district.

She is also a mother, author, public servant, and mentor figure to so many in our community. In addition to their ministry at home in Westland, she and her husband travel all around the country to provide services for underserved communities and pray with families in need.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Lady Bonita Shelby for her commitment to serving our communities. Please join me in wishing her a happy 60th birthday and a meaningful year ahead.

#### ADDRESSING IMPORTANT ISSUES AFFECTING AMERICANS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are addressing important issues affecting Americans across the country.

This week, we passed legislation out of the Energy and Commerce Committee to stop the Biden administration from imposing further regulations on home appliances and pushing their rush to green energy agenda that squashes consumer choice.

I can't believe we have to even say that in the U.S. House of Representatives, that we have to even deal with this type of nonsensical policy, but it is an important thing to do, to be able to push back on this, again, rush to green energy agenda that makes no sense.

As Americans struggle with historic inflation and everyday goods and energy costs, it is important that we have the ability to purchase the appliances that best suit our needs rather than overregulated appliances that, per the Department of Energy's analysis, will increase upfront costs by nearly 30 percent.

I hope Americans can understand that. This type of nonsensical overregulation is just going to cost them more money in an inflationary period that has been persistent since Biden took office.

We continue to stand up to anti-Semitism on our college campuses and hold university leadership accountable. Speaker JOHNSON has convened a probe into the leadership failures at our colleges and universities and the ways that they have allowed dangerous and harmful protests to overrun their campuses, putting Jewish students and community members in danger. We will not stop Jewish students feel safe on their campuses again. This is a basic, fundamental right.

Last week, the House Committee on Homeland Security released documents that identified over 45 airports throughout the Nation that have been used by the Biden administration to secretly fly over 400,000 illegal immigrants into the United States, from Miami to Los Angeles, from Washington to Chicago. As this crisis at our southern border continues to wreak havoc on our communities, this is unconscionable.

President Biden's failed border policies have only further jeopardized our national security and risked the safety of our neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for my colleagues to be focused on these key important issues and for them to join me this evening briefly.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, after the October 7 terrorist attack on our ally Israel, a wave of hate has washed across our Nation. Our Nation's college campuses have been the focal point of a wave of anti-Semitism that I never thought I would see in America.

I have heard directly from Jewish students at our elite universities who have seen anti-Semitic mobs up close, donned in their terrorist scarves while shouting in support of the terrorist group Hamas.

These scenes are straight out of the Jim Crow 1960s South during the days of segregation and the KKK. The difference is the KKK bigots of my era hid their faces under white hoods. The pro-Hamas bigots today hide their cowardly faces behind face masks.

It was my sincere hope that we had left this hate in the past, but the slow march of Marxism has spread like a virus. It has even affected our K-12 system, where our children as young as the second grade are spewing anti-Semitic chants of kill the Jews.

Students, activist teachers, and administrators up until now have had

zero accountability. Well, accountability is finally here.

The people's House has the moral clarity to call out anti-Semitic hate and bigotry. As a House Republican majority, with committee oversight and the power of the purse, we are going to do the people's will and put an end to this Marxist indoctrinated bigotry. We are putting all options on the table as we demand our educational institutions step up, do the right thing, and protect our Jewish students.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Utah for his steadfast voice on these key matters.

Mr. Speaker, I am also grateful to welcome my colleague and the House Republican skipper to share his message.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, American campuses once respected and envied across the world have become breeding grounds for the radical left to promote their anti-America agenda.

For weeks, Joe Biden, far-left Democrats, and university leaders have stood by as woke mobs have stormed college campuses across this Nation.

These so-called leaders have allowed thousands of students to blatantly disregard the law and build encampments on campuses for the sole purpose of harassing and intimidating Jewish students, even physically barring them from attending class. Authorities have turned a blind eye as these hateful people continue to destroy property, deface statues, and burn the American flag.

There must be consequences. We must respect our Nation and protect our schools and our students. This is not free speech. There are not peaceful protesters in this group. These are terrorists hiding behind masks and using violence, threats, and intimidation to control Jewish and Israeli students.

Today, I am proud to introduce the No Student Loan Forgiveness for Antisemitic Criminals Act, which would bar any student who is arrested for engaging in anti-Semitic activities within the United States from receiving student loan forgiveness through Federal income-driven repayment programs.

Clearly, these out-of-control students have never faced meaningful consequences in their lives. If woke leadership will not hold these violent protesters accountable and keep our students safe, House Republicans will. I can guarantee that defunding violent gender studies majors will end this chaos immediately.

No one should feel unsafe on campus. Anti-Semitism is a virus that we cannot allow to spread. Let us not forget, on October 7, 2023, Israel was brutally attacked by Hamas. We must stand with Israel as they protect the future of Israel and the Jewish people.

On another note, what in the world is going on with the Boy Scouts? In God we trust.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I will share a couple of thoughts about this. I actually think it is very important as we are going through this moment right now in our country, as we see protests continuing on at colleges, to emphasize the importance of peaceful protests, the things that are done lawfully. We don't probably spend as much time focusing on the good examples that come out of this.

We have to be a nation of the rule of law. We have seen excellent examples from universities across the country as well taking a very clear, simple stance about offering opportunities for peaceful protest, but when they cross the line, they are going to be punished. We saw it from the University of Florida and others throughout the country.

Those are things we need to highlight. Those are things that are important to celebrate, that we are navigating that tricky line of making sure that we have the ability to protest. That is fundamental to who we are as Americans, and I commend those leaders.

Instead of just always talking about all the negative that is coming from this lawlessness that we see in a lot of ways, I commend those leaders who are across our country at different universities making it very clear that they are not going to tolerate anything that crosses the line. If you don't do that, you will continually see people cross the line.

Now, commencement ceremonies are being canceled. These kids have families, parents. Kids and students have put countless hours into their education to get to this moment. The commencement ceremony is one of the most special things that you could do in your academic experience. To then give in to this overextending of their protest capabilities just ruins the experience.

I hadn't even thought about it until I was talking to one of my colleagues, but this is the same group of people who probably had their graduations canceled because of COVID 4 years ago. Now, they are going through a similar type of situation. We are seeing it happen, popping up across the country. It is flat wrong.

