



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2024

No. 86

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, May 20, 2024, at 3 p.m.

## House of Representatives

FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2024

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

Pastor Mark Westerfield, Central Baptist Church Round Rock, Round Rock, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, I am humbled to stand before You and these honored and distinguished men and women today, to stand in the gap and offer this prayer.

Today, we gratefully recognize the gift of life, liberty, and responsibility You have given us to lead this great country. On behalf of these men and women, I ask for wisdom, discernment, and unity as they carry the weight of caring for the close to 350 million citizens of this land. They carry the weight of protecting all lives and making sure that justice is paramount.

We stand today on the backs of many that have gone before, and we stand grateful that You have shown grace and mercy to each of us.

Please give each of these servants the skin of a rhino and the heart of a lamb. We humbly ask this in Your holy name.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### WELCOMING GUEST CHAPLAIN MARK WESTERFIELD

The SPEAKER. Without objection the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to introduce my longtime friend, Pastor Mark Westerfield, who I have the honor of hosting as our guest chaplain in the House today.

Mark is the senior pastor at Central Baptist Church in my hometown of Round Rock, Texas, where he began his ministry nearly 40 years ago.

Under his leadership, Central Baptist has expanded to a house of worship services, a variety of ministries, Bible studies, and the prestigious Round Rock Christian Academy.

His impact has extended far beyond the walls of his church. He has been instrumental in organizing the annual Love the Rock volunteer event that marshals volunteers from 40 different churches to unite for a single day in service to help their neighbors in Round Rock.

Mark embodies what is great about the close-knit central Texas community where I live and how we come together to make our city a better place to live. I am grateful that Mark Westerfield is joining us as our guest chaplain.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### FREE AMERICAN HOSTAGES

(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, Roger Zakheim, director of the Ronald Reagan Institute and former general counsel of the House Armed Services Committee, published an op-ed on Wednesday in The Washington Post calling for freeing American hostages from Iran puppet Hamas terrorists: Shifting away from mediation to a more aggressive stance to demonstrate that the United States does not leave its citizens behind.

Corrupt Judge Merchan qualifies daily for my invitation as guest for the Trump inauguration as Merchan reelects Donald Trump.

I am glad untrue, false, salacious details of Merchan's perverted sexual conduct have not been admitted as lies of Merchan's untrue, fabricated, illegal conduct is ignored. Donald Trump will

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.

H3333

be reelected due to the rejection of corrupt Judge Merchan's derangement.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who have successfully protected America for 20 years in the global war on terrorism as it moves from the Afghanistan safe haven to America.

We do not need new border laws. We need to enforce existing border laws. Biden shamefully opens the borders for dictators as more 9/11 attacks across America are imminent, as warned by the FBI.

Christians appreciate the courage and the truth of Kansas City kicker Harrison Butker. Coach Lou Holtz is correct.

#### HONORING REVEREND WILLIAM LAWSON

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Reverend William "Bill" Lawson.

Reverend Lawson was a giant in Houston. He was a warrior against the evils of discrimination, of poverty, and of homelessness, lifting basic human dignity to its highest heights.

During the peak season of the civil rights era, he was a key leader in Houston where his best work was often behind the scenes.

A patriot for peace, Reverend Lawson organized quiet desegregation of Houston through secret meetings with the business community, a plan that kept away violence and bombings that were rampant across the South.

Reverend Lawson was always on the right side of good trouble. The positivity he brought to our community will be felt for years to come. Houston will miss Reverend Lawson and his quiet demeanor and his endearing smile.

I send my love and condolences to the entire Lawson family as we remember him and all that he accomplished. Well done, good and faithful servant.

#### THE GREAT STATE OF IOWA

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

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised in Iowa, and I have always known that it was the place that I wanted to live and raise my family.

Recently, U.S. News and World Report caught up to what Iowans have known for a long time and officially ranked Iowa as one of the best States to live. They also ranked Iowa third for new opportunities. Under Governor Kim Reynolds, Iowa is flourishing.

While President Biden spent trillions of taxpayer dollars on woke priorities and created rampant inflation, Iowa cut taxes for families.

While President Biden opened our borders and allowed countless illegal

immigrants to invade, Iowa is working to deport illegal immigrants who endanger our communities.

Iowa is a model for the rest of the country. Our prosperity under Governor Reynolds is the perfect contrast to Joe Biden's national failures. Iowa is leading the way with commonsense conservatism, and our future is bright.

#### HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF GLENN HILLIARD

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate National Police Week, I take a moment to honor the memory of Wicomico County Deputy Sheriff Glenn Hilliard, a heroic Maryland Eastern Shore police officer who was killed in the line of duty while protecting his community from a violent criminal; unfortunately, an all too often occurrence in today's America.

In the evening hours of June 12, 2022, Officer Hilliard received a call that a fleeing fugitive was in the surrounding area.

While certainly potentially dangerous, this call wasn't much different from the hundreds of calls for help the Wicomico County police departments and police departments across the country receive daily as they confront crime to protect our communities.

Sadly, for Officer Hilliard, this call to duty would be his last. As he pursued the wanted criminal, the fugitive turned and fired, ultimately taking the life of Officer Hilliard.

As Officer Hilliard's family reminds us, he died doing what he loved and left behind a legacy of selflessly defending his community. In the end, it was not the way Officer Hilliard died but the way he lived.

As we honor National Police Week, let's take a moment to thank the many police officers who risk their lives so we can be safe.

May the memory of Officer Glenn Hilliard and all our fallen police officers never be forgotten.

#### PRATT'S COUNTRY STORE

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the good folks at Pratt's Country Store in Fountain City. They have been longtime friends of mine and my family.

Perry Pratt's grandfather and brother bought the acreage in the 1920s, and it has been family owned and family operated ever since, Mr. Speaker.

Pratt's sells fresh produce, dairy, baked goods, and fruits. My mama always loved to shop there. I always like to stop there, as well.

The whole family grew up working in and around the store, and you can tell.

They treat everyone like family when they walk in.

I also never have to worry about where the produce comes from, Mr. Speaker, because Pratt's is known for locally sourcing their food from east Tennessee farmers.

I always love walking into Pratt's because it just smells good. It smells like an old country store, it smells fresh, and it smells clean. They do things the old-fashioned way, and they make people feel like they are stepping back in time.

Ralph and Perry Pratt were recently honored as Fountain City's Men of the Year due to their amazing customer service.

Everyone that goes to Pratt's Country Store knows how delicious everything is, and they have some really great vegetables.

As good as their produce is, though, Mr. Speaker, they are best known for the family atmosphere. They are God-fearing people, and they have always been respected in our community. They have been here for three generations for a reason. I want them to know they are appreciated, and I hope they are around for several more generations.

□ 0915

#### RESOLUTION REGARDING VIOLENCE AGAINST LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1213), a resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUEST). Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1213

Whereas, beginning in 2020, and in conjunction with the "defund the police" movement, respect for the rule of law and law enforcement officials diminished;

Whereas this change in attitude has resulted in record death and injury to America's law enforcement officers at the Federal, State, local, and Tribal level;

Whereas policies implemented at several State and local jurisdictions have increased the difficulty and added significant risks for law enforcement to do their jobs effectively and safely;

Whereas law enforcement is demanded to handle societal problems, including a nationwide mental health crisis, record-setting overdose poisonings due to fentanyl, and an increase in the homeless population;

Whereas the lack of accountability for violent criminals with decreased penalties and no-bail policies has opened the door for record criminal activity in cities across the country;

Whereas these policies have encouraged the public to aggressively and violently engage with law enforcement;

Whereas law enforcement officers answer every service call, regardless of community support or ridicule;

Whereas law enforcement officers answer every service call, regardless of the threat to their lives;

Whereas there are currently 23,785 names of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, DC;

Whereas the deadliest year on record for law enforcement was 2021, when 586 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas, in 2022, 224 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas, in 2023, 137 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas 378 law enforcement officers were shot in the line of duty in 2023, the highest year on record, of which 115 were violent ambush attacks;

Whereas the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund anticipates adding at least 151 names to the sacred walls in the spring of 2024, representing the current and historical deaths which, to date, have been approved as line-of-duty deaths;

Whereas the average fallen law enforcement officer is 45 years old;

Whereas the average fallen law enforcement officer has 15 years of service;

Whereas the average fallen law enforcement officer leaves behind 2 children; and

Whereas current data does not show how many law enforcement officers are assaulted, injured, or disabled in the line of duty each year: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns calls to defund the police, which has increased violence towards law enforcement officers;

(2) recognizes that law enforcement officers must have the equipment, training, and resources necessary to protect the health and safety of the public as well as their fellow law enforcement officers on the job;

(3) recognizes the need for better data collection on law enforcement officers who are assaulted, injured, or disabled in the line of duty;

(4) acknowledges its responsibility for exemplifying a respect for the rule of law and for the law enforcement officers who protect communities across the Nation;

(5) acknowledges the mental stress and strain law enforcement officers suffer not only due to the pressures and realities of the job, but also the negative environment in which they often must work;

(6) acknowledges the need to strengthen its relationship with law enforcement to ensure policy decisions are aligned with the realities law enforcement officers face daily; and

(7) expresses condolences and solemn appreciation to the loved ones of each law enforcement officer who has made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

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

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. IVEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLINE. 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 resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to welcome so many fine men and women in blue here in our Nation's Capital for Police Week.

However, as always, I am concerned every day for the safety and well-being of these brave men and women in the communities across this great Nation where they live and work. Radical policies in States and cities across the country continue to promote a disastrous rise in crime and a dangerous environment for police officers.

Now more than ever, we must show our support for our law enforcement officers. As a former local prosecutor, I know just how important a robust police force is to keeping our community safe. For effective crime deterrence, you need prosecutors willing to pursue convictions and judges willing to sentence and incarcerate.

First and foremost, you need police willing to arrest and charge offenders for crimes committed. You need local and State governments willing to fund and support our police forces.

Let me be clear, this effort to defund the police has had a detrimental impact on efforts to combat crime but also on recruitment, retention, and morale among our law enforcement officers.

In Democrat-run cities across the country, areas where they defunded the police saw a spike in crime and continue to struggle today with keeping their cities safe. Despite Democrats' calls to defund the police and the emotional toll that that takes, we know that law enforcement officers answer every call for help regardless of who the person is or what they believe and regardless of the threat to their own lives. So many of those brave men and women who answer the call of duty put on the uniform and go to work in the morning but never return home in the evening.

Today, there are 23,785 names of law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty that are inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here in Washington, D.C. Words can never express our gratitude to each and every individual whose name is on that wall.

Unfortunately, we still see warning signs that the environment does not show any promise of becoming safer. According to the Fraternal Order of Police, 378 officers were shot in the line of duty in 2023, the highest number recorded since FOP began collecting the data.

So far in 2024, 136 officers have been shot. That must end. That is completely unacceptable.

We must take a stand against these attacks and honor our fallen law enforcement officers. This resolution does just that. This resolution con-

demns calls to defund the police. It also recognizes that law enforcement officers must have the training and resources necessary to protect the health and safety of the public as well as their fellow law enforcement officers on the job.

We must never forget those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty. It is up to us in Congress to honor their memories and to stand up and protect those who do so much to protect us.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on August 29, 2002, two deputy sheriffs in Prince George's County, Elizabeth Magruder and James Arnaud, were ambushed in the home of the shooter's family. They had been called to the house to execute a warrant, a health warrant, because the parents were concerned about the erratic behavior of their son.

Elizabeth Magruder was shot in the back of the head, and James Arnaud was shot and killed, as well. He left behind a wife, two children, and two grandchildren. She left behind a husband and a 3-year-old son.

I had just been elected State's attorney in Prince George's County, but I hadn't even been sworn in yet. One of my first duties was to attend the funerals for both of them. My first memorial service during Police Week was in their honor.

Therefore, I take this very seriously. The National Police Week commemoration, I think, is something that is very grave, and we should treat it with great respect.

Unfortunately, ambushes like the one Magruder and Arnaud faced that day haven't ended. We just saw recently the ambush in Charlotte. Four officers were killed, and eight were shot. We have had others like that all over the country.

My thought when we had Police Week approaching was that we would approach this in a bipartisan manner. I actually reached out and worked with Congressman HUNT from Texas, and we put together a bill that was aimed at expanding the number of police officers because we know that there are shortages across the country. We know that we need to increase the pipeline so that more officers will come and take on these dangerous tasks and stand in harm's way, or stand in the gap, as the pastor said this morning.

It was a bipartisan effort. It came out of the committee by voice vote. It was passed on the floor in a similar capacity. The Senate companion bill was passed, as well. We are looking forward to that becoming the law of the land in short order.

Unfortunately, much of the legislation that has come after that has been anything but bipartisan. The legislation we are speaking to today, I am afraid, falls into that category.

When I took a look at the resolution, H. Res. 1213, I had hoped to see praise go out to our officers across the country for the work that they do and for the officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty. Indeed, there are paragraphs that speak to that. Unfortunately, there are passages that don't.

My colleague from Virginia and his comments a few moments ago made some of the same kinds of comments, with respect to, for example, the defund the police argument. My Republican colleagues have concluded that "defund the police," a phrase that was used several years ago, is somehow fueling the rise of crime and, in this particular instance, the death and attacks against police officers.

As I just went into a moment ago, Magruder and Arnaud were killed in 2002, over 20 years ago. We know we have been seeing deaths of officers in the line of duty for decades now. It is nothing new. To kind of casually blame it on a slogan that I am not aware of anybody in the body here today who espoused that—certainly, I didn't—to pretend that that is the reason these shootings or these killings are occurring, is, I think, unfortunate and an abuse of what this week is supposed to mean.

Now, in addition, I would say this: I just mentioned that I don't know that anybody supports the defund the police slogan from a few years ago, but we do have colleagues in the House right now, a House Republican, who has a bill, H.R. 374, to defund ATF, and we have House Republican colleagues who called for the defunding of the FBI.

The irony of that, as those of us who have worked in law enforcement know—I was a prosecutor for 12 years, 4 on the Federal level, 8 as the locally elected State's attorney—the local and Federal prosecutors work together all the time. It is critical. Sometimes they work together in task forces because they can bring the local, the State, and the Federal forces to bear and provide maximum support in protecting our communities.

Unfortunately, this piece of legislation and much of the legislation that has been discussed this week that has been offered by my Republican colleagues intentionally ignores Federal law enforcement. In fact, we had one that was marked up in my committee, the Judiciary Committee, where I offered an amendment to include Federal law enforcement. It was expressly rejected on a party-line vote by my Republican colleagues.

I have to say that the FBI, ATF, and Border Patrol put their lives on the line, too. We should respect them, as well. One of the reasons I can't support this legislation is that it really is disrespectful to those Federal officers.

The other is that, back to the defund police issue, there is a recognition in the legislation where it talks about the number of officers who died in the line of duty in 2021, 2022, and 2023. I can talk about the specific numbers in a mo-

ment when we move forward in the debate, but one provision actually notes that 378 law enforcement officers were shot in the line of duty in 2023. The one common thread between the vast majority of officers who have been killed in the line of duty, like Arnaud and Magruder, like the people who were ambushed in Charlotte, like most of the people with the names on the wall just a few blocks away from here, is they were shot.

Sadly, my Republican colleagues are unable, unwilling, un-something to take a step to address that gun violence. The resolution here speaks in terms of defunding the police as the cause of their deaths, but all of us know that the greatest threat that these officers face is not being stabbed to death. It is not being beaten to death with a slogan like defund the police. It is being shot to death.

Briefly, these are numbers from the cops working with the National Fraternal Order of Police. A total of 331 law enforcement officers were shot in the line of duty during calendar year 2022 in 267 separate shooting incidents, including 42 incidents where multiple officers were shot.

I appreciate the fact that we are going to offer resolutions to praise officers, but if we are really serious about protecting them, it is hard to ignore a data point like that. Yet, our officers have to go out there knowing that they face these threats all the time. Traffic stops are particularly dangerous, but sometimes, like for Arnaud and Magruder, officers can be ambushed in a home. Sometimes, like in Charlotte, they can be ambushed in the open air.

Taking that seriously, I think, is an important piece, yet the resolution doesn't even mention it.

I will say this, and then I will take a pause here for a moment, but there is legislation pending right now in the House of Representatives. I offered one, an assault weapons ban. I figured it might be a bridge too far for me to ask my Republican colleagues to cosponsor that, so I came up with a bill. It is called the Raise the Age Act, and it would elevate the age from 18 to 21 to purchase assault weapons.

I thought that would be a reasonable bill to offer because there was already a provision in the law for handguns. You had to be 21 to purchase a handgun. I believe that was put in place during the Reagan era.

For my bill, raising it to 21, since you have to be 21 to buy alcohol, I thought it might make sense to be 21 to buy an assault weapon, as well.

I think we have 171-plus cosponsors for that bill, but none of them are Republican, not one, even though Republicans had agreed to legislation similar to that in previous years.

□ 0930

I will speak to you in a moment about the resources issue, as well. In the 117th Congress, Democrats supported legislation to provide equip-

ment to police officers. We will get into the particular numbers of that in a moment, but none of that is moving forward here in the House now, and none of it is certainly moving forward in Police Week.

I want to point out one little factoid from the COPS document that I mentioned before. It is under the heading Bullet Resistant Vests:

At least 34 officers were protected from gunshots that struck a protective ballistic vest.