We need stronger leadership. We have shown that in the last few months from the House of Representatives with the House Republican hearings that we have had. I think what we saw with the inability to call out genocide for being against the code of conduct clearly is the wrong direction to go, and I think there was a nice recourse. People lost their jobs because of it, as they should have.

This is going to be one of those moments when they are not doing enough to protect the silent majority on these campuses that want to attend class, that want to put their money to use in something productive.

The more that this type of nonsense continues to happen, we are going to see a shift away from these types of

universities that aren't focused on what they should be focusing on, which is preparing those young minds and those students for the next-generation workforce. That is somehow lost in all of this. We are seeing it.

I am proud to represent a State that does such a good job with higher education. We are not immune to protests and things like that, but we are doing the best we possibly can to make sure that the rule of law is followed.

My oldest son is 11. I can't imagine helping out with tuition one day and then not even being able to go to a commencement or my son not even being able to get to class because of a group of people who have no idea and don't understand centuries and centuries of turmoil in a particular region. Hamas was elected 15 or so years ago and has made it impossible for Palestinians and citizens of Gaza to remove them from power. It has inflicted so much evil will on those innocent Palestinians, but they want to be in a position of supporting them.

It is fascinating that they think that they have it all figured out, that they understand Middle East policy, that they understand centuries and centuries of turmoil. It flat doesn't make sense. As a parent, to have a university president not be able to move forward to continue on with commencement is beyond me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

□ 1900

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the consequences that come when we stay home on election day.

Since President Biden took the oath of office on January 20, 2021, this country has been unrecognizable. Unrecognizable, Mr. Speaker. We will lose it completely if we don't get out in November and vote for constitutionalists who will defend the oath they took. We are in a battle for our way of life, and we better start acting like it.

Since Biden took office, he has let over 10 million illegal aliens cross our border, the government has completely weaponized our Federal agencies against the beliefs and interests of the American people, and war has broken out around the globe.

If you don't want to keep paying hundreds of billions of dollars to clothe, house, and make sure illegals are getting quality medical care before the veterans who served our country, dadgummit, you better get out and vote.

If you don't want to see theft and assault in broad daylight, violent protests in our streets and on our kids' college campuses, and see our men and women in law enforcement demonized, dadgummit, you better get out and vote.

If you don't want public school systems to tell your children that changing their gender is okay, that praying in public is wrong, and that our flag is

a reason not to stand for the national anthem, you all better get out and vote.

If you want a secure border, a fair justice system, and law and order in our communities, you better get out and vote.

If you want a military that is focused on its mission and not about meeting diversity quotas and having male recruiters out in dresses, you all better get out and vote.

If you want cheap, clean energy that is made in America instead of relying on our enemies, we better get out and vote.

If you want to quit sending money overseas to pay for drag shows and climate initiatives, we better get out and vote.

If you don't like where we have been, don't like where we are now, and don't like where we are going, folks, we better get out and vote.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that great message.

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

#### CELEBRATING MOTHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as the chair of the Congressional Mamas' Caucus, I would like to take a moment and truly celebrate Mother's Day and recognize the contributions of mothers across our country.

We must continue to center mamas in the policies we develop and champion here in the United States Congress. As the mother of two incredible boys, I stand here today as an advocate for the needs of all mothers. Mothers should not be struggling like they are today, and we can act.

As the founder of the Congressional Mamas' Caucus, I want to ensure that mothers have a seat at the table every day in our policies and legislative work. I always say to folks, we can't keep enacting laws that impact mothers, that are about mothers, but not with mothers.

From the incredible mothers in Michigan's 12th District Strong to mothers in other movements for justice, I want to tell you, I love you deeply. You are literally anchors within our communities and neighborhoods. Many of you are community mothers. Your

voices deserve to be heard in this House, the people's House.

Mothers, as we all know, embody strength. They nurture. They come into spaces with unconditional love. Today, we honor and celebrate mothers for their tireless dedication and unwavering commitment to their families.

Mr. Speaker, motherhood is a journey filled with joy but also challenges and sacrifices. It is a universal experience that transcends race, religion, and socioeconomic status, yet many mothers continue to face great, great disparities.

Mothers are often the primary caregivers, so this Mother's Day, I ask all my colleagues, please, don't just say "Happy Mother's Day," show your love with action, action that uplifts moms.

The challenges they face can be overcome with actions here in Congress. From the daily struggles of balancing work and family responsibilities to the barriers that negatively impact our marginalized communities, mothers often bear the brunt of inequity and injustice.

One of the most pressing issues that I see continued over and over, no matter which townhalls, whether I am having it in the city of Detroit or in suburban communities, mothers and families today are facing high levels of poverty and really, truly struggling every single day with the economics of their family around healthcare and so much more.

Millions of children, Mr. Speaker, in the United States live in poverty, lacking access to basic necessities like food, shelter, and healthcare. In Michigan, close to 20 percent of children under the age of 18 live in poverty. In the richest country in the world, that is unacceptable.

Working families in our country should not worry about where their next meal should come from. If we have the money for endless wars, this body can find the resources to end child poverty.

Ending child poverty is a policy choice, and in Congress we can start by expanding programs like the child tax credit. I introduced the End Child Poverty Act, which would cut poverty by over 60 percent. This bill would implement a universal child benefit program. This bill would lift millions of people out of poverty by providing about \$428 per child per month to every family in America so that nobody is left behind.

Universal school meals are critical in ensuring that no child goes hungry. Of course, we all know and have been taught by the incredible Shirley Chisholm, the first African American to serve in Congress, that children cannot learn when they are hungry, so let's feed them. Access to meals is essential for every child's development. By investing in universal school meals, we can ensure that every child has access to the resources they need to thrive at school. This is how we support mothers.

I am proud to cosponsor the Universal School Meals Program, which many of my colleagues are championing here, to provide free meals to every child in America.

Again, many of the programs I want to talk about tonight will continue.

Now I want to yield to one of my colleagues who I consider an incredible community mother and partner in this fight to, again, uplift mothers. She has championed so much work around reproductive health and been at the center of movement work, from the movement for Black lives, movement around Black maternal health, and so much more. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, AYANNA PRESSLEY.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAIB for her leadership in founding the Mamas' Caucus. I appreciate the way in which wherever she sees a gap, she seeks to fill it. I also appreciate what an incredible role model she is and the righteous representation that she provides for her sons. I appreciate the way that she fights for every child as if they are her own.

This time of year, Mr. Speaker, we wax poetic about the contributions of mothers, call their work valued, their love endless, their role invaluable. Mr. Speaker, mothers across America don't want a Hallmark card, they want policy change.

I grew up in a small storefront church on the south side of Chicago, and my grandfather was the pastor there. Even as a pastor, he would often say that he would rather see a sermon than hear one.

Mr. Speaker, the mothers of this country are deserving of policies, policies that see them, center them, and serve them, and they would prefer those over bouquets, verbal or otherwise.

We tell mothers that caregiving is their greatest contribution and then undermine them at every turn. We tell women that motherhood is aspirational and the greatest contribution they will ever make, while for many a safe pregnancy is a privilege and not a right. Then we thrust them into a broken healthcare system that denies their bodily autonomy, criminalizes pregnancy outcomes, and jeopardizes their lives.

We tell mothers that the work of keeping that baby warm, safe, and fed is the highest calling, and then we allow negligence and policy gaps to create a baby formula shortage in the midst of a pandemic as mothers panic to meet a most basic need.

We tell mothers that they must work like they don't have children and parent like they don't work while we fail to pass universal paid leave policy, thrusting mamas and caregivers back into the workplace mere weeks after their babies are born.

We tell mothers that it takes a village, and we are so proud to be a part of theirs, and then we fail to invest in safe, affordable childcare.

We tell mothers that they are their children's first teachers, and they send their little ones out into the world with a hopeful heart, and then a stark reality keeps them up at night—policy gaps that fail to keep that child safe from a gun on the block or in the classroom.

We tell mothers that in the twilight of their lives after they poured into their babies that we will take care of them, and then we gut social programs that would help our elders age in community with dignity and the care that they need.

Mr. Speaker, mothers don't need empty praise. They need policy change. Now, by the grace of God and the sheer will and brilliance and sacrifice of my mother—my shero, Sandy Pressley, may she rest in peace and power—the woman who gave me my roots and wings, there are many lessons that I was afforded by her example. Chief among those lessons was that being a mother was, in her opinion, her greatest achievement and her superpower. However, it was also not her only identity, and because I had a front-row seat early on to her humanity, I saw the many struggles and hardships that she was confronted with on a daily basis. Not for lack of good character, not for a lack of strong work ethic, but because of an absence of policy or policy violence.

Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we penalize and marginalize the very people who give us life, but yet and still mothers and caregivers persist, persist in doing the work of community and movement building, of mothering, of nurturing, when it has been 101 years too long, and we have yet to even enshrine gender equality in our Constitution. We still have not passed the equal rights amendment, and still we raise our voices, and we rise in the Halls of power, navigating systems not built for us to speak out.

Together we press, day in and day out, for a more just America because being a mom, being a mama, being a mommy is our superpower.

This is not a just nation which supports us as parents, as caregivers. If we want this to be a just nation and one that is more just and fair for the generations we are raising and for the generations to come, we fight for the rights of our children and grandchildren, we move with the clarity and conviction that only caretakers can. Leaving a better world behind is not an abstract concept, it is grounded in the children right in front of us.

Every society owes a debt of gratitude to those who mother, and in their name we press for a world that lives up to their aspirations, a world that keeps their babies safe, a world that keeps all our babies safe.

Mr. Speaker, I would rather see a sermon than hear one.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as a mother myself, I know that there are circumstances out of our control that require families, especially the mothers,

to take time off from work, especially new mothers. Whether it is your sick child, a parent, or a personal illness yourself, taking unpaid leave is not a reality for millions of our American families, our mothers.

Too many mothers are forced to choose between taking care of their families or keeping their jobs. We need paid leave for all by providing mothers with the time off they need to care for themselves and their families. No one, Mr. Speaker, not a single person should have to fear losing the income they need to keep a roof over their families' heads in exchange for literally just being able to take care of their child.

□ 1915

The Healthy Families Act would guarantee employees the right to earn paid sick days each year—again, earn it.

Now, I don't want us to forget a big crisis that we have, and I think the pandemic exposed this crisis. We have a childcare crisis in our country.

Affordable childcare is also incredibly essential for working mothers and the well-being of our children. Access to quality, affordable childcare allows mothers to continue to pursue their careers while knowing that their child is safe and taken care of.

By investing in affordable childcare, we can support working mothers and help them achieve economic justice and be able to thrive, not just survive.

I am proud to support as, again, the cofounder of the Congressional Mamas' Caucus to be pushing for the Childcare for Working Families Act to be sure families can afford the childcare they need and expand access to high-quality options and help ensure that childcare workers are paid living wages.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ), a wonderful colleague from Illinois who is not only championing tenants' rights, which is the center to many mothers, but also is a proud child of immigrants. I will tell you just how incredibly connected she is to her community on the ground and brings a lot of that lived experiences here in the Chamber that has been really missing for a long time.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker,  
(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

I rise today to honor the women in my community as we prepare to return home to our districts for Mother's Day.

I've said before that I'm the proud daughter of my courageous immigrant mother, Maria Elvira Ramirez.

A woman who almost drowned in the Rio Grande and sacrificed so much to give me a chance at a better life.

A woman who, to this day, never fails to lend a hand and offer support and guiding words to anyone in IL-03 who needs it.

She is a mother for the whole community.

And as I honor my mother, I can't forget women who have also served as mothers to community, including:

Elvira Arellano, Juanita Barraza, Nancy Aardema, Leticia Barrera, Catherine Garcia, and Julieta Alcántar.

Each of these "mujeres" have nurtured, cared for, and supported whole communities, extending their love and compassion.

As "madres de comunidad," they have: taught us how to care for each other and keep each other safe; defended our causes and protected our dreams; created safe spaces and encouraged us to be our authentic selves.

These mothers have taught us that love is both gentle and fierce.

They taught us how to fight for each other and to stand firmly against that which seeks to destroy us: unaffordable housing, gun violence, a broken immigration system, and more.

These mothers taught us to stand up for each other—not only for their children, but for all children.