Yet, we are struggling to find a way to provide additional support and equipment for officers to help them stay safe on the street. That is what we ought to be doing during Police Week, and to the extent we are going to talk in terms of resolutions in support of officers, let's strip out the political nonsense. The defund the police stuff really has no place in helping to protect police officers and make them safe.

As I mentioned a moment ago, it is a slap in the face the way these legislative provisions have been proposed to always exclude Federal law enforcement. I know you guys have issues on the other side about some of them, but I think this isn't the time or the place to express it in that way. Federal law enforcement deserves the same kind of respect, the same kind of appreciation, the same kind of protection that local and State law enforcement officers do.

I am going to urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution. We have had other resolutions that have come through before, and we have urged them to oppose them, as well. I am going to urge my colleagues on the other side after this vote is over—and you are in the majority, so you can move this kind of stuff whether it really makes a difference or not. Hopefully, after we get past this moment, we can actually sit down and get back to the type of legislation that I worked on with Congressman HUNT that can really make a difference to help make police officers safer, to help get more police officers on the street, and to praise all of them for the great work that they do.

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

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

I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I agree with him that we should stand in support of all of our law enforcement officers at the local, State, and Federal level. In addition to the work that we have done together on bills affecting law enforcement in the Judiciary Committee, I am also honored to serve on the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of Appropriations where we deal specifically with support for Federal law enforcement, as well as programs for State and local law enforcement. I can commit to the gentleman that the appropriations process under Chairman COLE's leadership will be focusing on providing that support for law enforcement across the country

at all levels. I encourage him to keep a close watch on those bills as they move through, and hopefully we can get his support for those pieces of legislation that provide that funding.

We have the loss of officers in every community, and during National Police Week we pause to thank those brave men and women in blue, and in rural areas like mine wearing brown uniforms, as well as sheriff's deputies, and we remember those who were lost.

We have had loss in the Sixth Congressional District. In Bridgewater, recently we had officers who we lost, and it really does take a toll not just on the families of the victims but on the entire community.

We want to make sure that that number is reduced, eliminated, and we can do that not only through funding efforts to support our police but also through resolutions like this where we try and reverse the trend that we have seen across the country and in many Democrat-run cities, quite frankly, where the antagonistic attitude toward men and women in law enforcement has reached a fever pitch. We have to turn that around. We have to restore that respect for law enforcement in our communities, that confidence in law enforcement in our communities through efforts like this, but also through efforts on the ground.

Nothing can replace support for law enforcement among city councils, among elected officials at the local level, among teachers, among community members. That is what is going to be, ultimately, the driving force behind the reversal in this antipolice, defund-the-police-type attitude in our communities and the restoration of that respect and a reduction in crime that would follow. If you respect the police, hopefully it follows logically that you are not going to be someone who wants to cross the police by violating the laws.

We will continue to push legislation like this and legislation that we work on in a bipartisan manner. I am sorry the gentleman says he can't support this resolution, but I hope that we continue to work on these types of bills as we move forward.

As to the issue of gun violence, I would say that efforts to raise the age at which adults in this country can exercise their constitutional rights to defend their homes, defend their families, defend their communities are not the answer. We only need to look in the District of Columbia to see what has happened when the age at which juvenile crimes, the age for covering crimes and determining that they are juveniles, has been raised over the years and is now 25. If you are under 25 years old in the District of Columbia and you commit a crime, you can be considered a juvenile for purposes of sentencing and for purposes of punishment. That doesn't make sense.

We passed a bill this week that actually lowers that age from 24 down to 18 because, truly, if you commit a crime

and you are a juvenile—and I worked in juvenile courts, so I understand that there needs to be different approaches to punishing juveniles. They need a much more restorative process that brings them back to a point at which they will be law-abiding adults. Once they are adults, once they are 18, treating them as juveniles without any kind of punishment for the crimes that are committed really does nothing but encourage that type of illegal behavior once they reach adulthood.

We don't think that raising age and pretending someone who is an adult is not an adult and can't exercise all of the rights enshrined to them under the Constitution is appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), a great law enforcement officer.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I am frustrated and angry but also deeply saddened. The law enforcement profession is an honorable one. To have so much compassion for others that you are willing to put your life on the line, it is, as we say, a call to service, and not many hear that call today.

If you had asked me a few years ago if my children should become law enforcement officers, I would have undoubtedly said yes. However, after these last few years of observing the treatment of our law enforcement officers, I would have to think twice about my answer.

Since 2020, I have watched the law enforcement profession become a punching bag, scapegoated by rabid media pundits more interested in clickbait than the facts, villainized by Hollywood, and disparaged by city councils, Members of this Congress, both men and women, and even our President.

Yet, all these people expect law enforcement to respond to their calls for service. They expect them to take the verbal assault and show up with a smile on their face ready to serve.

The wonderful thing about my brothers and sisters in uniform is that despite this treatment and abuse, they will show up. They will answer every call. They will sacrifice their safety for others. They will help protect their community no matter how much ridicule or resentment they face.

I am here to say the things that they can't. I am here to protect my brothers and sisters in the blue and brown because others won't.

Enough is enough.

Law enforcement officers deserve our respect, our admiration, and our support. To provide anything else is unacceptable.

The resolution before us acknowledges the change in attitude toward law enforcement over the last few years and the subsequent violence directed toward them. It acknowledges that they respond to calls for service no matter who is on the other line.

It acknowledges that the job has only become more dangerous and more men-

tally and physically exhausting, yet they still show up for work, not knowing if they have kissed their families good-bye for the last time.

Importantly, this resolution also acknowledges that we in this Chamber set the standard. We are the ones who must demonstrate a respect for the rule of law and a respect for our law enforcement officers if we are to expect the public to do the same. We must do so in our actions, in our conversations, and even the policies we consider.

Bills that never become law can have the most staggering ripple effect. They can persuade local municipalities to implement soft-on-crime policies and strip law enforcement of resources. They can encourage the public to cheat, steal, and disrespect fellow community members. They can cause good, noble people to change their minds about entering the profession that I love so much, which is law enforcement.

Actions have consequences, and our communities are suffering as a result.

Let's take this moment to learn, to change for the better. We can rise to the moment, stand with our law enforcement officers, reestablish law and order, and bring safety back to our communities.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to respond to my good friend and colleague who is managing the time on the other side of the aisle. He talked about his support for law enforcement and what he did.

I want to read something to you: "It is not enough to hold the officers involved accountable. In the past year, police killings have reached a record high. Rogue, militant policing continues to run rampant across our country, threatening public safety and the lives of millions of Americans.

"Our antiquated criminal justice system has long allowed law enforcement to utilize excessive force and prejudicial policing practices while avoiding accountability. We need extensive reform now with de-escalation training, selective bias training, and better policing. I am urging my colleagues in Congress to pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

"Additionally, we must invest in our communities through unarmed first responder agencies, mental health and crisis support treatment options, diversion programs, community intervention groups, and re-entry programs. We can and must do better to avoid tragedies and improve public safety. I will never stop working to support and enact changes that will make our country safer for all Americans."

The first part, this whole quote that I read was from my colleague who is managing the time on the other side of the aisle. That is horrendous because the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act takes away qualified immunity. If you take away qualified immunity

from the American law enforcement officer, it will devastate our communities. It will devastate recruitment, retention, and morale.

□ 0945

You have to be kidding me.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we are dealing with.

I became a law enforcement officer in late 1994 when Ron Ryan and Tim Jones from the St. Paul Police Department were ambushed and killed. I was a young officer. I didn't even have my funeral uniform yet, but I went to those funerals wondering what profession I was getting in, even taking a second thought whether I should stay in the profession. I was 1 week on the job.

In Cottage Grove, Minnesota, I was working the night shift. My partner and I that night, Tom Uland, stopped at a gas station to have a cup of coffee on the midnight shift. We talked about our families. We split up. He went one way, and I went the other. Within 3 minutes he is screaming for help. He needed help on a traffic stop. I couldn't get there fast enough. When my squad car got on that scene, the whole engine was shaking. I couldn't get to him fast enough.

He was being attacked by the driver and a dog, and the female passenger was crying. We found out when Officer Uland went to make that traffic stop the driver said to the female passenger: I am going to kill him.

When Officer Uland went up to the window, the suspect was digging into his armrest trying to get a handgun, and the female passenger was trying to move it away from him to save the officer's life. I got there during the struggle. Five minutes before that, he and I were having a cup of coffee and talking about our families and our futures. That is how quickly it can change.

The cavalier attitude of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is unconscionable. Where were they during the summer of love, 2020, when officers were getting ambushed? Where were they, Mr. Speaker?

On December 15, 1995, at 10:32 p.m., at the intersection of Sixth Avenue East and Fourth Street, Duluth, Minnesota, a career criminal tried to shoot me in the head and kill me, and I survived by the grace of God. He was a career criminal who should have been put away years ago.

Don't tell me we don't have issues.

We have issues with prosecution, too. The Federal prosecutor in Minneapolis would not charge him with felon in possession of a handgun. We couldn't figure out why. An off-duty police officer was shot in the head by a career criminal who should never have had the gun, and he wouldn't prosecute.

It was about 8 years later when the drug task force supervisor woke me up in the middle of the night and called me.

He said: Pete, we got him. He is going to prison for a long time. We have got

the stolen guns on him. He is not getting away with this one.

It took him years after to put this guy away.

Then on London Road in Duluth, Minnesota, suspects tried to kidnap some folks. I get the call with my supervisor. I don't get to choose what call I go on. I don't get to say: I don't want to go on this gun call. I don't want to go on that.

I get the call, and I go, and every single police officer in this Nation does the same thing.

It is a kidnapping, suspect with a gun. I go, I clear the room, Mr. Speaker, and the suspect comes flying in the room, points a handgun right at me, and pulls the trigger. By the grace of God, it didn't go off.

Do you know why I knew it didn't go off?

It happened so fast; I saw it in his eyes. I was in a street fight for my life; and, yes, I needed some help after that call. That is why I am adamant that the professionals who serve our communities get the mental health they need, and they need it now sometimes.

To listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle pretend they support law enforcement, they have never worn the boots, or many of them have never worn the boots. They have never answered a call: Two shot, officer needs help. Most of them have never had a suspect with a rifle in his hand ready to kill you.

I have to make a decision, Mr. Speaker. If that rifle comes up, then I have to save my life. I have to do that. I don't want to, but his actions are causing me to save my own life and the lives of others.

Mr. Speaker, the honorable men and women in law enforcement in America deserve better treatment. This week we celebrated Law Enforcement Week, Police Week. We saw the men and women in uniform, the proud men and women in uniform, come to our Nation's Capital and be proud of their profession.

This week, Law Enforcement Week, should be 52 weeks a year. Every week we should support law enforcement and protect law enforcement. I am sick and tired of seeing this happen to law enforcement men and women, Mr. Speaker, throughout this Nation. There are Members in this body who stand at a microphone and vilify law enforcement. They will go to their funerals though. They will go to their funerals.

When it comes to supporting the legislation that I have here, a resolution regarding violence against law enforcement, my colleague says that it is partisan.

You have to be kidding me.

This is a resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers, and my good friend calls it partisan.

Yes, defund the police was real. We are seeing the effects of it today. The recruitment and retention morale are at the lowest ever. There are shortages, Mr. Speaker, in police departments across this Nation, including my hometown.

Do they want to sit up here during National Police Week and pretend?

No. We are not going to have it. You are either going to support law enforcement or you don't.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker?

Most departments today wear body cameras or have squad car cameras, in-squad cameras. In this Nation, cooler heads must prevail on the support for law enforcement. We have to understand what they go through. We must push: comply now, challenge later. Comply now, challenge later.

Mr. Speaker, in 23 years of law enforcement, when I placed somebody under arrest: Please put your hands behind your back. You are under arrest. Palms out. Don't resist. Do you understand?

I placed my handcuffs on them, gapped them, and double-locked them, escorted them to the right rear seat of my squad car. When they obeyed my lawful order, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get hurt, the suspects didn't get hurt, and the public didn't get hurt.

When a law enforcement gives you a lawful order, obey her. Obey a lawful order. When a law enforcement officer says: Put your hands on the steering wheel, then put your hands on the steering wheel.

When a law enforcement officer says: Sit on the sidewalk for safety purposes, then sit on the sidewalk.

When a law enforcement officer says: You are under arrest for domestic assault, obey a lawful order, Mr. Speaker.

As a society, where do we want to be? Judge, juror, and executioner on the streets of the United States of America?

It is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we have to change, and it is up to leadership in our Nation's Capital and elected leaders at all levels in every State.

To the men and women who wear the uniform in this great Nation: I will tell you it is a noble, honorable profession. No matter what you hear from some folks that you are not wanted, it is unwarranted, it is not a good career, I will tell you: I spent 23 years as a police officer in the city of Duluth, Minnesota. I helped build a community policing program. I love the profession, and I enjoyed the profession.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is the darkest hours of someone's life we deal with, and we deal with it with compassion and professionalism. It is not easy, but we need the good men and women.

Mr. Speaker, we also need to hold people who perform violent acts against innocent citizens accountable. We need prosecutors to hold them accountable when they perform a violent crime.

In closing, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, we in this country had better reshape our thinking and our focus toward safety of all of us, and we do that by supporting the men and women in uniform. We do that by electing leaders at all levels of government who support law enforcement.

We in law enforcement want to be held accountable, but let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. Right now we have a rogue attorney general in Hennepin County, Minnesota, who is bringing murder charges against Minnesota Trooper Ryan Londregan for what he did to save his partner's life, and the use of force expert opined to that, that Trooper Londregan used lawful force to save his partner's life. He is now being charged in Hennepin County by an anti-law enforcement attorney general.

In fact, she can't even find an attorney in her own department, Mr. Speaker, to prosecute the case. She is spending over \$1 million of taxpayer money, Mr. Speaker, to come to this town and find a prosecutor. It is unbelievable.

The people of Minnesota and Hennepin County should understand what is happening to that good man, that good trooper and his family. I will stand up to the good men in law enforcement no matter what I have to do, no matter what I have to do.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this: If we don't have a change of attitude toward law enforcement, then this country is going to be in trouble.

Before I close, I want to ask—this is an ask to the American people, to every American: The next time you see a law enforcement officer, I want you to look her in her eye and tell her: Thank you for your service. We appreciate you.

She will take that response and carry it with her the rest of the day, the rest of her shift, and forever.

We need to show appreciation.

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

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have got to say that I am deeply shocked and offended by the statements that were just made, especially regarding me, but the larger context, too.

The gentleman from Minnesota read a quote that he attributed to me, and it is a statement I made, but it was about the killing of Tyre Nichols.

Tyre Nichols was the gentleman in Tennessee who was beaten to death over a period of 10 to 15 minutes by I believe it was six police officers. In fact, I remember watching the video, and there were multiple videos because they had different angles. One of the officers who had been beating him got tired and stepped away so he could catch his breath and then came back to continue beating him.

I had never seen anything like it. I was shocked.

□ 1000

I had cases when I was the State's attorney where police officers used excessive force, and I prosecuted those cases. In some cases, we convicted those individuals.

I guess my colleague from Minnesota thought that the beating death of Mr. Nichols was good policing, but keep something in mind. The chief of the police of that department fired those officers because he recognized that that

had crossed the line that good police officers recognize and follow every day, under every circumstance, and in every situation.

I thought that is what we were going to honor this Police Week. To sort of hold up the Tyre Nichols scenario as an example of what police officers are supposed to be doing during Police Week is insane. I can't believe it, but that is what the gentleman did.

Let me say this. It is important for us to make sure that we walk and chew gum at the same time. We want to honor good policing, for sure, because every community needs it. We need police officers who go out and respond to calls for robberies, shootings, or whatever. We need detectives who respond in homicide and rape prosecutions and investigations at the local, State, and Federal levels. We definitely need it, but even they have recognized over time that the bad apples, and the ones in Tyre Nichols' case were clearly not just bad apples but about as bad as you can get, have to be separated out because it is important for the police to police themselves. I know it is hard, but we have to make sure that they do it.

The gentleman mentioned body cameras a moment ago. Guess why we have body cameras. That was one of the innovations that was made to address excessive force. Guess what. One of the things that has led to is better policing.

When I first ran for State's attorney in Prince George's County, one of the issues I ran on was videotaping interrogations, and I wrote an op-ed. It was titled "Safeguards for the Innocent." I was joined by the former head of the homicide unit here in Washington, D.C. We wrote it together.

The reason we wrote it was because we knew that if these investigations were videotaped, it would address the flurry of false confessions that had been made in Prince George's County. We knew they were false because they were proven to be innocent by DNA evidence. We knew they were false confessions, so we made this change to try to address that.

Guess what happened. Initially, the police officers opposed it, but the good detectives realized quickly that the videotapes showed the great work that they were doing and that they were going about it the right way. The juries appreciated that, too, because then we could just bring it in, set up the video, play the tape, and the jurors could see for themselves and make their decision. That is good policing.

I think it is important for us to make sure that we hold police officers, just like we do prosecutors or any other law enforcement profession, to a basic level of following the law even as they try to protect us from misconduct.

I guess this is kind of par for the course now for my Republican colleagues. On the January 6 piece, for example, we have colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are calling the

perpetrators of January 6, the rioters of January 6, hostages and patriots. The majority is calling the people who participated in it patriots, the ones who had been prosecuted, convicted, and jailed. Even though I think over 900 of them pled guilty, others were convicted after jury trials.

They have had their day in court. They have had their due process. They were rightly convicted and held accountable. They have been sentenced to jail, but we still have my colleagues on the other side of the aisle calling them patriots and hostages, even though five officers died as a result of January 6 and many others were injured, too.