El día de hoy me levanto para honrar a las mujeres de mi comunidad mientras nos preparamos para regresar a nuestros distritos para celebrar el Día de la Madre.

Muchas veces he dicho que soy la orgullosa hija de mi valiente madre inmigrante, María Elvira Ramírez.

Una mujer que casi se ahoga en el Río Grande y sacrificó tanto para darme la oportunidad de una mejor vida.

Una mujer que, hasta el día de hoy, no deja de dar una mano y ofrecer apoyo y palabras de orientación a cualquiera en IL-03 que lo necesite.

Ella es madre de toda la comunidad.

Y al honrar a mi madre, no puedo olvidar a las mujeres que también han servido como madres en la comunidad, entre ellas: Elvira Arellano, Juanita Barraza, Nancy Aardema, Leticia Barrera, Catalina García, y Julieta Alcántar.

Cada una de estas mujeres ha nutrido, cuidado y apoyado a comunidades enteras, extendiendo su amor y compasión.

Como madres de comunidad, ellas nos han tienen: enseñado cómo cuidarnos unos a otros y mantenernos seguros; Defendido nuestras causas y protegido nuestros sueños; Creado espacios seguros y animado a ser nosotros mismos.

Estas madres nos han enseñado que el amor es a la vez gentil y feroz.

Nos enseñaron cómo luchar unos por otros y a oponernos firmemente a aquello que busca destruirnos: viviendas inasequibles, violencia armada, un sistema de inmigración fallido y más.

Estas madres nos enseñaron a pararnos firmes, no sólo por sus hijos, sino por todos los niños.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, it is why I rise today to honor mothers, my mother, and so many women in Illinois-3 who have shown love, who have shown compassion, who have shown love even when they have been given hate.

I also recognize that our mothers, as we pay respect to them, they also want

to make sure that we pay respect to the brave children that they have raised.

You see, on college campuses across the United States and the whole world, students, our children, they are fighting for our shared humanity.

They are putting their comfort and their bodies on the line to disrupt the status quo. They are sending a clear message that Palestinian, that Jewish, that Christian children must be protected and that we must uplift our shared humanity.

Inspired by the lessons we have learned from our own mothers in our communities, these brave and courageous students are defending children in Gaza who are being murdered with U.S. bombs.

They are taking a stand for children whose schools have been destroyed. Students of all faiths—Muslim, Jewish, Christian, and from diverse backgrounds—are uniting to care for each other and to keep each other safe, to defend their cause and protect their dreams and to create a space that is encouraging freedom for everyone.

These children are an inspiration to so many of us, and they remind us that the future is bright by putting the values and love into action that their courageous mothers instilled in them.

Thanks to the teachings of these women, today we have a generation who believes in our interconnectedness struggles and are saying enough. In one voice, they are telling us clearly: No more war.

I close by saying that I learned from my own mother, a woman with a third-grade education, a woman who struggled and has experienced all that is wrong with this world, that if you lead with compassion, that if you lead with courage, that you are willing to be uncomfortable in the times that you must be uncomfortable, then you are living your purpose and our collective responsibility for collective care.

It is why today as we are all getting ready to head back to our districts to celebrate Mother's Day, I call on us all to remember the lessons we learned from our own mothers, and I urge all of us to see our shared humanity, no matter where we were born, no matter our citizenship status.

Let's not forget the women who right now are mourning their children and the children looking for their mothers under the rubble in Gaza and in every conflict. May we remember those children. May we remember those mothers.

After all, President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the first Mother's Day in 1914 to honor mothers who had lost their sons in the First World War.

May we come back to protecting our children, may we come back to protecting mothers and fathers, and may we be reminded in this day as we celebrate mothers across the world that we, here in Congress, have a responsibility to protect them and to uplift them.

I thank Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB for her work, particularly the

work she is doing around paid family leave, affordable childcare, universal school meals, investments in WIC and SNAP, ending child poverty, and reproductive freedom.

It is the honor of my life to serve with her.

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as you heard from my colleague, again, incredible lived experience is so needed because mothers come from all different backgrounds, all in different income classes.

Again, we could be doing more as Mother's Day comes up, not just saying happy Mother's Day but uplifting policies that uplift all mothers.

In the Congressional Mamas' Caucus, we have been centering our work on Black maternal health. The crisis is real, it is here, and I know many of my residents continue to tell me: We don't want just task forces and commissions and to be studied.

We know that there is a crisis. We know that Black women are three times more likely to die from pregnancy complications.

We know it is not because Black women are less capable of bearing children or giving birth but because our healthcare system has consistently neglected and mistreated them. We must address the racial health disparity in our healthcare system and face that fact.

I am also incredibly proud to be a co-sponsor of the Black Maternal Momnibus Act, a comprehensive bill, Mr. Speaker, that would ensure Black mothers are safe and supported in their decisions and journeys to have children.

Every person should have the right to make decisions about their own body, including whether and when and how to have children.

There is a clear attack on women's rights as we know across our Nation. Rather than prohibit safe and legal contraception, we need to provide support for women and families that lack the means to access such treatment.

The relentless attacks on reproductive freedom are making it more difficult for mothers to access the care they need.

Today, I say to my colleagues that it is time to do better for our mothers. This Mother's Day, let's celebrate the incredible strength and resilience of our mothers everywhere and thank them by continuing to fight for policies that will change their lives for the better.

I can't leave this House floor without talking about the fact that I grew up in the most beautiful Blackest city in the country.

When you grow up in Detroit, Mr. Speaker, you don't have one mother. There are all the Black mothers and the neighborhood mothers so that even when my mom's eyes were not on us,

all the other mothers on the block had eyes on us.

I take this moment and acknowledge these community mothers throughout my district, and I know I am going to leave some out, and I love them all. There are particular ones that really, really, really have touched me and shaped the person that I am today.

From Mother Christina Guzman to Mother Monet Davis to Mother Angie Webb, Linda Campbell, Mother Dr. Leonard who is fighting, fighting for the right to breathe clean air, Mother Braxton who is embedded in the community.

These are mothers that after they take care of their family, they are trying to take care of the neighborhoods they live in.

I thank again Mother Nan Berry, Mother Laveta Browne, who is my former high school teacher who continues to check on me and make sure that I am okay and literally is always in the background saying that we have to do better as a country.

Again, as we come together, we honor and celebrate every single mother every day, and we can do it every single day, not wait until Mother's Day to say Happy Mother's Day but do it with action.

I would be remiss in not speaking about my mother. My Yama was born and raised in Palestine in the occupied territories in the West Bank, a little village, Mr. Speaker, Beit Ur al-Foka.

It is an olive farm that she grew up on, picking olives and harvesting in October, a family that literally struggled every single day, but they lived off their land.

My mother came to the United States after marrying my father with only an eighth-grade education. She was pregnant with me, 3 months.

She came to the city of Detroit, and she raised 14 children, and I am the eldest. When people call me mama bear, it is really real.

My mom, to this day, after we all left, now she is an empty nester, and I kid you not. I have people come up to me. Can you tell your mother to stop sending food because she cooks for the whole block, even folks that are, like, I am fine. I have children that take care of me.

She sees a person that is limping or maybe had an accident, one of her neighbors, she will bring them food, all kinds of Middle Eastern food, all kinds of food. You have to take it. If you don't take it, she gets very angry. She takes care of her block.

I think people don't realize just the incredible compassion that my mother has, was really filled with living again in Palestine with the most compassionate woman I have ever met, my grandmother.

These mothers—sorry, Mr. Speaker. I just lost my grandmother. These mothers deserve us to do more here, and the Congressional Mamas' Caucus centers this.

We can't keep talking about how we love our mothers, but they are struggling from food insecurity to housing.

When I am at a town hall, I do not ever want a mother to tell me she is struggling to feed her children. It should be easier for them.

Again, if they are doing everything they are supposed to do, why can't we help them? I feel very compelled that we need to move with the same urgency that many of my colleagues do when it is corporations.

When it seems to be the defense budget, it seems like we find the money. When it is somebody that literally comes to my office and says: Rashida, I found out I have MS. How am I supposed to take care of my family? I have MS. A young girl came to my office at 31 years old telling me she is on dialysis, spending 3 to 4 hours in treatment.

These mothers deserve us to do more in this Congress. We deserve to do it in action. We have to do more.

This is incredible to sit there and tell you all that these mothers come to us, and they are not even asking. They are saying: Tell us what we need to do, but it is hard out there. It is hard. I am working, but if my child gets sick, I am out. I can't make up those hours.

Again, our families right now are struggling with sick care in our country, not healthcare. Literally, people are making money off of the fact that folks continue to be sick.

I am asking our Congress this Mother's Day as the Congressional Mamas' Caucus member and many of us in this Chamber; we know that we love our mothers, but we can do more.

We can do more through policy and through action to really protect and to uplift them, to make sure that they are not only surviving in our country, but they are thriving. Because I will tell you, if we take care of our mothers, I know the children will be taken care of. Our neighborhoods and communities will be taken care of.

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

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 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.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kevin F. McCumber. Acting Clerk of the House, reported that on May 1, 2024, the following bills and joint resolution were presented to the President of the United States for approval:

H.R. 292. 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. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3901

MacArthur Blvd., in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the "Dr. Rudy Lombard Post Office".

H.R. 2379. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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".

H.J. Res. 98. Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to "Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status".

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, May 10, 2024, at 12:30 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-4090. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Floodplain Management and Protection of Wetlands; Minimum Property Standards for Flood Hazard Exposure; Building to the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard [Docket No.: FR-6272-F-02] (RIN: 2506-AC54) 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 Financial Services.

EC-4091. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Investing Lenders and Investing Mortgagees Requirements and Expansion of Government-Sponsored Enterprises Definition [Docket No.: FR-6291-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ60) 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 Financial Services.

EC-4092. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Authority's Fiscal Year 2025 Congressional Budget Justification; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-4093. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report entitled, "FY 2023 Superfund

Five-Year Review Report to Congress", pursuant to Sec. 121(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4094. A letter from the Senior Policy and Regulatory Coordinator, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medical Devices; Laboratory Developed Tests [Docket No.: FDA-2023-N-2177] (RIN: 0910-AI85) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-4095. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Garrett Lee Smith Campus Suicide Prevention (GLS Campus) Grant Program Report to Congress, pursuant to Sec. 520E-2 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4096. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Dedication of Commercial-Grade Items for Use in Nuclear Power Plants [Regulatory Guide 1.164, Revision 1] 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-4097. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Installation, Inspection, and Testing for Class 1E Power, Instrumentation, and Control Equipment at Production and Utilization Facilities [Regulatory Guide 1.30, Revision 1] 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-4098. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Installation Design and Installation of Vented Lead-Acid Storage Batteries for Production and Utilization Facilities [Regulatory Guide 1.128, Revision 3] 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-4099. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG — Guidance for Evaluation of Defense in Depth and Diversity to Address Common-Cause Failure Due to Latent Design Defects in Digital Instrumentation and Control Systems [NUREG-0800 Revision] [Branch Technical Position 7-19] 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-4100. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month period report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4101. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination under Sec. 7034(k)(5) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, pursuant to Public Law 118-47, Sec. 7034(k)(5); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4102. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report titled "Voting Practices of UN Members", pursuant to Public Law 101-246; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4103. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4104. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting fourteen (14) notifications of a vacancy, a designation of acting officer, a nomination, an action on nomination, and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4105. A letter from the Deputy Staff Director for Management and Administration, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4106. A letter from the Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the Service's FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4107. A letter from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4108. A letter from the Deputy Controller, performing the delegated duties of the Controller, OFFM, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's notification of final guidance — Guidance for Federal Financial Assistance [Docket No.: OMB-2023-0017] 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 Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4109. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the Corps' FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4110. A letter from the Director, Public Affairs and Government Relations, Postal Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Report to the President and Congress for FY 2023, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 109-435, Sec. 701(a); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4111. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conservation and Landscape Health [BLM-HQ-FR-NO-0450017935] (RIN: 1004-AE92) received