Mr. Speaker, this is Police Week, and I am hoping that we can get back to trying to do things in a bipartisan way here, but based on what I heard from my colleague from Minnesota, that is not likely to happen.

It is important to make sure that we do this: We have to make sure that we recognize the challenges we face in law enforcement. I support law enforcement, as I mentioned earlier. We have legislation to try to increase the number of police officers who are going to be out there on the street because we need more police officers on the street. The George Floyd Act, which was referenced, I think, a minute ago, is aimed at making sure that, in addition to having more on the street, they do the job in the right way.

When I first got elected, we didn't have iPhones very often. We would prosecute these cases and present the evidence to the jury in excessive force cases, and many times, the jury would reject it.

One of the transformations that happened with the iPhone, though, was that people, standing there on the street while excessive force was taking place, videotaped it, and then they were able to bring that to the police. Additionally, cases that probably wouldn't have been charged previously were not only charged but led to convictions.

The George Floyd scenario, the person who that legislation is named after, is a paradigm example. Derek Chauvin was there with his knee on George Floyd's neck for 9½ minutes. The police report that Derek Chauvin and his other colleagues on the street filled out made no mention of all of that, but the videos made it clear that Derek Chauvin had basically just strangled him to death with his knee. He was held accountable, and the other officers around him, who basically did nothing while it was happening, were held accountable, too.

Maybe my colleague from Minnesota had that in mind when he made some of the statements he just said a few minutes ago. I sure hope not because officers who do that belong in jail. They shouldn't have a badge, a gun, and a license to kill. That has to be given to the people we can trust to enforce the law in the right way.

For the vast majority of police officers, that is how they do it, and that is why we appreciate and respect them. When they cross the line, I hope we don't have people like the gentleman from Minnesota act like that is okay because it is not. We have to hold them accountable.

A minute ago, I mentioned serious legislation. It is a little surprising to me that we are having such a debate like this over legislation that is just a resolution basically. It speaks only of defund the police and the like.

The Democrats in the last Congress, for example, passed meaningful reforms to support police even though, in many instances, they were opposed by Republicans. Last Police Week, we passed H.R. 6943, the Public Safety Officer Support Act, which extended death benefits to law enforcement officers with PTSD. It happened over the objection of 17 Republicans, including 4 on the Judiciary Committee.

Last Police Week, H.R. 2992, the Traumatic Brain Injury and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Law Enforcement Training Act, passed, as well. Twenty-one Republicans objected to that also.

We keep passing legislation, or we did when the Democrats were in control, to actually provide additional resources and benefits to police officers who get injured in the line of duty. I think that is important for us to continue to do, but our colleagues aren't doing it.

Republicans are bringing this political legislation, and it got really political a minute ago when the gentleman from Minnesota was up there, frankly, kind of ranting about things he attributed to me, which I think was wrong and incorrect, but, more importantly, things the gentleman keeps trying to attribute to Democrats and the change in policy.

Mr. Speaker, here are a couple of other quick points about some of the things my colleague said, like the decline in police officers. I have to be clear. One of the things we have in the bill I cosponsored with Mr. HUNT was a report that is going to study this because I think it is going to help address a lot of the misinformation that is coming out on the other side about why we are having some shortages.

They are saying it is based on the defund the police slogan, but the roots of these shortages started many years ago. In some instances, in some jurisdictions, we just have a cycle of people who are coming up for their retirements at their 20-year and 30-year marks. In any event, let's try to make sure we get the evidence and the data so we can correct those challenges.

It is not just fixing a slogan on the street. It is a dangerous job. It doesn't pay as much as it should. Many of the officers or potential officers find that they can have jobs that pay as much but don't have to work as hard. For example, in a Homeland Security Committee hearing, I remember the Border

Patrol agents testifying that they are having trouble retaining officers at the border, not because of a defund the police slogan but because they can leave the job and make more money doing other things and stay in the same community, and it is less taxing than being an officer.

If we are honest about it, we can come up with better solutions to try to retain them, like maybe paying them more money, but if we keep spreading rhetoric about this is defund the police, we won't fix the problem and get more officers.

If money is the issue, and of course it is a factor, then just standing here and haranguing about defunding the police doesn't fix it. We have to find ways to raise the salaries and help attract and retain more of them to go out on the street.

I am going to stop with this, for the moment. I first went into law enforcement in 1990 as a prosecutor, and I took it seriously then.

The gentleman on the other side is accusing Democrats of not being serious about police. We have former police officers here on this side of the aisle who are Democrats, and I know them across the country. Not only that but every time I have run for office, I have been endorsed by the FOP in my jurisdiction. It is a little unfortunate to sort of use those sorts of attacks to justify the resolution that is proposed here.

Let's get serious. Let's get back to doing things that actually will address the problems and retain more police officers, recruit more police officers, and address the concerns that we have with respect to keeping safe on the street.

Yes, gun violence is a big factor in the dangers that they face on the streets. I think it is kind of hard to be serious about protecting them if we are not even going to discuss that.

My colleague from Virginia mentioned that he thinks we want to make sure that they are 21 because if you wait until they are 21, it undermines their Second Amendment rights. I appreciate that, but I don't agree with that take.

Let me say this: Ghost guns, I haven't come across anybody who thinks those make sense. They are intentionally designed to avoid prosecution. They don't have any numbers on them in order to avoid being tracked in the event of use for a criminal enterprise. The use of ghost guns in crimes on the street is exploding.

We need to get our Republican colleagues to help us support legislation like that. We are having trouble finding it, but today would be the day.

By the way, talking about killings on the street, it is handguns primarily, as I just mentioned a few minutes ago, that are leading to officers' deaths on the streets. If we are really serious about protecting police officers, can't we do something to try to address that? Can't we do something to try to limit the number of guns on the street?

Also, I know that the argument is going to be Democrats are soft on crime and all of that, but remember, a lot of the people who commit these crimes don't have prior offenses. The guy who killed the two deputies in my jurisdiction, Arnaud and Magruder, didn't have any prior record. He had mental health issues.

We can't just assume that all of these issues revolve around people who have long criminal records because they don't, and many times police officers are killed on the street by people with no prior records.

Let's try to address all of these issues in a serious way, in a bipartisan way, because that is the way to actually help keep our police officers safe on the street.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 3½ minutes remaining.

□ 1015

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

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, no Member of Congress questions the difficulty, danger, or stress associated with serving in law enforcement. We are grateful for each and every Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement officer, agent, or employee working daily, putting their lives on the line to keep us safe in every corner and territory of this Nation.

This week we should come together to honor their dedication to their jobs and communities, lift up the names of those officers and agents who gave their lives in service, and wrap our arms around their loved ones left behind.

Sadly, Republicans have chosen partisanship over bipartisanship at this time. I, therefore, must oppose H. Res. 1213, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, we should all come together. We should all be standing united on this floor in support of law enforcement today. Unfortunately, it is the other side that is going to object to this legislation in support of police. To the defund the police movement, this rhetoric has come from Members in this Chamber on the other side and, yes, that has been followed up by action in cities across the country.

We just had a field hearing in Philadelphia where they defunded the police. They took money away from police departments in Philadelphia.

The gentleman may call the testimony of our colleague from Minnesota, former law enforcement, ranting, but, instead, I believe it was a passionate defense of each and every law enforcement officer in this country. We must stand and back the blue.



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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1213, A resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers.

Let me be clear: I am supporting this resolution because our law enforcement officers deserve better training and equipment, better data about the injuries they incur in the line of duty, and better resources to support their mental health and community engagement. Peace officers who serve their communities faithfully deserve our respect, and I resoundingly condemn the increase in violence against law enforcement officers. However, this resolution also inserts unnecessarily divisive language into what should be a unifying message of support. The claim that an increase in violence against law enforcement officers is tied to calls to defund the police is unsupported and irresponsible. Congress should never use our first responders to force a partisan, politically charged message. This is especially true during Police Week, when we reflect on those who have died in the line of duty, and honor those who put their lives on the line every day to keep our communities safe.

The work law enforcement does is felt every day, and they deserve real, tangible support. Genuine support for our law enforcement officers requires Congress to address the myriad challenges they face. For example, we must work to stem the proliferation of ghost guns and assault weapons that make it especially dangerous and difficult for law enforcement to do their job. Congress must also ensure law enforcement is equipped to respond to the many calls they receive. I strongly support federal COPS grants to local law enforcement agencies, which have provided more than \$16 million to Minnesota law enforcement agencies since 2016, putting more than 100 additional officers in our communities. Just as strongly, I oppose the Republican Majority's budget proposals to cut this essential funding. Additionally, support for mental health professionals to accompany officers in certain situations is needed. Being a law enforcement officer already entails so much. They should not be expected to fill dozens of specialized roles in addition to their primary responsibilities.

During my service in Congress, I have been committed to ensuring that our law enforcement officers have the resources and support they need to do their jobs. In my role on the Appropriations Committee, I have secured more than \$8 million in Community Project Funding to directly support Fourth District law enforcement agencies and programs. I will continue to work to support Minnesota's first responders and invest in community safety.

I thank our law enforcement community for the sacrifices they make every day to keep us safe.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 337, nays 61, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

YEAS—337

Adams Espaillat Letlow
Aderholt Estes Levin
Agullar Ezell Lieu
Alford Fallon Lofgren
Allen Feenstra Loudermilk
Allred Finstad Luetkemeyer
Amo Fischbach Luna
Amodei Fitzgerald Luttrell
Armstrong Fitzpatrick Lynch
Arrington Fleischmann Mace
Auchincloss Fletcher Malliotakis
Babin Flood Maloy
Bacon Foxx Mann
Baird Frankel, Lois Manning
Balderson Franklin, Scott
Banks Fry
Barr Fulcher Mast
Bean (FL) Gaetz Matsui
Beatty Gallego McBath
Bentz Garbarino McCaul
Bergman Garcia, Mike McClintock
Beyer Golden (ME) McCollum
Bice Gonzales, Tony McCormick
Biggs Gonzalez, Meeks
Bilirakis Vicente Menendez
Bishop (NC) Good (VA) Meng
Blunt Gooden (TX) Meuser
Boebert Gosar Miller (IL)
Bost Gottheimer Miller (OH)
Boyle (PA) Graves (LA) Miller (WV)
Brecheen Graves (MO) Mills
Brown Green (TN) Molinaro
Brownley Griffith Moolenaar
Bucshon Grothman Moore (AL)
Budzinski Guest Moore (UT)
Burchett Guthrie Moran
Burgess Hageman Morelle
Burlison Harder (CA) Moskowitz
Calvert Harris Moulton
Cammack Harshbarger Mrvan
Caraveo Hayes Mullin
Carbajal Hern Murphy
Carey Higgins (LA) Neguse
Carl Hill Nehls
Carter (GA) Himes Newhouse
Carter (LA) Hinson Nickel
Carter (TX) Horsford Norman
Cartwright Houchin Nunn (IA)
Case Houlihan Obernolte
Castor (FL) Hoyer Ogles
Chavez-DeRemer Hoyle (OR) Owens
Cherfilus- Hudson Pallone
McCormick Huizenga Palmer
Chu Hunt Panetta
Ciscomani Issa Pappas
Cline Jackson (NC) Pascrell
Clyde Jackson (TX) Pelosi
Cohen Jacobs Peltola
Cole James Pence
Collins Jeffries Perez
Comer Johnson (LA) Perry
Connolly Johnson (SD) Peters
Correa Jordan Petterson
Costa Joyce (OH) Pfluger
Courtney Joyce (PA) Phillips
Craig Kaptur Posey
Crane Keating Quigley
Crawford Kelly (IL) Raskin
Crenshaw Kelly (MS) Reschenthaler
Crow Kelly (PA) Rodgers (WA)
Cuellar Kennedy Rogers (AL)
Curtis Khanna Rogers (KY)
D'Esposito Kiggans (VA) Rose
Davids (KS) Kildee Rosendale
Davidson Kiley Ross
Davis (NC) Kilmer Rouzer
De La Cruz Kim (CA) Roy
Dean (PA) Krishnamoorthi Ruiz
DeLauro LaLota Ruppertsberger
DelBene LaMalfa Rutherford
Deluzio Lamborn Ryan
DeSaulnier Landsman Salazar
Diaz-Balart Langworthy Salinas
Dingell Larsen (WA) Sánchez
Donalds Larson (CT) Scalise
Duarte Latta Schiff
Duncan LaTurner Schneider
Dunn (FL) Lawler Scholten
Edwards Lee (FL) Schriener
Ellzey Lee (NV) Schweikert
Emmer Leger Fernandez Scott, Austin
Escobar Lesko Self

Sessions Strong
Sherman Suozzi
Sherrill Swalwell
Simpson Sykes
Slotkin Tenney
Smith (MO) Thanedar
Smith (NE) Thompson (CA)
Smith (NJ) Thompson (MS)
Smith (WA) Thompson (PA)
Smucker Tiffany
Sorensen Timmons
Soto Titus
Spanberger Tokuda
Spartz Tonko
Stanton Torres (CA)
Staubert Torres (NY)
Steel Trahan
Stefanik Turner
Steil Valadao
Steube Van Drew
Stevens Van Duynes
Strickland Van Orden

Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—61

Balint Garcia (TX) Omar
Barragan Garcia, Robert Pingree
Blumenauer Goldman (NY) Pocan
Bonamici Gomez Porter
Bowman Green, Al (TX) Pressley
Bush Huffman Ramirez
Cárdenas Ivey Sarbanes
Carson Jackson (IL) Scanlon
Casar Jayapal Schakowsky
Casten Johnson (GA) Scott (VA)
Clark (MA) Kamlager-Dove Scott, David
Clarke (NY) Lee (CA) Stansbury
Crockett Lee (PA) Takano
DeGette McClellan Tlaib
Doggett McGarvey Underwood
Eshoo McGovern Velázquez
Foster Moore (WI) Waters
Foushee Nadler Watson Coleman
Frost Napolitano Williams (GA)
Garamendi Neal
Garcia (IL) Ocasio-Cortez

NOT VOTING—32

Bera Gimenez McClain
Bishop (GA) Granger McHenry
Buchanan Greene (GA) Mfume
Castro (TX) Grijalva Miller-Meeks
Cleaver Jackson Lee Mooney
Cloud Kean (NJ) Norcross
Clyburn Kim (NJ) Sewell
Davis (IL) Kuster Trone
DesJarlais Kustoff Wexton
Evans LaHood Wilson (FL)
Ferguson Magaziner

□ 1049

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mses. ESCOBAR, BROWNLEY, Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER, AMO, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. PANETTA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for: Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for today's vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 218, H. Res. 1213.

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I had to miss votes today to travel back to Illinois. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 218.

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, I missed one vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 218.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2024, TO TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2024

MR. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to

meet at noon on Tuesday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MALOY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1822

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 1822.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is granted.

#### RECOGNIZING THE ANASTASIA MOSQUITO CONTROL DISTRICT

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the critical public health work carried out by our Nation's mosquito control professionals.

Mosquitoes are not just a nuisance. In fact, they are also vectors for deadly diseases like malaria, Zika, and the famous West Nile virus.

The world-renowned Anastasia Mosquito Control District, which is located in my district in St. Johns County, St. Augustine, Florida, was initially formed thanks to Floridians who wanted to live mosquito-free.

Since 1948, the AMCD has served more than 320,000 Floridians in St. Johns County. AMCD is now the leader in education and applied research all across the world in the field of mosquito control, not just in Florida, not in just the United States, but literally across the globe.

I urge my colleagues to meet with their mosquito control professionals to learn more about this critical mission because it truly is about our healthcare in America.

#### HONORING PEGGY STAMEY

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

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional life of North Carolina's Peggy Stamey who recently passed.

A trailblazer for women, Peggy shattered glass ceilings as the first woman who was elected chairperson of the Wake County Democratic Party.

Elected to the North Carolina House in 1982, Peggy sponsored a number of bills that helped make North Carolina a better place for all people.

Peggy's unparalleled commitment to progress and equality went far beyond her legislative accomplishments. During her final chapter of service to our State, Peggy was appointed to the parole commission where her service re-

flected her strong belief in second chances.

Madam Speaker, today we mourn the loss of Peggy Stamey and celebrate the indelible mark she left on our State.

Peggy's enduring legacy lives on through the barriers she broke and through the many lives she transformed.

#### FAIR COMPETITION IN SPORTS

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

Mr. LALOTA. Madam Speaker, girls' sports should be reserved for biological girls. For decades, Title IX has provided young women the opportunity to compete in college athletics. However, the Biden administration's recent actions threaten these very principles.

As the father of three girls and a husband to a former Division I athlete who is currently a PE teacher, I am appalled by this administration's assault on Title IX.

Allowing biological men to compete in women's sports denies young women the chance to develop physically and mentally as athletes and teammates. This undermines decades of progress and gender equity in sports.

Fair competition is crucial to maintaining athletic integrity and the rights of female athletes. Without proper protections, girls may face unfair disadvantages, discouraging their participation and hindering their dreams.

Upholding Title IX safeguards the future of girls' sports, ensuring every young athlete can thrive and succeed.

#### CONGRATULATING DONNY WILLIAMS, BERTINA KING, AND ALAN JONES

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, this Police Week I rise to recognize three incredibly dedicated veteran detectives of the Akron Police Department who will be retiring from the force.

Detectives Bertina King, Alan Jones, and Donny Williams have served the Akron community for 33 years each for a combined total of 99 years of experience.

The trio started on the job together in 1991, and, since then, they have each left their own personal mark on the department.