May 1, 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-4112. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Management and Protection of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska [BLM-HQ-FR-NO-04500177994] (RIN: 1004-AE95) received May 1, 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-4113. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — West Coast, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Groundfish Bottom Trawl and Midwater Trawl Gear in the Trawl Rationalization Program [Docket No.: 180207141-8999-02] (RIN: 0648-BH74) received May 1, 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-4114. A letter from the Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, NOS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary Regulations [Docket No.: 230206-0037] (RIN: 0648-BL38) received May 1, 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-4115. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Geophysical Surveys in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 240410-0195] (RIN: 0648-BL68) received May 1, 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-4116. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Annual Report on Disability-Related Air Travel Complaints received During Calendar Year 2022, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 41705(c)(3); Public Law 103-272, Sec. 41705(c)(3) (as added by Public Law 106-181, Sec. 707(a)(3)); (114 Stat. 158); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4117. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Value in Opioid Use Disorder Treatment Demonstration: Intermediate Report to Congress", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395cc-6(g)(2); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1866F(g)(2) (as amended by Public Law 115-271, Sec. 6042); (132 Stat. 3984); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EC-4118. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Report on Unobligated Balances for Appropriations Relating to Quality Measurement", pursuant to Public Law 116-260, Sec. 158(a)(2); (134 Stat. 2662); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and 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. JORDAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7581. A bill to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-494). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 7659. A bill to authorize and amend authorities, programs, and statutes administered by the Coast Guard; with an amendment (Rept. 118-495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8287. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue a rule relating to stress capital buffer requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8288. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to carry out a review of discount window operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 8289. A bill to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, the Judiciary, Homeland Security, 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, considered and passed.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 8290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the public disclosure of grants made by certain tax-exempt organizations to foreign entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 8291. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit certain tax-exempt organizations from providing funding for election administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself,

Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. HERN, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mrs. STEEL, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. FEENSTRA, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, and Mr. CAREY):

H.R. 8292. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase penalties for unauthorized disclosure of taxpayer information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 8293. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the public reporting of data on certain contributions received by tax-exempt organizations from foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 8294. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a waiver of certain criteria with respect to the designation of a critical access hospital; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 8295. A bill to require the President to deliver ammunition to Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTZ:

H.R. 8296. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to require Federal agencies to submit to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on rules that are revoked, suspended, replaced, amended, or otherwise made ineffective; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. JACOBS, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 8297. A bill to amend the HOME Investment Partnerships Act to establish a Project Turnkey Program to leverage vacant hotels and motels for housing and enhance shelter capacity nationally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 8298. A bill to amend section 1977A of the Revised Statutes of 1977 to equalize the remedies available under that section and to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to provide any legal or equitable relief available under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. SOTO, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS):

H.R. 8299. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Council for Technology and Innovation of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, to carry out a program to facilitate and coordinate efforts between the United States and Israel to expand and enhance collaboration on the development and delivery of health care products and services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself and Ms. BUDZINSKI):

H.R. 8300. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to establish online and delivery standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 8301. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Oversight and Accountability, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-

sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 8302. A bill to establish a commission to review the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and make recommendations for legislative reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 8303. A bill to require the United States Postal Service to notify postal customers and relevant officials when operations are temporarily suspended at a post office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. FRY (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. GUEST, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 8304. A bill to provide for a limitation on liability for certain institutions regarding limitations on compensation to student athletes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine (for himself, Mr. STAUBER, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 8305. A bill to establish a payment program for unexpected loss of markets and revenues to timber harvesting and timber hauling businesses due to major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OGLES, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 8306. A bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 8307. A bill to provide that the memorial to commemorate the sacrifice and service of the women who worked on the home front to support the efforts of the United States military during World War II may be located on the National Mall, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 8308. A bill to reauthorize the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACOBS (for herself and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 8309. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the inclusion of additional information relating to internet freedom in Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES (for himself and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 8310. A bill to require strategies on United States policy towards the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for

consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CASAR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 8311. A bill to cancel existing medical debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIM of California (for herself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. CISCOMANI):

H.R. 8312. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to permit certain members of the Armed Forces to pre-enroll in the system of annual patient enrollment established and operated under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 8313. A bill to prioritize Federal permitting for certain national defense activities related to the authorities under the Defense Production Act of 1950 and projects related to such activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:

H.R. 8314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose penalties with respect to contributions to political committees from certain tax exempt organizations that receive contributions from foreign nationals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCUAUL (for himself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 8315. A bill to amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 to prevent foreign adversaries from exploiting United States artificial intelligence and other enabling technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio (for himself, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Mr. D'ESPOSITO):

H.R. 8316. A bill to establish a program of workforce development as an alternative to college for all, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 8317. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicaid program for services provided by doulas and midwives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COLE, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 8318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat Indian Tribal Governments in the same manner as State governments for certain Federal tax purposes,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 8319. A bill to create a grant program to support the development of innovative learning models, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NEHLS (for himself and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 8320. A bill to allow taxpayers to indicate whether the Federal income taxes they pay should be used for domestic or international purposes, to rescind certain balances made available to the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 8321. A bill to require person convicted of unlawful activity on the campus of an institution of higher education beginning on and after October 7, 2023, to provide community service in Gaza; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. ROSENDALE):

H.R. 8322. A bill to revoke visas of certain aliens for rioting or unlawful protests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. TRONE, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASAR, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 8323. A bill to provide emergency assistance to States, territories, Tribal nations, and local areas affected by substance use disorder, including the use of opioids and stimulants, and to make financial assistance available to States, territories, Tribal nations, local areas, public or private nonprofit entities, and certain health providers, to provide for the development, organization, coordination, and operation of more effective

and cost efficient systems for the delivery of essential services to individuals with substance use disorder and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, the Judiciary, 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. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 8324. A bill to designate the United States courthouse annex located at 310 South Main Street in London, Kentucky, as the "Eugene E. Siler, Jr. United States Courthouse Annex"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 8325. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue regulations to ensure due process rights for physicians before any termination, restriction, or reduction of the professional activity of such physicians or staff privileges of such physicians; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 8326. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to the treatment of dates for processing under certain marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. MOYLAN, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 8327. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for the redistribution of unused territorial cap amounts under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 8328. A bill to establish grants to provide education on guardianship alternatives for older adults and people with disabilities to health care workers, educators, family members, and court workers and court-related personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Ms. KAPTR, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 8329. A bill to reauthorize and modify the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 8330. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase access to accelerated nursing degree programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Ms. WILD, Mr. CAREY, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. BACON, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. LANGWORTHY):

H.R. 8331. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to require skilled nursing facilities, nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities for the intellectually disabled, and inpatient rehabilitation facilities to permit essential caregivers access during any period in which regular visitation is restricted; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.R. 8332. A bill to prohibit student loan forgiveness for certain students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OGLES, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.J. Res. 138. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services relating to "Clarifying the Eligibility of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Recipients and Certain Other Noncitizens for a Qualified Health Plan through an Exchange, Advance Payments of the Premium Tax Credit, Cost-Sharing Reductions, and a Basic Health Program"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GREENE of Georgia:

H. Res. 1209. A resolution declaring the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives to be vacant.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. BRECHEN, Mr. GUEST, Mr. EZELL, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee):

H. Res. 1210. A resolution condemning the Biden border crisis and the tremendous burdens law enforcement officers face as a result; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. CLYDE):

H. Res. 1211. A resolution condemning the violent, anti-American and anti-Israel protests that are occurring on campuses of institutions of higher education nationwide; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILEY:

H. Res. 1212. A resolution ending campus encampments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STAUBER:

H. Res. 1213. A resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mr. MORELLE):

H. Res. 1214. A resolution honoring the resiliency of America's teachers during Teacher Appreciation Week of May 6, 2024, through May 13, 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 1215. A resolution calling on elected officials and civil society leaders to join in efforts to educate the public on the contributions of the Jewish American community; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-105. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Resolution No. 195, relative to funding for the federal Victims of Crime Act Victims Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ML-106. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 6, to urge the United States Congress to repeal the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8287.

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 require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue a rule relating to stress capital buffer requirements.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8288.

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 require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to carry out a review of discount window operations.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 8289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, clause 1, clause 3, and clause 18.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 8290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require tax-exempt organizations to include in their annual filings certain information regarding any grants they provide to foreign entities.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 8291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amends 501(c)(3)s to limit their donations to boards of elections.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 8292.

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:

The single subject of this bill is to increase penalties for unauthorized disclosure of taxpayer information.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 8293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution (Taxing and Spending Clause)

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the public reporting of data on certain contributions received by tax-exempt organizations from foreign sources, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 8294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a waiver of certain criteria with respect to the designation of a critical access hospital.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 8295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the President to deliver ammunition to Israel, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BENTZ:

H.R. 8296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section \*

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to require Federal agencies to submit to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on rules that are revoked, suspended, replaced, amended, or otherwise made ineffective.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 8297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Housing

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 8298.

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:

Labor & Employment

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 8299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Council for Technology and Innovation of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to carry out a program to facilitate and coordinate efforts between the United States and Israel to expand and enhance collaboration on the development and delivery of health care products and services.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 8300.

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:

Supporting America's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) workers.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 8301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

Section—Powers of Congress. 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

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill enacts new laws with regard to to relocation of physical customer service facilities.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 8302.

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 commission to review the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and make recommendations for legislative reforms

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 8303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the United States Postal Service to notify postal customers and relevant officials when operations are temporarily suspended at a post office, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FRY:

H.R. 8304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Limited Liability

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8305.

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:

Establishing a disaster assistance program for timber harvesting and timber hauling businesses.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 8306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To deregulate suppressors.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 8307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 and Article 4 Section 3

Clause 2

The single subject of this legislation is:

The creation of a monument to the Women who Worked on the Home Front on the National Mall.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 8308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1, Article 8 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To reauthorize the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003.

By Ms. JACOBS:

H.R. 8309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To include internet freedom in annual

Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

By Mr. JAMES:

H.R. 8310.

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:

Foreign Affairs

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 8311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Medical Debt

By Mrs. KIM of California:

H.R. 8312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states “[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense 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:

To direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to permit certain members of the Armed Forces to pre-enroll in the system of annual patient enrollment established and operated under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 8313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prioritize Federal permitting for certain national defense activities related to authorities under the Defense Production Act of 1950 and projects related to such activities, and for other purposes.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:

H.R. 8314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose penalties with respect to contributions to political committees from certain tax exempt organizations that receive contributions from foreign nationals

By Mr. McCUAUL:

H.R. 8315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 to prevent foreign adversaries from exploiting United States artificial intelligence and other enabling technologies

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 8316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish a program of workforce development as an alternative to college for all.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amends the Social Security Act to include reimbursement eligibility for doulas and midwives

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Federal taxation

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 8319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Education

By Mr. NEHLS:

H.R. 8320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution. 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 allow taxpayers to indicate whether the federal income taxes they pay should be used for domestic or international purposes.

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 8321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To send any person convicted of unlawful activity on a college campus on or since October 7, 2023 to Gaza for the purpose of providing community service.

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 8322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To revoke visas of certain aliens for rioting or unlawful protests.

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 8323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Authorizing robust, sustained funding for communities on the frontlines of the substance use disorder crisis

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 8324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To designate the United States courthouse annex located at 310 South Main Street in London, Kentucky as the “Eugene E. Siler, Jr. United States Courthouse Annex”.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 8325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Due process rights for physicians

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 8326.

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 the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to the treatment of dates for processing under certain marketing orders.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 8327.

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:

Authorizing the redistribution of unused Medicaid block grant funding among the territories

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 8328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Article 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish grants to provide education on guardianship alternatives for older adults and people with disabilities, to health care workers, educators, family members, and court workers and court-related personnel.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 8329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Human Rights

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 8330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Nurses

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 8331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Provides visitation rights for Essential Caregivers at long-term care facilities accepting funds from Medicare.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.R. 8332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Prohibits any individual arrested for participating in antisemitic activities from receiving federal student loan forgiveness programs under President Biden’s Department of Education IDR plan.

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.J. Res. 138.

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:

Blocking taxpayer subsidized health care for illegal immigrants

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 33: Mr. DELUZIO.

H.R. 130: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 549: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 618: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. DELUZIO.

H.R. 694: Mr. NICKEL.

H.R. 789: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. NICKEL.