Detective King made history as the first Black woman to join APD's major crimes unit. She also helped establish the sexual assault nurse examiner unit at the former St. Thomas Hospital to provide survivors of sexual assault with culturally sensitive and trauma-informed evaluation and treatment.

Recently, she led the effort to create the department's sexual assault kit initiative to investigate unsolved rape cases to bring justice to survivors.

Detective Jones is a part of the street narcotics uniform detail, which works to protect our communities from guns and drugs. He was also the first Black canine handler in the unit with his dog Midnight.

Finally, Detective Williams is the longest-serving member of the street narcotics unit starting just 1 year after the unit was created in 1992.

All three detectives have worked on high-profile cases and helped bring dangerous criminals to justice. This trio has exemplified what it means to serve our city with dignity and respect and have demonstrated the power of having a force that reflects and represents the community they are sworn to protect and serve.

We thank them for their many years of service and wish them the best in their well-deserved retirement.

□ 1100

#### MAY IS FOSTER CARE 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. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize May as National Foster Care Month and to thank every parent, volunteer, and mentor who works with our foster children.

I am a proud member of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth. When I was an 11-year-old, a foster child, Bob, came into our family, and he continues to be my brother today.

During this month, we renew our commitment to ensure that every child has a safe and loving family. I know firsthand how a supportive and loving home can make all the difference in a young person's life.

Madam Speaker, there are more than 460,000 children and youth in foster care. These children and youth range from infants to 18 years old when they age out. Foster youth who transition out of the foster care system without a permanent home are at high risk for unemployment, poor educational outcomes, health issues, early parenthood, long-term dependency on public assistance, increased rates of incarceration, and homelessness.

Madam Speaker, every child deserves a safe, supportive, and permanent family. We have the responsibility to continue to create policies that will improve outcomes and the overall well-being of foster youth and their families.

#### RECOGNIZING EPA COORDINATOR BETH MURPHY

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

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to extend my sincerest thanks to the dedication and service of

the EPA coordinator for Cahokia Heights, Beth Murphy.

Back in October, I asked EPA Administrator Michael Regan to appoint a member of his team to assist our response to the environmental, health, and safety crisis in Cahokia Heights. He delivered.

As the area's first dedicated Federal coordinator, Beth has helped bring new urgency to alleviating the flooding and sewage crisis in Cahokia Heights and surrounding communities. Her efforts to streamline collaboration between stakeholders across Metro East will help ensure that Federal, State, and local government resources can finally be used collaboratively.

Beth's hard work has helped us to put a spotlight on the needs of a community that has been overlooked for far too long.

I extend my deepest gratitude and appreciation for everything she has done for our community.

As Beth moves to her next assignment, we are excited to welcome our new coordinator, Betsy Nightingale. I look forward to working together with Betsy to build on the progress we have made and to finally solve these problems once and for all.

#### CONGRESS OUGHT TO ASSERT ITS EQUITIES TO STOP ELECTION INTERFERENCE

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

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to alert this House of election interference that is going on in a Manhattan courtroom right now, and we ought to assert our equities to ensure that Federal elections aren't subject to this type of devious behavior.

This entire case in New York is based on Michael Cohen. He is one of the few people walking around the planet Earth today who has lied to all three branches of government. He lied to the investigators. He lied to his own sentencing judge. He lied to this very Congress.

As if that wasn't enough, Michael Cohen lied to this very jury Tuesday. Tuesday, he said that the principal correspondence that he had was directly with President Trump and only about the completion of this payoff to Stormy Daniels. In reality, text messages prove that Michael Cohen was complaining to Keith Schiller about harassing phone calls from a 14-year-old and threatening to send him to Secret Service.

Michael Cohen lies about matters large and small. There is a reason he was held to the end of this case. They were hoping to corroborate him. They couldn't. It has failed, and it should be dismissed. Otherwise, the Congress should certainly assert our equities to stop election interference.

#### SUPPORTING LGBTQIA+ NEW MEXICANS

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I rise on this date of awareness to stand on the floor of the House of Representatives, the people's House, to show support for each and every LGBTQ person in the great State of New Mexico and across the country.

It is shocking and unconscionable that there are still Members of this Chamber who act with hate instead of love—in fact, we just saw it moments ago—who want to attack and criminalize who you are, who you love, and how you live.

I want the LGBTQ/queer community to hear me. I see them. I love them. I support them. They are not alone, not today, not tomorrow, not ever in this House, the people's House.

#### HONORING JACKSONVILLE SPORTS MEDICINE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is all fun and games until somebody gets hurt, especially when it comes to youth sports, but that is where JSMP comes in.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Jacksonville Sports Medicine Program, which allows local youth to slam dunk and swing for the fences without fearing for their safety.

It was always a joy to watch my kids play ball, but what if they get hurt? In northeast Florida, we know the answer. We turn to the Jacksonville Sports Medicine Program. Established in 1984, they have been a guiding light for countless families, coaches, and doctors in sports safety. Sudden cardiac arrest is a leading cause of death for kids in sports, but thanks to JSMP, over 50,000 student athletes have received free screenings. That is a stadium full of lives.

We commend the leadership of Bob Sefcik, Dr. Jennifer Maynard, Jeff Ferguson, and Allegra Jaros for their unwavering commitment to this cause. I congratulate the Jacksonville Sports Medicine Program for 40 years.

JSMP, play ball.

#### RESTORE ORDER AT THE BORDER

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remind this Chamber and our Nation that it has been over 100 days since congressional Republicans blocked a bipartisan bill to restore order at the border and fix our immigration system.

Week after week, only toothless, do-nothing resolutions attacking the President have been brought forward. When my colleagues across the aisle were presented with a bipartisan bill to actually tackle the chaos at our southern border, crack down on fentanyl trafficking, and begin to fix our broken immigration system, they said that is not their problem to solve.

This is a bill that would have hired nearly 2,000 new border personnel and immigration judges and streamlined our asylum system, making the process faster and fairer. It would have funded new inspection machines that could have been screening for deadly fentanyl for the past 100 days if only my Republican colleagues would have brought this bill up for a vote.

Madam Speaker, actions speak louder than words. One hundred days is already too long to wait. Let's vote on this bill today.

#### HONORING ROBERT MERRIMAN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of Robert "Bob" Merriman, who passed away on May 11 at the age of 69.

Bob began his law enforcement career in Athens, Georgia, in 1975 and then moved to the Chatham County Police Department in 1977, where he became a detective. He moved to the Chatham-Savannah Police force in 2004 and retired as captain in 2007.

Bob came out of retirement in 2013 to serve as the chief of police in Thunderbolt and retired 5 years later.

Officer Merriman's skills as a detective led him to solve some of the toughest cases in his department. He was truly one of our finest. He was known for treating his victims and their families with great dignity and respect.

Bob will continue to serve as a hero to many and will always be remembered for his compassion, selflessness, and bravery.

#### IMPROVING WELLNESS SERVICES FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, our men and women wearing the badge experience life-threatening risks every day.

As an emergency medicine physician, the increasing access to both physical and mental health resources have been a priority of mine, which is why I have successfully advocated to increase funding to the law enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act Program five-fold to \$10 million and am advocating to increase it to \$12 million. This funding will improve the delivery of and access to mental health and wellness services for law enforcement.

In closing, I want to take a moment to recognize the names of the officers from my district who have made the ultimate sacrifice: Deputy Sheriff Brett Harris, Deputy Sheriff Anthony Joel Redondo, Police Officer Efren Coronel, Police Officer Jose Gilbert Vega, Police Officer Lesley Marie Zerebny, and K9 Sultan of the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. I also recognize their families for their immense service and sacrifice.

As we close National Police Week, I urge my colleagues to follow words with action that will improve the lives of fallen first responders' families.

#### MENTAL HEALTH CARE IS HEALTHCARE

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

Ms. SALINAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share a simple truth: Mental health care is healthcare. We have to start treating it as such because these challenges are more common than people may think.

Several members of my own family have struggled with mental health challenges, so I know from personal experience how hard it is to watch the people you love suffer and not be able to help them.

It is why I have introduced several bills that would put an end to the stigma, bring down costs, and expand access through peer support programs and telehealth to ensure more Oregonians and Americans get the care they need.

May is also Mental Health Awareness Month, but raising awareness alone doesn't go far enough. We need bipartisan action on this issue. It is the only way we can put an end to the mental health and substance use crisis in America.

As co-chair of the Mental Health Caucus, I am working across the aisle to find consensus and get more policies passed that will actually help people who are struggling, people like my family members and probably yours, too.

I invite every single one of my colleagues, regardless of party affiliation, to join me in this fight. My door is always open, and I am open to forging solutions together.

#### CELEBRATING DR. RACHAEL MAHMOOD

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

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate Dr. Rachael Mahmood, a fifth grade teacher at Georgetown Elementary School in Aurora, Illinois, and the 2024 Teacher of the Year.

Dr. Mahmood's dedication to service, education, and equity has allowed her to make a lasting impact on the lives

of her students, whether it be helping them succeed in their studies or achieve their extracurricular goals. She has also become an indispensable leader beyond the classroom, pioneering various cultural and social initiatives to create an inclusive environment where students can connect with their peers.

As one administrator notes, she "embodies the qualities of an exceptional educator and inspiring leader."

At the end of the 2023–2024 school year, Dr. Mahmood will go on sabbatical, touring schools around the State of Illinois and sharing her valuable insights with fellow educators.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Rachael Mahmood on being named Illinois Teacher of the Year and thank her for her commitment to improving education for young people in the Aurora community.

#### MARKING GIANT DIPPER CENTENNIAL

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

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, today is the 100th anniversary of the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk's iconic roller coaster, the Giant Dipper.

This amazing roller coaster opened on this day in 1924 and took only 47 days to construct, making it the fourth oldest roller coaster in the United States and one of the 10 oldest roller coasters in the world.

Despite its age, it still packs a punch. Starting off by racing through a pitch-black mine shaft of a tunnel, then popping outside and clinking and clacking up a steep incline. After reaching its peak point, the coaster plunges straight down and provides a ride that races up and down its wooden brace tracks, lifting you up and down out of your seats.

Just like any good roller coaster, it is a ride that can turn your stomach. No matter how you feel, the Giant Dipper is exhilarating. It is exciting, and it is just plain fun.

It is no wonder that more than 68 million people have taken this thrill ride. It is no wonder that the Giant Dipper is recognized as a National Historic Landmark.

Happy 100th birthday to this famed roller coaster, and congratulations to the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk. I honor the Giant Dipper for providing a fun and exciting ride that has provided generations of families with fun and fulfilling memories.

□ 1115

#### CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF MICHAEL A. ALFULTIS

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

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rear Admiral and SUNY Maritime College President Michael A. Alfultis for his years of service and to celebrate his retirement.

Presidential Alfultis has served for 28 years in the U.S. Coast Guard, eventually rising from captain to rear admiral. After retiring from service, Admiral Alfultis began teaching at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy and then went on to become the director and chief administrative officer at the University of Connecticut.

His consecutive years of academic and professional leadership culminated in his tenure as the 11th president of SUNY Maritime College.

President Alfultis' leadership has transformed SUNY Maritime and shaped the future of the maritime workforce. His tenure has been marked by significant achievements, including a \$100 million investment in institutional organizations such as the Institute for Community Resiliency and Climate Adaptation and the establishment of the Center of Excellence for Offshore Energy.

I was proud to have supported the Center of Excellence for Offshore Energy with an \$800,000 appropriation to support its curriculum development for New Yorkers.

As his time as president of SUNY Maritime College ends later this month, I would like to thank President Alfultis personally and on behalf of our community for his years of service to our country, academic institutions, and the people of New York.

We wish President Alfultis fair winds and following seas.

#### CONGRESS MUST PUT POLITICS ASIDE

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, when insults, chaos, and name calling become the norm, it takes courage to come together and work through our differences.

America is facing significant challenges right here at home and around the world.

I believe that the people of eastern North Carolina sent me here to get things done. I work daily to be a champion for a part of my State that is often forgotten and left behind.

My grandmother raised me to look for the best in others because everyone is somebody. We must extend respect. We must extend dignity. We must extend civility to each other.

It is better to cross bridges together as opposed to sending one of the greatest institutions on Earth over a cliff.

We must put politics aside to achieve meaningful results for the people of eastern North Carolina and our country. May God bless us.

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND  
INCLUSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DE LA CRUZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm regarding attempts to eliminate diversity, equity, and inclusion, referred to as "DEI," initiatives in medical education.

Any anti-DEI efforts endanger our Nation's healthcare and threaten our global leadership in medical science.

Many in this Chamber owe their health and lives to the groundbreaking work of physicians of color, specifically today, Black physicians. Many of our loved ones are living healthier and longer lives thanks to Black physicians and medical pioneers.

Madam Speaker, let me just ask this Chamber and those watching to listen and then you be the judge when I say to you: Let's start with Dr. Kizzy Corbett, who led in the development of the Moderna COVID vaccine.

Now, Madam Speaker, many in this very Chamber, Republicans, Democrats, and those in leadership, received the vaccine, and we can thank her for her pioneering leadership, for not contracting COVID or being hospitalized or dying from severe COVID symptoms.

What are we afraid of for physicians of color to be in medical schools that receive Federal funding and that the school is sensitive to cultural needs, to DE and I?

One in eight women in the United States will be diagnosed with breast cancer during her lifetime. Whether you are Republican or Democrat, if you or a loved one have benefited from early breast cancer detection, it is thanks to Dr. Myra Logan, a Black woman. She developed early methods for breast cancer detection and treatment, along with new antibiotics.

Others have benefited from advancements in chemotherapy because of Dr. Jane Wright who pioneered this vital cancer treatment in 1949 when it was still experimental.

Madam Speaker, there are people in this Chamber who have gone through chemotherapy. There are Members of this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans, who have benefited from the pioneering efforts of Black physicians.

Now, we want to say that we will remove Federal funding if a medical school wants to have programs for the underserved, for those who are representing the great diversity in this America in which we live?

Simply put, doctors of color, and Black medical doctors in particular, have shaped medical science, saving countless lives globally. Despite their essential medical contributions, systemic barriers cause their underrepresentation in the ranks of medical doctors.

As a result, DEI programs and practices are key to their increased partici-

pation in our Nation's healthcare system.

Listen to this, Madam Speaker, 60 percent of physicians in the United States are White, compared to just 5.7 percent of Black physicians, and that is with the support of DE and I programs and practices.

The question today is: What are Republicans afraid of? DEI offices in medical schools promote racial diversity and cultural competencies among physicians. Both improve healthcare for all Americans—all Americans, especially underserved communities of color.

DE and I practices and training help correct biases about racial differences that adversely impact medical judgments, treatment decisions, and patient interactions, regardless of socioeconomic status.

We, therefore, need to be doing more. Let me say this again. We, therefore, need to be doing more and not less to ensure that our Nation's healthcare workforce is diverse and culturally competent.

Why am I doing this today? Why do I take this hour to come to this floor in this Chamber where we will make decisions that affect the lives of all Americans? We celebrate our rich history, the 70th anniversary of Brown versus the Board of Education of Topeka, which is all about the education of our children. You would think in 70 years that we would have moved away from the systemic racism, that we would have moved away from not wanting us to be culturally sensitive to help us serve all Americans.

I am here today because some of my Republican colleagues supporting this bill, the so-called education act, which would cut off Federal funding to medical schools pursuing DE and I initiatives.

Let me say this again. I know it is hard to believe for those who are watching me in this Chamber, this Chamber where we are elected to represent all people—we know there is not a competitive edge. You have already heard the facts that only 5.7 percent of the physicians are Black Americans. This so-called education act, again, would cut off Federal funding to medical schools pursuing DE and I initiatives.

This harmful legislation and similar DE and I threats prioritize intolerance over innovation and stifle cultural competencies in the medical profession.

What if I suggested and wrote legislation that would say we will withdraw Federal funding from medical schools that fail to implement culturally sensitive and DE and I policies and practices?

What if?

Madam Speaker, oh, let's take it a step forward this morning. What if I were to say that legacy programs at medical schools should be abolished and that relatives and donors who simply write a check to have their name

listed on the wing of a medical school, that their children could not go there, that they would not be able to have a legacy program where simply because of writing a check you could be admitted to a medical school? Should they receive or should they not receive preferential treatment in medical admissions?

We know that this happens.

Over 60 percent of the United States' doctors are White while White people comprise just over 50 percent of the population. You do the math. Who is overrepresented here? Look at the legacy admission policies and other forms of systemic racism, and you tell me who has an unfair advantage.

We should support and not stop initiatives that help diversity or help to diversify our physician pipeline, such as a program called Made for Medicine and Adtalem.

Made for Medicine supports Black middle and high school students interested in medicine with training and mentoring to best position them for success.

This program, Made for Medicine, is such an incredible program. Madam Speaker, it gives me great honor today because the founder of that program, a young, brilliant physician, who just happens to be a Black American, just happens to be someone that I have watched grow up. I have watched the dedication of Dr. Laura Espy-Bell who decided for all communities that it would be good to be able to have a program that educated our children, so they could see faces like them. The research shows when we go into a hospital when you are Black how great it is to see someone that looks like you, whether you are Hispanic to see someone like you or Asian American, and the list could go on, to be able to have that appreciation.

□ 1130

The list could go on to be able to have that appreciation. You see, Mr. Speaker, not only is Dr. Laura Espy-Bell the founder of Made for Medicine, she could have just talked about herself, but she brought other doctors along with her. Some are photographed here. I have another photograph that we will get on the floor soon of Black male doctors.