H.R. 830: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 920: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 1015: Ms. SALINAS and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1088: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 1179: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1255: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 1359: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1425: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. MACE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1510: Mr. AMO.

H.R. 1572: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1582: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1787: Mr. TRONE and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1806: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 1810: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 1822: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1826: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1831: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 2395: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2411: Mr. MEUSER and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 2439: Mr. CARSON and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 2451: Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 2530: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2630: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2673: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2696: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 2713: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 2784: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2800: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.

H.R. 2889: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 2900: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 2921: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGARVEY, and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 2923: Mr. CROW.

H.R. 3100: Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 3170: Ms. LEE of Florida.

H.R. 3240: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 3418: Mr. TIFFANY.

H.R. 3481: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 3519: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois.

H.R. 3599: Mrs. PELTOLA.

H.R. 3605: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.  
 H.R. 3606: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.  
 H.R. 3690: Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 3725: Mr. CARBAJAL.  
 H.R. 3875: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 3882: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.  
 H.R. 4052: Mr. SUOZZI.  
 H.R. 4121: Mr. SWALWELL.  
 H.R. 4148: Mr. ROUZER.  
 H.R. 4157: Ms. DELBENE and Ms. DE LA CRUZ.  
 H.R. 4184: Mr. SOTO.  
 H.R. 4189: Mr. BACON, Ms. TOKUDA, and Ms. STEVENS.  
 H.R. 4335: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 4350: Mr. RUIZ.  
 H.R. 4432: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
 H.R. 4438: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.  
 H.R. 4519: Mr. HORFSORD.  
 H.R. 4571: Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 4646: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
 H.R. 4800: Mr. CARBAJAL.  
 H.R. 4894: Mr. FITZGERALD.  
 H.R. 4911: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. CARBAJAL.  
 H.R. 4942: Ms. STEVENS, Mr. CROW, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. BUDZINSKI, and Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 5041: Ms. MANNING.  
 H.R. 5134: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.  
 H.R. 5141: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.  
 H.R. 5163: Mrs. DINGELL.  
 H.R. 5266: Mr. MOORE of Utah.  
 H.R. 5324: Mrs. FLETCHER.  
 H.R. 5414: Ms. STEVENS.  
 H.R. 5419: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. ADERHOLT.  
 H.R. 5509: Mr. CASTEN.  
 H.R. 5644: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.R. 5646: Mr. TRONE.  
 H.R. 5749: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 5785: Ms. HOULAHAN.  
 H.R. 5834: Ms. STEVENS.  
 H.R. 5851: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.  
 H.R. 5987: Mrs. HAYES.  
 H.R. 5995: Mr. PHILLIPS.  
 H.R. 6020: Mr. BACON.  
 H.R. 6049: Mr. KHANNA.  
 H.R. 6173: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 6179: Mr. TRONE and Ms. BROWNLEY.  
 H.R. 6203: Mr. LIEU.  
 H.R. 6205: Mr. MOULTON.  
 H.R. 6211: Mr. STEUBE.  
 H.R. 6371: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.  
 H.R. 6415: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.  
 H.R. 6515: Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 6601: Ms. LEE of California.  
 H.R. 6664: Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
 H.R. 6935: Mr. FROST and Ms. MANNING.  
 H.R. 6951: Mrs. CAMMACK.  
 H.R. 7101: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.  
 H.R. 7158: Mr. HARDER of California.  
 H.R. 7174: Mr. YAKYM.  
 H.R. 7203: Ms. BONAMICI.  
 H.R. 7218: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. TRONE.  
 H.R. 7222: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 7227: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. HORFSORD, and Ms. PEREZ.  
 H.R. 7231: Mr. VAN ORDEN.  
 H.R. 7232: Mr. VAN ORDEN.  
 H.R. 7252: Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 7255: Mr. DONALDS.  
 H.R. 7315: Mr. TRONE.  
 H.R. 7384: Mr. SOTO.  
 H.R. 7401: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 7403: Mr. LOUDERMILK.  
 H.R. 7450: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 7467: Ms. PETTERSEN.  
 H.R. 7479: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. GUEST.  
 H.R. 7581: Mr. SCOTT Franklin of Florida.  
 H.R. 7624: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 7629: Mrs. SYKES and Mr. PHILLIPS.  
 H.R. 7634: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.  
 H.R. 7735: Mr. CARBAJAL.  
 H.R. 7763: Ms. OMAR.  
 H.R. 7766: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 7770: Ms. TLAIB.  
 H.R. 7771: Ms. TLAIB.  
 H.R. 7825: Ms. WILD.  
 H.R. 7862: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 7869: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.  
 H.R. 7891: Ms. WILD.  
 H.R. 7914: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.  
 H.R. 8057: Mr. BERA, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. WATERS.  
 H.R. 8061: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.  
 H.R. 8141: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.  
 H.R. 8164: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CASTEN, and Ms. BONAMICI.  
 H.R. 8173: Mr. SABLAN.  
 H.R. 8174: Mr. SABLAN.  
 H.R. 8195: Mr. ELLZEY and Mr. BURCHETT.  
 H.R. 8212: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. McGOVERN.  
 H.R. 8224: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.  
 H.R. 8238: Mr. GIMENEZ.  
 H.R. 8244: Mr. FEENSTRA, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 8253: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 8282: Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Ms. BOEBERT.  
 H.J. Res. 8: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
 H.J. Res. 82: Mr. NADLER.  
 H.J. Res. 135: Ms. TENNEY and Ms. LEE of Florida.  
 H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. OGLES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. GUEST.  
 H. Res. 86: Mrs. DINGELL.  
 H. Res. 146: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. COSTA.  
 H. Res. 376: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois.  
 H. Res. 837: Ms. PINGREE.  
 H. Res. 946: Mr. KUSTOFF.  
 H. Res. 1019: Mr. SELF.  
 H. Res. 1145: Mr. NORCROSS.  
 H. Res. 1148: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.  
 H. Res. 1180: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
 H. Res. 1184: Mr. TRONE.  
 H. Res. 1186: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
 H. Res. 1188: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. CALVERT.  
 H. Res. 1192: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. NORTON.  
 H. Res. 1197: Mr. DELUZIO.  
 H. Res. 1206: Ms. KUSTER.