You see, Madam Speaker, as shown in this photograph, you have a young physician. I call him Dr. B.J., Dr. B.J. Hicks. He is a cardiovascular neurologist. He did his internship and his residency at the Henry Ford Hospital. Not only is he a brilliant, brilliant neurologist, but he gives back through the national American Heart Association. He is revered in his field, one of the top in the Nation.

Guess what, Madam Speaker? He doesn't just serve Black Americans. He serves White and Brown Americans, like all of these physicians. This brilliant doctor, B.J. Hicks, comes from a line, a family line, of physicians. His father, a dear friend and constituent in

my Third Congressional District, the world would put his reputation as an oncologist among the best of White physicians and Black physicians.

Now, just think, Madam Speaker, for the young doctor, William Hicks and B.J. Hicks, coming up that we are denying that right for someone like Spencer, my grandson, or Leah, my granddaughter, who may want to follow in their footsteps if they went to a medical school that had Federal funding and said: We want to have DE and I programs.

B.J. Hicks' sister and dear friend is a doctor of dermatology. When you walk into her downtown medical practice, Dr. Shari Hicks-Graham's office is as diverse looking as if we looked to the left and right of this Chamber.

Again, we would not have brilliant doctors like the Hickses if this legislation goes forward. I could go on and on.

Madam Speaker, I could tell you about Dr. Joshua Joseph who did his internship and residency at Yale School of Medicine. I could tell you that he is an endocrinologist and his wife is a neurologist. They are two young Black physicians who are saving Black, Brown, and White lives.

Nevertheless, here we are today in this Chamber dealing with a piece of legislation that says that medical schools shouldn't be culturally sensitive and that medical schools should not have DE and I programs, yet our country is built on a history, thank goodness, of pioneers in medicine who have saved Black, Brown, and White lives, Democrat and Republican, and a Republican would bring to this House floor a bill that should not see the light of day.

Let me just say that these physicians and thousands more were trained at institutions, thank goodness, that understood teaching and practicing cultural sensitivity and having DE and I initiatives.

Adtalem is the leading healthcare educator that partners with organizations to address their future workforce needs. Eighty percent of their medical graduates serve low-income communities, and 44 percent are in medically underserved areas. When you look at these two programs, Madam Speaker, they are just a few examples of how DE and I initiatives can enrich our Nation's physician pipeline.

Earlier this month, I proudly filed a resolution with my colleague, Congresswoman KATHY CASTOR, that stands in stark contrast, Madam Speaker, to the so-called EDUCATE Act. Rather than cutting Federal funding to medical schools, pursuing DE and I initiatives is outlined in the EDUCATE Act, our resolution reaffirms the importance of DE and I efforts in medical education.

Our resolution is supported with over 25 medical and medical education organizations, including the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American College of Physicians, and the American Federation of Teachers.

Make no mistake, the EDUCATE Act is yet another misguided Republican effort to diminish the quality of healthcare of all Americans, especially communities of color.

Whether it is proposing a voucher-like system for Medicare, reducing the Affordable Care Act protections for individuals with preexisting conditions, or attempting to substitute the ACA coverage for Medicaid recipients, Republicans continue to attack equitable, quality healthcare access.

Meanwhile, my side of the aisle continues to work for accessibility and affordable healthcare by lowering the cost of prescription drugs. I could tell you, Madam Speaker, how many people are diabetic and went to get their insulin and could not afford it. Madam Speaker, that is just not Black Americans, that is Black, Brown, and White. Someone in the gallery today is diabetic, and when we were able for our seniors to lower that cost to \$35 a month, we did not care whether they were Democrat, Republican, Black, Brown, or White. It was about putting people over politics. It was about serving the wonderful America that I have the opportunity to serve.

If it seems like I am passionate today, I am. I lost my late husband just a few years ago unexpectedly, but I am thankful that there were doctors there in his time of need, Black and White physicians. Yes, they went to medical schools that had Federal funding. Yes, they understood our life and our culture because they were sensitive to cultural and diversity issues.

All I am asking today of my colleagues is to just look at what is right for our children and for our families. Today, we had 300-some students in the eighth grade here in this Chamber. A week ago, I had 200-some eighth graders in this Chamber touring this wonderful institution.

Madam Speaker, do you know how proud I was to be able to tell them about the rich culture and the rich history? How proud I was to be able to tell them how I am fighting for civility, how I am fighting for us to work together, and how the days of Rosa Parks not sitting in that seventh row in the seat for colored women and colored men without being arrested are over?

We should be far beyond 1955, far beyond 70 years ago when we couldn't attend the same schools because of segregation. Here in this House is no place for us to deny Black physicians who serve Black, White, and Brown constituents the opportunity to matriculate in a medical school because that medical school, thank goodness, believed in serving all people and believed in training brilliant minds, like these physicians, to go out in the world and not, not understand the value of taking care medically and socially people of all colors, of all ethnicities, and of all races?

Today, in this Chamber we have Members who want to take away the rights of medical schools to be able to

teach cultural sensitivity and to have DE and I programs.

I am so grateful to have had this opportunity and this hour to share my views, to share my passions, and, Madam Speaker, to ask this Chamber to not allow that bill to see the light of day.

Madam Speaker, for the people and putting people over politics, I yield back.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to share a remarkable moment from a committee hearing this week with Health and Human Services Secretary Xavier Becerra.

Mr. Becerra began his testimony by saying that we can now manage COVID like we do the flu.

I asked Mr. Becerra: If that is true, then what about these 30 colleges and universities across the country that still have COVID-19 vaccine mandates?

That is, they require students to get a vaccine in order to enroll, and they will expel students who do not comply with that mandate.

I asked the Secretary: If it is true that we can now manage COVID like the flu, then will you call on these 30 universities that, right now in May of 2024, still have COVID vaccine mandates?

The Secretary refused to do it. He is just fine with these institutions continuing to impose these exclusionary policies.

Now, at this point in time, it is so beyond the pale to continue to have these mandates that I think it is important to specifically call out the universities that still have them. Of course, we now know there was never any public health justification for universities to have COVID vaccine mandates, and it certainly was not consistent with the values of our country or the values of higher education. Nevertheless, to still have them now is so beyond the pale and so utterly absurd that I think we should recognize each and every university that still has them.

There is Cal State University Cal Poly Humboldt, CSU Dominguez Hills, CSU San Francisco State, Harvey Mudd College, Mount Saint Mary's University, Pitzer College, Pomona College, University of San Francisco, Scripps College, Mitchell College, Trinity Washington University, Clark Atlanta University, Morehouse, Morris Brown College, Oglethorpe University, Spelman, Methodist College, Dillard University, Southern University System, Wellesley, Wayne State University, Franklin Pierce, Mount Saint Vincent, Kenyon, Oberlin, Wooster, Reed, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore.

I am calling on these 30 universities to end their COVID vaccine mandates immediately and end their status as bastions of ignorance in American higher education.

□ 1145

Madam Speaker, 2 days ago, I rose on the floor of this House to call for the resignation of the president of Sonoma State University in California.

This institution is one of a disturbing number that has chosen to deal with this highly disruptive trend of encampments on campuses not by evenhandedly enforcing university rules and enforcing the law but, rather, by caving to the demands of this small minority of unlawful protesters, appeasing their desired changes in university policy in order to make university policy anti-Israel and anti-Semitic in nature.

What happened at Sonoma State was particularly egregious. In response to the demands of the illegal encampment, the university president agreed to divest, agreed to an academic boycott, agreed to even scrub any mention of Israel from university materials. Perhaps worst of all, he agreed to convert the unlawful encampment into a permanent advisory council with the members of the encampment responsible for picking who was part of it, and they would then have the power to enforce these anti-Israel policies going forward.

We finally have a little bit of good news in that this call was heard by the chancellor of Cal State University, and that university president is now on administrative leave. Of course, that doesn't go far enough. He has no business leading the university in our State or in this country when he is willing to institutionalize the anti-Semitic demands of those who are disrupting the university by unlawful means.

Unfortunately, Sonoma State University is not alone in California, as can be seen right here from these headlines. There are a number of other universities within the California State University system, within the University of California system, and in other institutions, public and private, across our State and across the country, where suddenly administrators have decided to negotiate with these encampments and to reach agreements with them based on what they want.

It is hard to overstate just how perverse this truly is. Let's leave aside for a moment the substance of what they are agreeing to and just consider the message that this sends, the precedent that it sets, that the way to get what you want on a university campus is not by presenting a reasoned argument or by convincing the governing body and your fellow students and other stakeholders. Rather, it is to try to use force to get your way.

These unlawful encampments, as we heard in an example from a student at Harvard in a committee hearing the

other day, are refusing to leave. They are occupying public spaces. They are disrupting the function of the university.

In this particular example, they had self-appointed campus monitors who would follow Jewish students around on campus and monitor their activities.

We have seen examples of occupying buildings. We have seen students being stopped from entering the campus, entering the library, and entering other public spaces. We have seen loud disruptions that stop academic activities from proceeding.

In a number of cases, universities have responded in a way that is also unacceptable, which is by canceling classes, canceling graduation ceremonies, and thereby punishing all students.

The message this sends is that we are going to give those who are engaging in these unlawful activities, many of them not students, by the way, and with a lot of funding coming from the outside, what they want. We are going to reward those tactics. What exactly does that encourage in the future? Of course, what it does is encourage these tactics to be repeated.

The reason that these tactics are being resorted to is because those who are behind the encampments know that their argument is completely morally bankrupt and bigoted and would never prevail in a reasoned dialogue, which is why it is such a farce that some of these university leaders have patted themselves on the back and said that dialogue is the answer, negotiations are the answer.

The problem is they are only giving voice to those who are creating the disruption. When these so-called negotiations are going on, it is only those who are responsible for the problem that are being listened to. We are not seeing any evidence that they are bringing in representatives from Jewish student groups or, for that matter, the broader law-abiding student body to come and have their voices heard. Rather, they are elevating this small, disruptive minority and privileging their despicable points of view.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter that I have written to the leaders of our public education systems in California.

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

There was no objection.

DEAR PRESIDENT DRAKE AND CHANCELLOR GARCIA: Over the past month, campuses in both the UC and CSU systems have been disrupted by illegal encampments. These encampments violate university rules, violate the law, and have given rise to other disruptive activities posing a threat to the safety, civil rights, and learning of students.

Some UC and CSU campuses have responded by rewarding the perpetrators and incorporating their anti-Semitic demands into university policy. Specifically, a number have agreed to boycott, divest, and sanc-

tion (BDS) programs relating to Israel. Just this week, we saw Sonoma State's President agree to end all study abroad programs in Israel and divest from companies associated with Israel. President Lee even went so far as to promise to scrub university materials of references to Israel, and to convert the illegal encampment into a permanent "advisory council" charged with enforcing the new anti-Israel policies.

While Chancellor Garcia's decision to place President Lee on leave is a start, the problem is not limited to that campus. Other examples include UC Riverside, which agreed to review its investments and explore the removal of its endowment from the UC system, while also agreeing to discontinue its business school's study abroad programs to Israel; UC Berkeley, which agreed to start a "rigorous examination" of the school's investments; CSU Sacramento, which agreed to divest from Israel-tied investments; and CSU San Francisco, which agreed to reexamine its investments.

Irrespective of the merits of these policy changes—which, to be clear, are altogether unmeritorious, bigoted, and quite possibly illegal under California's anti-BDS law—allowing a small minority to get their way through force is no way to run a campus. It is not clear what efforts, if any, these campus leaders made to consult with Jewish student groups or the broader law-abiding student body before capitulating to the demands of encampment participants.

There is an urgent need for system-wide action in both the UC and CSU systems to restore order on campus, stop the adoption of BDS policies, and, where appropriate, appoint new campus leadership. As a Member of the Education & the Workforce Committee and Chair of the Workforce Protections Subcommittee, I am actively involved in the House of Representatives' ongoing investigations of anti-Semitism in higher education. I would appreciate a timely response as to what steps you are taking to avoid further damage to California's public universities, which have long been a tremendous asset to our state and country.

Sincerely,

KEVIN KILEY,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. KILEY. This is to President Drake, the president of the University of California, and Chancellor Garcia, who is the chancellor of California State University. I will read a few excerpts here. We are sending them this letter today, and I am hoping that it will put a stop to this incredibly disturbing trend.

"Over the past month, campuses in both the UC and CSU systems have been disrupted by illegal encampments. These encampments violate university rules, violate the law, and have given rise to other disruptive activities posing a threat to the safety, civil rights, and learning of students.

"Some UC and CSU campuses have responded by rewarding the perpetrators and incorporating their anti-Semitic demands into university policy. Specifically, a number have agreed to boycott, divest, and sanction (BDS) programs relating to Israel. Just this week, we saw Sonoma State's president agree to end all study-abroad programs in Israel and divest from companies associated with Israel. President Lee even went so far as to promise to scrub university materials of references to Israel and to convert the illegal encampment into a permanent 'advisory

council' charged with enforcing the new anti-Israel policies.'

The letter then goes on to list several other examples within the UC and CSU systems at UC Riverside, UC Berkeley, CSU Sacramento, and CSU San Francisco.

The letter continues: "Irrespective of the merits of these policy changes—which, to be clear, are altogether unmeritorious, bigoted, and quite possibly illegal under California's anti-BDS law—allowing a small minority to get their way through force is no way to run a campus. It is not clear what efforts, if any, these campus leaders made to consult with Jewish student groups or the broader law-abiding student body before capitulating to the demands of encampment participants.

"There is an urgent need for system-wide action in both the UC and CSU systems to restore order on campus, stop the adoption of BDS policies, and, where appropriate, appoint new campus leadership."

I am a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee and chair of the Workforce Protections Subcommittee, and I am actively involved in the House of Representatives' ongoing investigations of anti-Semitism and higher education. I tell these university system leaders that I would like a timely response as to what steps they are taking to avoid further damage to California's universities, which have long been a tremendous asset to our State and country.

I will, of course, share with the public the response that I receive from these university officials. Moreover, this next week, we have the leader of one campus, UCLA, who will be appearing before our Committee on Education and the Workforce to be held to account for the horrifying events that unfolded on that campus, thanks to the university's failure to take action to protect students.

#### QUESTIONS FOR THE CDC

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I call the House's attention to an extremely concerning statement made by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Xavier Becerra, at a hearing this week.

I asked Secretary Becerra about the illegal Chinese biolab that had been discovered in California with very close ties to the Chinese Communist Party.

This lab was discovered in Reedley, outside of Fresno, early last year and was discovered to have many dangerous pathogens. Some were labeled in Mandarin, and some were labeled in some code that was not decipherable.

There were 32 refrigerators and freezers containing pathogens like E. coli, hepatitis B, hepatitis C, HIV, malaria. There were about a thousand mice, some of them dead by the time they were discovered, that were, by some reports, genetically engineered to carry the COVID-19 virus.

At the time that this was discovered, I called for an investigation and, eventually, the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the

United States and the Chinese Communist Party produced an incredibly disturbing report about how this lab had been set up by a gentleman named Jesse Zhu, who had come from China and ran several companies linked to the CCP.

He had then gone to Canada, where he started a company designed specifically to steal American IP. He was found liable in court for hundreds of millions of dollars in damages, so he eventually fled as a fugitive to the U.S., where he eventually set up this lab that was illegal, violating all sorts of laws, and had all manner of code violations.

It wasn't exactly clear at all what the lab was for because they said it was there to make test kits, such as pregnancy test kits and COVID test kits, but that is actually not what they were doing. The test kits they were selling were coming from China or being sold as counterfeits. Mr. Zhu, by the way, is now under Federal indictment.

I asked Secretary Becerra at this week's hearing if he can tell us with confidence that there are not similar such labs operating secretly and illegally throughout the United States. He said, no, that he could not say that with confidence.

This is an incredibly disturbing situation. I am authoring bipartisan legislation with Representative COSTA designed to close the regulatory loophole that allowed for these dangerous pathogens to be in this lab undetected.

I also have recently sent a letter to the Director of the CDC, Mandy Cohen, which is under the jurisdiction of Secretary Becerra's Health and Human Services, because one of the truly disturbing parts of this story is that the CDC completely dropped the ball and ignored the situation long after it had been discovered.

The Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party's report found that local officials in Reedley had begged the CDC to come in and investigate after they found this lab and that CDC repeatedly ignored them and even hung up on them.

I have spoken with the city manager myself, and she said that their calls for help from both the Federal Government and the State were completely ignored, and it was only after Representative COSTA, who represents that area, got involved that the CDC finally came to investigate.

Even then, their investigation was completely inadequate. Incredibly, they didn't test any of the actual samples, so some of these were labeled with E. coli or hepatitis or whatever it was, and they just sort of assumed that that was accurate. Some of them were labeled in some indecipherable code. We don't know what was in there, and they didn't bother to test those. There is a refrigerator labeled Ebola that was found by officials afterward that completely escaped the CDC's notice.

I have sent a letter to Director Cohen, asking for an explanation as to

how it is that the CDC ignored and then failed to sufficiently investigate this danger to public health with pathogens that the CDC itself cites as being of grave danger to human health and communities.

These are the questions that I have posed to Director Cohen:

Why were local officials ignored by the CDC?

Why were none of the unlabeled agents tested?

Why did the CDC falsely claim that it could not test unlabeled select agents when they have previously tested unlabeled select agents in many cases, such as when anthrax was sent to this building?

Why did the CDC order State officials not to test any samples themselves even though this will result in an abatement order requiring all samples found in the lab to be destroyed?

How did you miss a freezer that was labeled Ebola?

How did this lab escape detection in the first place?

What is the CDC doing to prevent future labs of the same nature from being built?

□ 1200

What pathogen enforcement gaps allowed the illegal importation of deadly pathogens? What efforts are being made to crack the code that was used to label various vials on site? Is there any investigation into what the Ebola samples were being used for since there is little market for Ebola tests, making a financial motive unlikely?

Indeed, there is little apparent financial motive for the activities in the lab, given that the kits that they were selling were coming directly from China.

We also know that Mr. Zhu, who ran the lab, put it there, and he is now under Federal indictment. He was receiving regular payments from China while the lab was in operation.

I would ask the director for a timely response to these questions, and I am also urging my colleagues in the House to pass my legislation with Representative COSTA so we can do everything possible to get to the level where we have the confidence that Secretary Becerra—now by his own admission lacks—to say that there are no other CCP-linked, illegal biolabs operating in this country.

CITING ATTORNEY GENERAL GARLAND FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I will address an extraordinary development that happened yesterday right before a Judiciary Committee hearing in which we ultimately voted to cite the Attorney General of the United States, Merrick Garland, for contempt of Congress, for defying a congressional subpoena.

Just minutes before this hearing happened, we received a letter from the President's counsel, Edward Siskel, invoking executive privilege with respect to the materials that our committee



has been seeking. Those materials being recordings of President Biden's interviews with Special Counsel Robert Hur.

I will take a moment to address just how absurd this invocation of executive privilege is. Indeed, I will identify the six absurdities of this invocation of executive privilege, but first a little bit of background as to how we got here.

In 2022, Attorney General Merrick Garland ordered an unprecedented raid of Mar-a-Lago, purportedly in search of classified documents. This became awkward for the administration when it was soon revealed that President Biden himself had various classified documents scattered about his personal properties. Attorney General Garland, in an attempt, I suppose, to appear even-handed, appointed a special counsel. He appointed Robert Hur special counsel to investigate President Biden's possession of classified documents.

Earlier this year, we received the report from Special Counsel Hur, and the report found considerable evidence that President Biden had willfully obtained classified documents in violation of the law. He found evidence as to each of the elements of that criminal offense. I asked Special Counsel Hur when he came to testify before our committee, I asked him a simple question: Could a reasonable juror have voted to convict the President? Special Counsel Hur answered yes.

Now, it is important to note that while some in that hearing tried to cast aspersions on Mr. Hur's integrity, when Merrick Garland appointed him, he praised him, praised his long and distinguished career as a prosecutor.

Now, despite those findings, Special Counsel Hur opted not to charge the President, citing his age and the lapses in memory that he displayed during his interviews with Hur.

The Judiciary Committee sought access to these records of those interviews, given the obvious public interest in matters pertaining to the Commander in Chief's competency or, for that matter, his potential criminality. Eventually, the Justice Department responded by producing redacted transcripts of President Biden's interviews with Special Counsel Hur. However, they continually refused to produce the actual recordings of those interviews with shifting explanations over time until the Judiciary Committee was forced to convene a hearing yesterday to cite the Attorney General for contempt because the subpoena that had been duly issued for those materials was being defied. Attorney General Garland refused to comply with it.

It was only moments before that hearing yesterday, after months of back and forth, that suddenly this letter lands from the White House that says, well, we are invoking executive privilege with respect to those recordings of President Biden's interviews with Special Counsel Hur.

Now, I will go through the six absurdities of that particular use of executive privilege.

The first is just the timing. As I have already mentioned, this had been going on for a long time and it is only right when we are about to begin a hearing that they suddenly come in and invoke this privilege.

The second absurdity is that this is not at all what executive privilege is meant for. Executive privilege is a facet of the separation of powers that is designed to protect the President's internal deliberations so that, for example, his advisers can give unvarnished advice when it comes to policy decisions and don't have to fear that anything they say, even if it is advice that the President doesn't ultimately take, will suddenly be made public. That is the purpose of an executive privilege. It is to protect these internal deliberations of the President on matters of policy.

This is an entirely different situation. It is not pertaining to the collaborative discussions involved in policymaking, rather it is the adversarial situation of an investigation of the President himself and the President's interview with his investigator. There was no decision on the part of the President that was being made; it was a decision on the part of the special counsel that was being made as to whether or not the President ought to be charged with a crime. The justification for executive privilege simply doesn't exist in this scenario.

The third absurdity is that the President had already waived the privilege. At the time that this was invoked, when we received the letter yesterday, we already had the transcripts of the interview that had been produced. So how exactly is it the case that the transcripts of the interview are not privileged, but the recordings of the interview are?

The fourth absurdity is that the justification for invoking the privilege completely contradicted the justification that the Attorney General had been giving for not complying with the subpoena in handing over the recordings. The Attorney General has maintained throughout this process that he doesn't need to hand over the recordings because they are cumulative; meaning, they are the same as what has already been produced, so they don't need to keep producing the same thing. Now we have the President's counsel coming in and saying that, no, they are actually different. They are so different, the transcripts versus the recordings, that one is not privileged and the other is.

The fifth absurdity of this letter from the President's counsel is that it explicitly cites a political motivation for invoking the privilege. The President's counsel, Edward Siskel, states a fear that the recordings will be used "for potential political gain."

Suffice it to say, a fear of political fallout, a fear of adverse political con-

sequences, is not an adequate basis for invoking executive privilege.

Now, the letter tries to couch it a little differently. The letter says: Well, what we are actually afraid of is that the recordings are only being requested for political purposes and that once they are obtained, they will be sliced and diced and used to politically damage the President. However, that amounts to saying exactly the same thing as we fear the political consequences of handing over these recordings.

There is no precedent nor will there ever be a precedent in any court or otherwise for executive privilege to be invoked explicitly for political purposes or to spare the President political embarrassment.

The final absurdity of this invocation of executive privilege by President Biden is there will be a chilling effect if he hands over the recordings; that this will make it less likely that witnesses will cooperate in future law enforcement investigations, and there are several layers of absurdity to that claim.

The first is that they have already produced the redacted transcript of the interview. So they are saying there is not going to be a chilling effect for cooperation if someone knows a transcript could be revealed, but there will be a chilling effect if the actual recording is released.

However, the problem is deeper than that because the statement I just read, the justification that was given by the Attorney General and given by the President's counsel, is that this is going to deter witnesses from participating in the future. The President is not a witness. He was the target of an investigation initiated by his own Department of Justice.

What exactly is the chilling effect here? Who does it apply to? The only possible future scenario that this could affect is if at some point in the future another President is under investigation by his own administration.

What is the fear? If we release the recordings here that that future President will not want to sit for an interview? Well, the President in that situation would have to answer for his refusal to cooperate, which would be a pretty good incentive to be cooperative in the first place.

Whichever way you look at this, there is simply no legitimate basis for invoking executive privilege in this scenario, which is why the Judiciary Committee did move ahead yesterday and pass a resolution citing Attorney General Garland for contempt.

I would encourage the President and the Attorney General to ensure that this does not have to go any further and the way to do that would simply be to hand over the requested recordings. Let the American people see them for themselves.

Truly, the President should never be in a position where he deprives the

public of information of this kind, especially when it pertains to vital matters of his competency and culpability with respect to the matters being investigated.

This is a clear case of the public's right to know, and so I would encourage the administration to do the right thing here, albeit very belatedly.

RECOGNIZING PLACER COUNTY DA INVESTIGATOR  
BRANDON OLIVERA

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I will now move on to recognize some truly outstanding individuals in my district.

Madam Speaker, I recognize District Attorney Investigator Lieutenant Brandon Olivera who has served as a law enforcement officer since 1996.

In his 27-year career, he has worked on patrol, in investigations, as a SWAT operator, and currently leads one of California's most successful narcotics investigation units.

Lieutenant Olivera works collaboratively with local, State, and Federal agencies to investigate drug trafficking organizations with the goal of reducing their impact on the northern California Central Valley region.

Lieutenant Olivera has led his team to remove 4,447 pounds of methamphetamine, 129 pounds of cocaine, 135 pounds of heroin, and 643 pounds of fentanyl from the streets of our communities. Those are truly staggering numbers.

□ 1215

In 2021 and 2022 alone, his team seized 344,465 counterfeit fentanyl tablets.

Currently in America and California, we are losing our youth to fentanyl at a truly alarming rate. In 2021, California lost 224 young people between the ages of 15 and 19 to fentanyl overdose. In America, while drug use among youth has trended down from 2019 to 2020, overdose deaths have increased 94 percent from 2019 to 2020 and 20 percent from 2020 to 2021.

In the same period, drug trafficking organizations have changed marketing tactics, creating rainbow or multicolored fentanyl tablets. These tablets look similar to candy, making them even more enticing, tragically so, to our Nation's youth.

Lieutenant Olivera has led the fight against these dangerous narcotics making it to our communities. He and his team, in fact, seized the first rainbow fentanyl trafficked in the Central Valley of California. The work done by Lieutenant Olivera has certainly saved lives, though few will ever understand how many.

Through his dedicated service and his dedication to protecting our community from drug trafficking organizations, Lieutenant Olivera truly has made our community and its surrounding areas a safer place to live. I thank him for his years of service and dedication.

HONORING OUTSTANDING EDUCATOR KELLEN  
WIRTH

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I wish to take a moment to recognize an out-

standing educator, Mr. Kellen Wirth, in California's Third Congressional District.

In his 8 years of instruction as a science teacher in the Loomis Union School District, Mr. Wirth has made remarkable contributions within the Ophir STEAM Academy as well as in the general Loomis School District as a whole.

Kellen's tireless efforts have resulted in significant academic achievements, as demonstrated through his 5E Lesson model, a hands-on approach to engage collaboration and critical thinking.

Moreover, Kellen's reach spans well beyond the classroom as he takes on various roles such as leading science camps and innovation programs, showcasing his true commitment in instilling a sense of wonder and passion in his students.

Alongside these achievements, Kellen is also serving on the Curriculum Team and coaching multiple sports, exemplifying his holistic dedication in serving students.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize educator Kellen Wirth for his years of hard work in our schools.

COMMENDING JENNIFER DEBORTOLI

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to highlight a teacher from Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District in Roseville, Jennifer DeBortoli, who has dedicated 31 years of her career to educating the students of her community while acquiring accolades of high regard.

Jennifer DeBortoli is a distinguished educator and exceptional leader who contributes significantly to her school and district. She has a passion for writing and leads the Area 3 Writing program at her school as well as spearheading Spark the Fire Committee, fostering a love for literature with students. She also mentors new team members by offering valuable insights into lesson planning, guided reading, and GLAD strategies.

Jennifer's impact extends beyond her immediate school, as she conducts districtwide staff development and has become a sought-after resource for teachers looking to bring writing to life for their students.

I commend Mrs. DeBortoli for exuding an immense level of passion and commitment to student success, which has no doubt redounded to the benefit of many, many young people in our community.

AMANDA COPPA COMMENDED AS OUTSTANDING  
EDUCATOR

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I wish to take a moment to recognize Amanda Coppa, an outstanding educator in California's Third Congressional District.

As an English and history teacher, Amanda embodies the essence of going above and beyond for her students, ensuring that each student receives an exceptional education.

Amanda's tireless efforts have resulted in significant academic achieve-

ments, as demonstrated through significant improvements in CAASPP test scores for students with disabilities alongside a remarkable increase in overall scores.

Moreover, Amanda's reach spans well beyond the classroom as she takes on various leadership roles as a behavior committee member, W.E.B. leader, Safe Schools Ambassador leader, and Read-In coordinator, highlighting her true commitment in building a positive environment for her students.

Her enthusiastic dedication and unwavering connections with students enrich the lives of both her students and her peers.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize educator Amanda Coppa for her years of hard work in our community and the enormous difference she has made in the lives of her students.

HONORING JULIE FERGUSON

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I wish to take a moment to recognize an outstanding educator of California's Third Congressional District.

The communities I represent offer both outstanding public and private school education to our students, due in large part to the dedication, sacrifice, and hard work of our communities' teachers.

I would like to recognize Julie Ferguson, a dedicated third grade teacher from the Roseville City School District at Brown Elementary School. Julie began her teaching journey in 1998 and has continued to influence and better the youth of our district for the last 26 years.

Mrs. Ferguson has been a dedicated master teacher to countless student teachers. She participates in all professional development with a student-first focus, and she has written numerous grants to help obtain resources, giving her the ability to provide better experiences and opportunities for her students.

Julie Ferguson is the definition of a teacher-leader and will be serving as RTA co-president this upcoming year. I thank her for being a faithful, positive, and thoughtful educator contributing to the development of our communities' students.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor on behalf of the United States House of Representatives to recognize Julie Ferguson for her outstanding contributions as an educator in California's Third Congressional District. She is making and will continue to make, I know, an enormous difference in the lives of her students.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

SEGREGATION IS STILL ALIVE  
AND WELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise.

I am honored to have this preeminent privilege to speak on the floor, if you will, or in the Chamber of the House of Representatives. It is a unique experience to be here. I never take it for granted, and I always appreciate the leadership for affording me the opportunity to speak.

I rise today as a person of color, a person who understands the need for Brown v. Board of Education. We needed it then and still need Brown. We needed it when we enshrined it into law in this country, and we still need it today.

This is the day that marks the 70th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education, a lawsuit that has impacted the lives of all Americans but has had a greater impact, I believe, on persons of color because it eliminated the notion that we could have separate but equal institutions in the country, especially in the area of education.

Yes, we still need Brown v. Board of Education. There is an article in today's USA Today. It is styled "School segregation is still alive and well." "Seventy years after Brown, funding drives divide." Segregation is still alive and well.

I would like to explain why we needed Brown before delving a little bit more into this topic of funding. We needed Brown because of 335 years of slavery, convict leasing, and lawful segregation—335 years. It started on August 20, 1619, when the ship *White Lion* docked at a place called Point Comfort, near what we now call Norfolk, Virginia.

When the *White Lion* docked, it had some 20 persons of African ancestry. These 20 persons were traded to the Colonies, the persons who were here to form the Colonies, if you will. They were traded. They became the first enslaved persons to be introduced into what would become the United States of America.

These 20 persons marked the beginning of something that still haunts the United States of America, and that is invidious discrimination, but these 20 persons became a part of millions of persons who would traverse the ocean, who would be treated as cargo, not as passengers; persons who would be raped, robbed, murdered, incarcerated; persons who would be brought to this country because there was a desire to have in this country people who would be subjugated. They would be persons who could be immediately identified because of color.

They would be persons who would not be a part of a class because class is a socioeconomic circumstance. They were not a part of a class, Madam

Speaker. They were a part of a caste, not a class. A class is socioeconomic. You can move in and out of a class, but a caste is associated with your heredity. If you were born into this caste, you would live in it, you would work in it, and you would die as a part of the caste.

America had a caste system. Persons of African ancestry were a part of the caste. They were persons who were immediately identifiable, who were subjugated, and made a part of a caste. This caste system in the United States of America lasted for some 246 years.

A good many people assumed that slavery only lasted for 20 or 30 years. No, 246 years. People were born into slavery. Babies were enslaved. People lived their lives enslaved, and they died as slaves. There were 246 years of it.

These persons became the economic foundational mothers and fathers of the country. They planted the seeds. They harvested the crops. They fed the Nation. They built the Capitol, this very building that we are in now. Their hands were a part of the construction of this facility. Their hands were a part of the construction of the White House. They built the roads and the bridges. They were the economic foundational mothers and fathers, and every person in the United States of America is standing on their shoulders.

□ 1230

Yes, they have not been respected. They have not been respected since they were brought to this country. They have not been respected while they were here in the institution known as slavery.

It moved from slavery to an institution called convict leasing. These are persons who were charged with violating what were called Black codes. They were charged with some offense. It could be a minor offense.

After having been charged, they would be leased to some plantation. They would work on this plantation just outside of Houston, Texas, a place called Sugar Land, Texas.

We have a gravesite with 95 bodies in it. They are called the Sugar Land 95. These were persons, human beings, people who were leased and died as convicts, convicts who were leased.

It is a shame that the story of America contains these facts, but it is the truth, and we ought not be ashamed to tell the truth because only by dealing with the truth can we get to a point wherein we are able to communicate fairly and properly with each other and span the chasms that divide us.

These convicts, persons who were leased is what I will call them for now, this lasted for 76 years. Madam Speaker, 76 years of convict leasing; 246 years of slavery followed by 76 years of convict leasing.

I am making the point for why we needed Brown v. Board of Education, for those who may be tuning in a bit late.

We needed Brown v. Board of Education because of the 246 years of slavery and 76 years of convict leasing, but it didn't end there. It did not end with the convict leasing.

We suffered nearly 100 years of lawful segregation, lawful segregation wherein persons of color were separated.

Persons of color had to go to the back door in this country. In my lifetime, I was relegated to going to the back door. Persons of color had to drink from separate water fountains.

In my lifetime, I have been forced to drink from a colored water fountain, and I might add, a filthy water fountain.

They were never maintained to the same extent that White water fountains were maintained. Persons of color were required to sit in the back of buses. In my lifetime, I sat in the back of a bus.

The laws that were enshrined in the Constitution to protect me and give me equality under the law as explained and extolled in the 14th Amendment, my friends and neighbors took those rights away from me. They denied me those rights.

The Constitution said they were there for me, but my friends and neighbors decided they would deny me those rights.

I know what segregation is about. I have lived it. Yes, we needed Brown v. Board of Education then, and we still need it now.

Segregation for nearly a hundred years, 246 years of slavery, 76 years of convict leasing, and nearly a hundred years of lawful segregation. We needed Brown v. Board of Education.

In the process of suffering these some 335 years, we had a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in a case styled Dred Scott where Chief Justice Taney, in his infinite wisdom, indicated that the Negroes or African Americans, as we would call ourselves now, persons of African ancestry, if you will, that they had no rights which a White man was bound to respect and that the Negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit, not for his benefit meaning the benefit of the Negro, but for his benefit meaning the benefit of the White man. That is what the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court said.

It might be interesting to note that most scholars conclude that this is one of the worst decisions ever made by the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

Yes, we needed Brown v. Board of Education. However, but for some quirks in history, we might not have the same decision that Chief Justice Warren arrived at. We might not have it but for some quirks in history.

I want to talk about a couple of these quirks in history. Thurgood Marshall was the lead counsel for the NAACP, an organization that I belong to. I was the president of the Houston branch of the NAACP for nearly a decade.

Thurgood Marshall, the lead counsel for the NAACP, when he decided to go

to law school, he tried to get into the University of Maryland. He couldn't get in.

He then decided to go to Howard University. At Howard University, he had the superlative pleasure of meeting a man who introduced him to a concept, and that concept was use the Constitution to right these wrongs associated with segregation. That is my paraphrasing of it. That concept was something that he would take to the courts.

I believe that but for the University of Maryland, Thurgood Marshall may not have developed the philosophy that he did.

In a strange sort of way, I have to say thank God for the University of Maryland because had he gone there, he may have developed a different philosophy, and, as such, would not have taken the case to the Supreme Court as he did.

Thurgood Marshall won many cases before the Supreme Court, but not one of them surpassed what he did with *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Thurgood Marshall takes the case to the Supreme Court, but when the case gets to the Supreme Court, the Justice who was there at the time was a person that was unable to pull the Court together to get a decision by June of 1953.

Because he could not do so, the case was then to be reheard in December of 1953. Between that time, the June date and the December date, the Chief Justice died. Then it became the duty of President Eisenhower to appoint another Chief Justice to the Supreme Court.

President Eisenhower looked to California. There in California was a Governor, a Governor who was unique in history for many ways, but this one I find worthy of mentioning.

He ran for Governor as a Democrat and as a Republican, imagine trying to do that today, and was elected Governor. He ran on the Democratic ticket and the Republican ticket. Never happen today. We are so divided here that neither party would tolerate it. The divide is so evident.

The public wants us to span the chasm. We can't span the chasm because the public is divided. The same people who want Members of Congress to compromise don't want to see compromise on the issues that are important to them.

Compromise is about give and take. Compromise is not winner take all, my way or the highway. The public itself has to understand that they are part of the reason there is a divide.

Back to the case, *Brown v. Board of Education*. Chief Justice Warren became the Chief Justice by virtue of President Eisenhower having appointed him as such.

President Eisenhower thought he did the country a great service when he appointed him, but he later said it was one of his greatest mistakes.

He said he made two mistakes, they were both on the Supreme Court, and one of those was Chief Justice Warren

because it was Chief Justice Warren who pulled the Court together.

It was Chief Justice Warren who was able to get a unanimous decision in the *Brown* case. I don't know that anybody else could have done it.

He was a unique personality. He understood the politics of the judiciary. He was a Governor. He understood people, what motivated people and moved people, and he pulled together the Court such that there was a unanimous decision.

That unanimous decision was not, as one might think, a decision that would be immediately embraced by the country. It was not embraced immediately by the country.

There were persons who still wanted separate but equal or separate but unequal because that is what it was.

You can call it equal, but when you have inferior schools for people of color, which is what I attended, and then you have superior schools, not in the sense that the minds in the schools are inferior or superior, but in the sense that the facilities, the books that I received were hand-me-down books from another school system.

You could see the names of children who had the books before I acquired them. Hand-me-downs. The school systems were segregated in that fashion.

This segregation did not end with May 17, 1954, and the *Brown* decision. In fact, a Nobel Laureate, Milton Friedman, he had a very clever idea.

He was of the opinion, Nobel Laureate Milton Friedman, that we ought to just give the public dollars to the parents, and they could have these vouchers, and they could use these vouchers to send their children to private schools, maintain segregation but under a different name. What a world. What a world. Milton Friedman, Nobel Laureate.

If you believe that that was the end of vouchers, you are imminently incorrect. The Governor of Texas is still pushing for vouchers, still wants to take public dollars and give them to parents and let them take their children and put their children in private schools.

That would have maintained segregation if it had been done, and there is a good likelihood I wouldn't be standing here now.

Do not believe that slavery had to end. It ended because of the will of Abraham Lincoln.

□ 1245

It didn't have to end. It could have continued. The caste system could have continued. To this day, I could be a part of a caste but for brave people who took a stance and but for the Civil War that was fought—for all the politicians who are listening—because of slavery.

We could easily find that the caste system exists today if not for some brave people. So this notion that we integrated, and it was about desegregation, it wasn't about integration. The

*Brown* decision said that there should be desegregation with the term "all deliberate speed," but it didn't happen immediately.

Milton Friedman tried his best to thwart it. In fact, in Prince Edward County, Virginia, the White elite of that county defied the *Brown* decision by closing the entire school system. They closed the school system, and they diverted public education funds into vouchers to be used at segregated private academies that were for Whites only. It would have still been segregation just by another name.

So, yes, we needed the *Brown* decision, but do not be deceived into believing that the decision was immediately implemented. We are still implementing it, by the way. We needed it then. We need *Brown* now.

*Brown* has made a difference, but *Brown* hasn't brought us to the promised land. We are not there yet.

The Senate of the United States of America disrespects African Americans on a daily basis. Now, some people don't believe I said that, so I probably should say it again: The Senate of the United States of America disrespects African Americans on a daily basis. The Senate of the United States of America is a place of shame.

The Richard Russell Office Building is a national disgrace. Richard Russell was a self-proclaimed white supremacist. Richard Russell fought antilynching legislation. Richard Russell fought civil rights legislation. Richard Russell coauthored the Southern Manifesto.

His name is on the Senate Russell Office Building. That is the Richard Russell. The Senate will not take Richard Russell's name off the building.

You are a place of national shame, Senate. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves, every one of you. Every one of you. What is wrong with you? You know you are disrespecting African Americans, yet you leave the name of Richard Russell on a building being paid for with taxpayer dollars.

If that name was associated with the Third Reich, it would come down tonight. We are disrespected, people of color who happen to be of African ancestry.

The rationale given for not changing the name is that the Senators can't agree on a new name. Well, I solved that problem. Pardon me for using a personal pronoun. My mother taught me to say "we" whenever possible, but in my business, if you don't say "I," other people will. We have solved that problem. Here is the solution: Let the name revert back to the name it had before it became the Russell Senate Office Building. Let it revert back.

What was that name, AL GREEN? It was the Old Senate Office Building. Just take Russell's name off. Let it revert to Old Senate Office Building, and then take as much time as you want, ad infinitum, if you will, and let it become the name of your choice.

I have no name. I am not doing this because I want a name. I am doing this

and saying this because it is not just the right thing to do; it is the right-  
eous thing to do. His name needs to  
come off of that building.

Brown v. Board of Education didn't  
bring us to the promised land. We still  
have problems here in the Congress of  
the United States of America. This one  
is so obvious. It is intuitively obvious  
to the most casual observer. The name  
ought to come off.

I will say to every Senator: You  
ought to be ashamed. You made the  
Senate a place of national shame.

By the way, the news media ought to  
be equally ashamed because, in the ro-  
tunda where Richard Russell's statue  
is, you have the news media right there  
above Richard Russell. He has a ro-  
tunda devoted to him. Above him is  
CNN, MSNBC, FOX. You ought to be  
ashamed, all of you. You are perpet-  
uating this. It has been perpetrated by  
the Senate, and you are perpetuating  
it.

Well, AL, you will probably not get  
back on those stations or networks  
again. Do you think that matters to  
me, that someone would keep me off  
because I speak the truth not only to  
power but about power?

Speaking truth to power is fairly  
easy. You say power is a problem we  
need to solve. Speaking truth about  
power is to say, power, there is a prob-  
lem, and you are it.

You are it, CNN. You are it, FOX,  
MSNBC. You are it, Senate. You don't  
have the courage to do the right thing.  
You ought to be denouncing what the  
Senate is doing, but you are right there  
in the building where it is happening.  
You ought to be ashamed of yourselves.  
You are perpetuating this insult to Af-  
rican Americans.

So Brown v. Board of Education did a  
lot, make no mistake about it. It has  
made a difference in the lives of people  
of color, especially African Americans.  
It has made a difference. It has made a  
difference in job opportunities. It has  
made a difference in opportunities for  
education, opportunities to hold public  
office. It has made a difference, but we  
are still not there.

We aren't because people of color are  
disproportionately poverty-stricken.  
People of color are not—let me close  
with this. I am being told my time is  
up. This is a to-be-continued.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DE  
LA CRUZ). The time of the gentleman  
has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speak-  
er, I appreciate you calling it to my at-  
tention. We have much work to do.

#### SOUTHERN BORDER INVASION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under  
the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-  
uary 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the  
gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr.  
GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I  
think one more time today it is impor-  
tant to update the Chamber as far as  
what is going on with the biggest crisis

in America today. That is, of course,  
the virtual invasion across our south-  
ern border.

We recently had published an esti-  
mate of the number of people who have  
crossed the southern border in April,  
the most recent month available. That  
number is about 204,000. April is usu-  
ally a low month, but per usual, it ap-  
pears as though we hit the all-time  
record number of people coming here in  
April.

A year ago, it was about 178,000, and  
a year before that, about 160,000. If you  
go back to the final year that Presi-  
dent Trump was President, it was  
about 6,000. We have gone from about  
6,000 people, which is apparently do-  
able, to about 205,000.

During that time, President Biden,  
through executive orders, has changed  
the policy and is also allowing about  
30,000 people here as parolees from  
countries such as Haiti, Venezuela,  
Cuba. So, that number of 204,000 is real-  
ly probably understated by about  
30,000.

Our country continues to struggle  
with this. It is very expensive, though  
that is not the biggest problem, be it  
schools, be it medical care. Even in my  
district when I talk to people who try  
to put together free clinics used to get  
Medicaid payments, that sort of thing,  
one of them told me even a majority of  
people they are having to take care of—  
in essence, charity—are people who  
some would describe as illegal immi-  
grants.

I assume that the number of illegal  
immigrants who are unaccompanied  
minors continues to be a concern. We  
have about 6,000 of the 205,000 unaccom-  
panied minors.

We heard testimony about this re-  
cently, but we still do not know ex-  
actly where all these folks are. We  
don't know if they are living with a so-  
called relative, whether we are consist-  
ently giving DNA tests to see whether  
it really is a relative. We know The  
New York Times published articles  
that guessed that there are tens of  
thousands of unaccompanied minors  
not accounted for.

It would be very easy to solve this  
problem. You reinstitute the stay in  
Mexico policy. You get parole. By the  
way, with parole, you automatically  
get what we refer to as welfare benefits  
as soon as you come here. You get rid  
of these programs and this drive to  
change America would change almost  
overnight.

We can never forget that Barack  
Obama, living in the greatest country  
in the world, the United States, during  
his term felt that one of his goals  
would be to fundamentally change  
America. When you change the people  
in America, how they are brought up,  
how they think about things, you will  
fundamentally change America, the  
greatest country in the history of the  
world.

The only reason you continue to let,  
as far as I can see, about a quarter mil-  
lion people coming here every month is

because you do want to change it and  
want it to be different. So, I call upon  
President Biden to return to the stay  
in Mexico policy.

I think primarily by doing that, you  
could get that quarter of million figure  
back down around 20,000 or 10,000 al-  
most overnight.

Again, the takeaway for this body  
and the American public should be, and  
we should never get bored of saying it,  
it appears, one more time in April, we  
hit the all-time high for an April of the  
number of people crossing into our Na-  
tion.

What I thought was the biggest crisis  
in the country when I became a Con-  
gressman—now I guess I have to say it  
is second to the border—is the contin-  
ued assault on marriage and the break-  
down of the family. When I talk to peo-  
ple in my district, they know some-  
thing is wrong.

In some ways, America is different  
than the America they knew in the  
1990s, the 1970s, the 1960s. You ask them  
what the change is, and they fre-  
quently say the number one change is  
the breakdown of the American family,  
the end of the old-fashioned mother  
and father and children at home as we  
slowly increase the number of children  
who are born without a father in the  
household.

Of course, this is a problem in two  
ways. It is a problem for the children  
by every metric. They would be better  
off if they had mom and dad at home.  
It is also a problem for the men in soci-  
ety, as usually men get their self-worth  
out of supporting their family.

We have more and more families in  
which, as an immigrant in my district  
tells me, in America, or some commu-  
nities, the woman marries the govern-  
ment. Because we have a situation in  
which we are encouraging the woman  
to marry the government, we have a  
situation in which we no longer have  
what is for most men their most impor-  
tant function in life, and that is sup-  
porting their wife and supporting their  
children.

□ 1300

I want to point out, by the way, that  
this is not a coincidence. When I talk  
to people around my district and say:  
Why do you think the family is break-  
ing down? Maybe they shrug their  
shoulders and say: America is less reli-  
gious or something. They have to real-  
ize there are people all along who want  
the breakdown of the family. That is  
their goal.

In 1848, Karl Marx, who is still read  
and still respected in some circles,  
wrote about the need to abolish the  
family in "The Communist Manifesto."  
He did not want children to be raised  
by parents. He wanted the government  
to assume that role.

I think it is not a coincidence that in  
the 1960s at the time of great subsidy of  
fatherless homes was also a high tide  
for feminism. Kate Millett, a very im-  
portant feminist, that I think some

young people don't know, said that destroying the American family was necessary to bring about the leftwing cultural revolution.

I think today our children are sometimes taught that the feminist movement was a positive. We can't forget during their power of the sixties their goal was to destroy the American family.

Remember a few years ago, at a time when so many Congressmen in this institution would show up at places where Black Lives Matter was having a rally or carrying signs, that at that time, before it was taken down out of embarrassment, they said that they were calling upon the end of the Western prescribed nuclear family.

Let's not forget that—despite the fact that on their website Black Lives Matter was calling for the end of the nuclear family—dozens, perhaps hundreds of people in this body, showed up at places showing support for Black Lives Matter, as well as the chief executives of our largest corporations frequently giving money to Black Lives Matter because, apparently, they thought it was the trendy thing the way America was going.

Last month, in another bit of evidence that the hard left likes to believe the nuclear family is outdated, there was a Wisconsin Supreme Court decision dealing with adoption laws. This wasn't the reason for the decision; the decision wound up being unanimous. Justice Jill Karofsky of the Wisconsin Supreme Court—and in Wisconsin our supreme court justices are not partisan elections, but everybody knows who the Democrat is and who the Republican is. The relatively new Democrat Justice Jill Karofsky writes: "The notion that marriage serves as the foundation of society is at best outdated, and at worst misogynistic."

Think about that. In a State like Wisconsin where frequently Republicans win statewide, we have U.S. Senator RON JOHNSON here, but a woman got elected to the Wisconsin State Supreme Court and here she declares that: "The notion that marriage serves as the foundation of society is at best outdated, and at worst misogynistic" letting the cat out of the bag that the goal of the left is to destroy the American family.

Now, how is President Biden responding to this in his proposed budget? There are many programs out there which are made available, as long as there is not a breadwinner in the family, particularly as long as there is not a man in the family, which I think they are really aiming at, then those programs kick in. Some of these programs, it appears to me, are increased in this budget, which, in other words, further pushes for financial reasons for getting the men out of the household.

President Biden tries to increase more low-income housing frequently available to one-parent families, not to married couples. The earned income tax credit is a horrible program which

was begun or actually pushed by a Republican Jack Kemp and is another program which discourages marriage. SNAP increases discourage marriage. Things like Pell grants are a program that is much easier to take advantage of, college scholarships, if you don't have a two-parent family at home.

It is very disappointing that President Biden has decided to put all this money into programs designed to assist primarily fatherless homes, but we have to stand up as a Congress and say, no, we are no longer going to push one lifestyle over another.

It would be a good thing if we went back to a time when the government was not putting their thumb on the scale as to what type of family you have. I hope that my Republican colleagues in the Appropriations Committee, when they see the increase in these programs, make sure that they don't come about, but, in fact, do the opposite, that they turn around and begin to work our way back to the eighties, the seventies, the sixties, the fifties where we did not punish parents for getting married.

On the Pell grant thing I want to recount an anecdote I have talked about before. I have spoken about this topic for over 20 years now, and I was once speaking to a group of primarily senior citizens. It was during the Tea Party thing. They were older people, and I went through all the programs that you lost if you married a guy with an income.

There was a young gal working at that time. Most of the people who are most familiar with the Tea Party movement know a lot of people there were older, but there was a young gal. I asked her what she thought about my speech and all the benefits out there to discourage people from getting married. She said that, you know, me and my husband, we got married before I had a child, but none of my friends got married, and they get free college.

I realized even then that the 24-, 25-year-olds, they had it figured out. Sadly, they already realized that the goal of the American Government was to discourage marriage and do what they can to give programs based upon the idea of not having a man in the family.

My hope is we begin to work our way back to a time where the two-parent family—there are wonderful parents raising children in all sorts of circumstances, but the government should no longer create situations in which there are incentives to keep the man out of the household.

We had some votes recently with regard to American aid to Ukraine, and I believe that once we have gone down the path we have gone down, we cannot allow Ukraine to collapse.

That being said, it bothers me that to this day the Biden administration does not talk about trying to end this war. We have two countries that are actually very closely related. In my district, when you run across someone

that is Russian, they very frequently have a spouse from Ukraine or the other way around.

It seems to me a real tragedy that a huge number of people, tens of thousands of people of both countries are dying because of that war. Ukraine has the second lowest birth rate in the world. It is always a tragedy when people die, but to have a country in which so many young people are dying is truly a tragedy. They have the same problem in Russia, a birth rate that is too low. Not only is the birth rate too low, but they also have a huge immigration problem.

I know in this country having been down at the southern border, it is not unusual to have Russians come in there. I know a few people in my district, including a young couple with children that I am sure Russia would love to have, but they left Russia to come here. That was before the war started.

The goal of both Mr. Zelenskyy and Mr. Putin ought to be to try to get more young people to populate their rather large countries, not to have this war going on. I think they both must realize this if they really want what is best for the future of their countries. I would hope that President Biden, in addition to asking for more munitions for the war would find some country, be it Israel, be it Turkiye, whatever country, to try to negotiate an end to this war. It is such a tragedy to see tens of thousands of young people dying on both sides when from what I can see the biggest problem that both countries have is a lack of young people in the first place.

I would ask President Biden to spend a little time on that. When I have met in the past with his advisers or his Cabinet on this issue, they really just seem dumbfounded when I ask them about when the war is going to end. It is like they haven't even considered it. It is something we should consider. It is also bad geopolitically for the United States.

We saw earlier this week meetings between Red China and Russia. I know going back to President Nixon we did not want close ties between Russia and China, and we have been very careful to make sure that hasn't happened. However, you leave it to President Biden, and those countries have closer ties, as well as closer ties with Iran, another country that we don't like to necessarily see prosper or become part of an alliance against the United States.

My third request for this body is that we try to prod the Biden administration in looking for an end to this war, so these two great historical countries do not continue to lose their younger population.

To go over one more time, we have to have Americans still be aware that we are hitting records of people coming across the southern border.

We have to remind people at home that this breakdown of the family did

not just happen; it happened because this Congress continues to dole out money, virtually conditioned upon not having an old-fashioned, nuclear family, and the Biden administration is trying to throw gas on the fire with this budget.

Finally, we hope Members of this body will prod the Biden administration towards looking for peace in Eastern Europe.

Madam Speaker, as I wrap up, I hope the body proceeds as I would wish, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-4227. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General John W. Brennan, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4228. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Christopher C. LaNeve, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4229. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonel Lawrence T. Sullivan, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4230. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonel Bill A. Soliz, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4231. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's interim final rule — Community Reinvestment Act; Supplemental Rule [Regulation BB; Docket No.: R-1830] (RIN: 7100-AG75) 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-4232. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2023 Merger Decisions Report; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4233. A letter from the Acting Director, office of Minority and Women Inclusion, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Section 324 Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act 2023 Report to Congress, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5452(e); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 342(e); (124 Stat. 1543); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4234. A letter from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — Safety Standard for Automatic Residential Garage Door Operators [Docket No.: CPSC-2015-0025] 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-4235. A letter from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — Safety Standard Mandating ASTM F963 for Toys [Docket No.: CPSC-2017-0010] 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-4236. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Grid Deployment Office, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coordination of Federal Authorizations for Electric Transmission Facilities [DOE-HQ-2023-0050] (RIN: 1901-AB62) received May 3, 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-4237. A letter from the Director, Rule-making Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Automatic Emergency Braking Systems for Light Vehicles [Docket No.: NHTSA-2023-0021] (RIN: 2127-AM37) received May 10, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4238. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Telemarketing Sales Rule (RIN: 3084-AB19) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-4239. A letter from the Chair, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's fiscal year 2025 Congressional Budget Justification; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4240. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy and designation of acting officer, 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-4241. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2023 Inventory of Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4242. A letter from the Chair, Public Interest Declassification Board, transmitting

the Board's annual report; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4243. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer and Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the Statement of Disbursements for the U.S. Capitol Police for the period October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1910(a); Public Law 109-55, Sec. 1005; (119 Stat. 575) (H. Doc. No. 118—142); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

EC-4244. A letter from the Director, Ruelmaking Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Uniform Procedures for State Highway Safety Grant Programs (RIN: 2127-AM45) received May 10, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4245. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's notice of funding opportunity — Notice of Funding Opportunity for the FY 2023-FY 2024 Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements Program 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 Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4246. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Comptche Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2023-0003; T.D. TTB-192; Ref: Notice No.: 222] (RIN: 1513-AC77) received May 10, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-4247. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Certain Required Minimum Distributions for 2024 [Notice 2024-35] received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 7251. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain poison control programs; with an amendment (Rept. 118-512). 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 Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Ms. BALINT, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. CHU, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. STANSBURY, and Ms. BARRAGAN):

H.R. 8444. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of

Health and Human Services, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, to establish grant programs to promote mental health in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Ohio):

H.R. 8445. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, and the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the eligibility of United States citizens who serve in the Israeli Defense Forces for certain protections relating to such service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CISCOMANI (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 8446. A bill to amend the Energy Act of 2020 to include critical materials in the definition of critical mineral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 8447. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish centers of excellence for agricultural security research, extension, and education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BACON (for himself and Mr. NUNN of Iowa):

H.R. 8448. A bill to establish a pilot program to establish a pre-approval process for direct farm ownership loans made under subtitle A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act in order to streamline the application process and provide greater certainty to borrowers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BILLIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 8449. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring access to AM broadcast stations in motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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 Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself and Ms. SLOTKIN):

H.R. 8450. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to evaluate certain minerals for designation as critical minerals; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 8451. A bill to establish a grant program for certain institutions of higher education to plan and implement projects for economic and community development in economically distressed communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Mr. GOODEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. OGLE, Mr. TIFANY, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 8452. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain membership status for Taiwan in the International Criminal Police Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself, Ms. BUDZINSKI, and Mr. FEENSTRA):

H.R. 8453. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to publish a report on the fertilizer industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. JACOBS:

H.R. 8454. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to add matters covered by counseling in the Transition Assistance Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. JACOBS (for herself and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia):

H.R. 8455. A bill to direct the Secretaries of the military departments concerned to conduct a feasibility study develop a plan to carry out a program to construct facilities of covered military housing and to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. JACOBS:

H.R. 8456. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to implement certain recommendations made by the Comptroller General with respect to disaster recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. LUNA:

H.R. 8457. A bill to prevent the distribution of intimate visual depictions without consent; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS (for herself, Ms. CHU, Mr. PFLUGER, and Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY):

H.R. 8458. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to psychological and behavioral services; 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. MOORE of Alabama (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BACON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GUEST, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. PALMER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. ROSENDALE):

H.R. 8459. A bill to amend the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 to require abortion providers to notify the National Human Trafficking Hotline of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah (for himself, Ms. CHU, and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia):

H.R. 8460. A bill to strengthen the Court Improvement Program to advance technology and modernizing the judicial child welfare system; 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. PERRY:

H.R. 8461. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a program under which an institution of higher education may elect to cosign Federal student loans made to students attending the institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 8462. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to support State and local governments making a transition to ranked choice voting; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 8463. A bill to prohibit and establish penalties for the use of the identity of another, without authorization, to make available certain information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIMMONS (for himself and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.R. 8464. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the National Credit Union Administration Board to jointly submit a report on trends in the use of blockchain technology to tokenize traditional assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VAN DUYN:

H.R. 8465. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to increase health insurance access for individuals placing their newborns for adoption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H.R. 8466. A bill to amend division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 to improve the Affordable Connectivity Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, Oversight and Accountability, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG (for himself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.J. Res. 150. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units Review of the Residual Risk and Technology Review"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 1238. A resolution supporting the designation of May 17, 2024, as "Endangered Species Day"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself, Mr. MILLS, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H. Res. 1239. A resolution strongly condemning the rise of antisemitism on campuses of institutions of higher education across the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MANNING:

H. Res. 1240. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4121) to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H. Res. 1241. A resolution calling for the establishment of a comprehensive, long-term



development program to rebuild the Republic of Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THANEDAR (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SOTO):

H. Res. 1242. A resolution prioritizing mental health to the same degree as physical health to address the epidemics of suicide and drug overdose in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XIII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 8444.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is: Mental Health

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER:

H.R. 8445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title 38, United States Code, and the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the eligibility of United States citizens who serve in the Israeli Defense Forces for certain protections relating to such service.

By Mr. CISCOMANI:

H.R. 8446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The Department of Interior's Critical Mineral List

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 8447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 8448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 8449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would require the Department of Transportation (DOT) to issue a rule that requires all new motor vehicles to have devices that can access, receive signals, and play content transmitted by AM broadcast stations or digital audio AM broadcast stations installed as standard equipment.

By Mrs. CAMMACK:

H.R. 8450.

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 include phosphate and potash on the final list of critical minerals

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 8451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish a grant program for certain institutions of higher education to plan and implement projects for economic and community development in economically distressed communities.

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas:

H.R. 8452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to 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, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Thus, Congress has the authority not only to increase taxes, but also, to reduce taxes to promote the general welfare of the United States of America and her citizens. Additionally Congress has the

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill directs the Department of State to develop a strategy to advocate for and endorse Taiwan as a full member of INTERPOL. Additionally, this bill encourages Taiwan's involvement in other international organizations and instructs the Secretary to issue a report on the efforts the Department and its representatives have taken to advocate for Taiwan's participation in international organizations including Interpol

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 8453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study on the state of the United States fertilizer industry.

By Ms. JACOBS:

H.R. 8454.

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 add counseling in the Transition Assistance Program regarding sexual assault, sexual or gender harassment, and intimate partner violence.

By Ms. JACOBS:

H.R. 8455.

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 direct the Secretaries of the military departments to conduct a feasibility study develop a plan to construct facilities of multi-unit housing with military child development centers.

By Ms. JACOBS:

H.R. 8456.

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 require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to implement certain recommendations made by the Comptroller General with respect to disaster recovery, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. LUNA:

H.R. 8457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would prevent the distribution of intimate visual depictions without consent

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:

H.R. 8458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

To expand access to psychological and behavioral services under Medicare

By Mr. MOORE of Alabama:

H.R. 8459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIII states "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I grants that grants that Congress shall "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 to require abortion providers to notify the National Human Trafficking Hotline of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah:

H.R. 8460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Administration for Children and Families Court Improvement Program

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 8461.

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:

Education

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 8462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, §8, cl. 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would authorize \$40,000,000 in funding for states and localities seeking to implement ranked choice voting.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 8463.

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 prohibit and establish penalties for the use of the identity of another, without authorization, and to make available certain information.

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 8464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The Tokenization Report Act of 2024 will require the prudential regulators to submit a report to both chambers of Congress on trends surrounding the tokenization of traditional assets; the purpose of this report would be to ensure the federal government

has the most up to date understanding on the dynamic trends within the world of blockchain technology and its relationship with our financial systems.

By Ms. VAN DUYNÉ:  
H.R. 8465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to increase health insurance access for individuals placing their newborns up for adoption

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H.R. 8466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend Division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 to improve the Affordable Connectivity Program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H.J. Res. 150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units Review of the Residual Risk and Technology Review”.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. JAMES.  
H.R. 549: Mr. KILEY and Mr. DELUZIO.  
H.R. 620: Ms. KUSTER.  
H.R. 847: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.  
H.R. 936: Mr. LANGWORTHY.  
H.R. 1015: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mrs. FLETCHER.  
H.R. 1083: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
H.R. 1088: Mr. AGUILAR.  
H.R. 1111: Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 1321: Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. STEVENS.  
H.R. 1458: Ms. ROSS.  
H.R. 1511: Mr. CARBAJAL.  
H.R. 1526: Ms. STEVENS.  
H.R. 1572: Mr. DELUZIO and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 1643: Mrs. RAMIREZ.  
H.R. 1668: Mr. SARBANES.  
H.R. 1787: Ms. SHERRILL.  
H.R. 1831: Mr. CÁRDENAS.  
H.R. 2429: Ms. MALOY.  
H.R. 2439: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
H.R. 2474: Mr. CROW.  
H.R. 2630: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CLINE, Mrs. SYKES, and Mr. VAN ORDEN.  
H.R. 2722: Ms. STEVENS and Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 2727: Mr. FROST.  
H.R. 2801: Mr. TRONE.  
H.R. 3018: Mr. BERA, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. AMO, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 3228: Mr. THANEDAR.

H.R. 3238: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3331: Ms. SHERRILL.  
H.R. 3470: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 3725: Ms. SALINAS.  
H.R. 3869: Mr. VAN ORDEN.  
H.R. 4121: Mr. SABLAN.  
H.R. 4185: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 4285: Mrs. RAMIREZ.  
H.R. 4333: Mr. CARTER of Texas.  
H.R. 4391: Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 4602: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.  
H.R. 4731: Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.  
H.R. 4818: Mr. SOTO and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.  
H.R. 4911: Ms. SALINAS.  
H.R. 4933: Mr. THANEDAR.  
H.R. 5013: Mr. BERA.  
H.R. 5266: Ms. SPANBERGER.  
H.R. 5364: Mr. CASTEN.  
H.R. 5601: Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 5830: Mr. DUNCAN.  
H.R. 5866: Mr. DOGGETT.  
H.R. 6179: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. SHERRILL.  
H.R. 6409: Ms. BROWNLEY.  
H.R. 6451: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 6521: Mr. BACON.  
H.R. 6644: Mr. GUTHRIE.  
H.R. 6727: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.  
H.R. 6754: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H.R. 6951: Mr. ROSE, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. CLYDE.  
H.R. 7056: Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 7131: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 7142: Ms. SPANBERGER.  
H.R. 7227: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 7478: Mr. CARL.  
H.R. 7508: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.  
H.R. 7577: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
H.R. 7649: Mr. CRANE.  
H.R. 7675: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.  
H.R. 7770: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUIZ, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.  
H.R. 7771: Mr. RUIZ and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.  
H.R. 7779: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.  
H.R. 7972: Mrs. HAYES.  
H.R. 8091: Mr. BRECHEEN.  
H.R. 8141: Ms. CHU.  
H.R. 8208: Ms. TENNEY.  
H.R. 8209: Mr. ROSE.  
H.R. 8213: Mr. CASTEN.  
H.R. 8281: Mr. BURLISON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FINSTAD, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. WALTZ.  
H.R. 8295: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. MEUSER.  
H.R. 8297: Mrs. HAYES.  
H.R. 8331: Mr. YAKYM.  
H.R. 8336: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H.R. 8345: Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. GUEST.  
H.R. 8364: Mr. MANN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. FISCHBACH, and Mr. ESTES.  
H.R. 8370: Mr. KILDEE and Mrs. MCBATH.  
H.R. 8373: Mr. NORMAN.  
H.R. 8374: Mr. OGLES and Mr. DUNCAN.  
H.R. 8375: Ms. PETERSEN.  
H.R. 8376: Ms. PETERSEN.  
H.R. 8410: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.  
H.R. 8419: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.  
H.R. 8421: Mr. ROSENDALE.  
H.R. 8423: Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 8426: Ms. CHU.  
H.R. 8437: Mr. HILL.  
H.J. Res. 76: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. STEVENS.

H.J. Res. 97: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. HARRIS.

H.J. Res. 123: Mr. LUTTRELL.  
H.J. Res. 138: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. BURGESS.  
H.J. Res. 144: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.J. Res. 145: Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.J. Res. 146: Mr. SELF and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.  
H.J. Res. 148: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.  
H. Res. 262: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.  
H. Res. 1063: Mr. HILL.  
H. Res. 1121: Mr. CARSON.  
H. Res. 1148: Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COLE, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. TORRES of New York.  
H. Res. 1215: Mrs. MANNING, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.  
H. Res. 1226: Mr. OBERNOLTE.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1822: Mr. VAN DREW.

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 11 by Mr. STEUBE on House Resolution 961: Ms. Jacobs, Ms. Ross, Mrs. Peltola, Mr. Phillips, Ms. Budzinski, Ms. Meng, Ms. Lois Frankel of Florida, Ms. Kuster, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Sorensen, Ms. Scanlon, Ms. Houlihan, Mr. McGarvey, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Nickel, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Mrvan, Mr. Morelle, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mrs. Hayes, Ms. Adams, Ms. Garcia of Texas, Ms. Dean of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Foushee, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Ms. Williams of Georgia, Mr. Davis of North Carolina, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Amo, Mrs. McBeth, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Casar, Mr. Espaillat, Mr. Neguse, Mr. Horsford, Mr. Underwood, Ms. Bush, Ms. Salazar, Mr. Auchincloss, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Himes, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Keating, Mr. Gallego, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Mfume, Mr. Meeks, Mr. Pocan, Ms. Greene of Georgia, Mr. Landsman, Ms. Escobar, Mr. Green of Texas, Mr. Mast, Mr. Carson, Mr. Mike Garcia of California, Ms. Moore of Wisconsin, Mr. Goldman of New York, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Bowman, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Ms. Tlaib, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. Ivey, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Foster, Ms. Davids of Kansas, Mr. Casten, Ms. Perez, Ms. Spanberger, Ms. Caraveo, Mr. Jackson of North Carolina, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Pappas, Mr. Pallone and Mr. Ryan.