



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2024

No. 90

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 23, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CELESTE MALOY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representative.

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, we pray to You, as we enter this Memorial Day weekend, that You would bless our efforts to honor our fallen heroes. In the fanfare of parades and picnics, barbecues and summer's beginning, may we take time to recall the countless sacrifices that were made to defend our freedoms and uphold our liberty.

These noble men and women have stood firm. In the face of war's alarms and up against the anguish of adversity, they would not be moved. May they rest knowing that they gave themselves fully to the work You, O Lord, set before them to accomplish. Grant them peace in knowing that neither their labor nor their sacrifice was in vain.

God of the ages, may we be the guardians and guarantors of their valourous legacy. Guide us in the living of these moments that we would remain true to the ideals they willingly devoted their lives to preserve.

Inspire in us the same depth of commitment to our country, the same fidelity to our fellow Americans, and the

same unhesitating character to humble ourselves in service to You and to this Nation.

In Your everlasting name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

RECOGNIZING JONATHAN FAY

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Com-

mander Jon Fay's tremendous career serving his country and commemorate his retirement from the U.S. Navy. For 24 years, Jon has dedicated his life to serving our great Nation and keeping it a great Nation.

From ensign to executive officer, Jon has worked his way through the ranks. Today, he is highly decorated and holds various personal, unit, and service awards.

In September of 2021, he joined the Blue Angels and has accumulated an impressive 2,900 flight hours and 168 carrier arrested landings.

Jon is a humble leader and true patriot fueled by love for his family and love for his country.

Jon's wife, Amy, and children have played a crucial role in his service. We must also honor the unwavering support and countless sacrifices they have made over the years.

On behalf of a grateful Nation and this Congress, I thank Jon Fay and his family for their selfless service to ensuring our freedoms for generations to come.

His life is one to be copied. As Jon would say: Go Navy. Beat Army. In God we trust.

15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF THE WAR IN SRI LANKA

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, this past Saturday, May 18, marked the 15th anniversary since the end of the civil war in Sri Lanka. The conflict saw the death, disappearance, abuse, and displacement of tens of thousands of Tamil people in Sri Lanka.

I want to take this time to remember and honor the lives lost and to reaffirm my and Congress' solidarity with the people of all communities in Sri Lanka in their search for reconciliation and reform. I also recognize the bravery

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.

H3487

and commitment of those who continue to seek justice and accountability.

I urge the Sri Lankan Government and the international community to advocate for the protection of rights for all peoples of Sri Lanka and to work with all parties toward a sustainable political solution to prevent recurrence of such violence and tragic loss.

FARM SAFETY NET

(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, America's farm families work around the clock to feed, fuel, and clothe our Nation and the world, yet their livelihoods are often at the mercy of unpredictable forces beyond their control.

Since the last farm bill was passed in 2018, producers have faced record inflation, rising input costs, fractured supply chains, labor shortages, natural disasters, and more.

Our current safety net is tattered, and our farmers have been bearing the burden of these challenges alone, risking the viability of their operations.

The 2024 farm bill is the opportunity to implement significant changes to the farm safety net, equipping our farmers to meet their needs.

A robust farm safety net provides stability to our producers to ensure farmers can continue operations in uncertain times.

A stable, reliable food supply is essential for ensuring national security. The importance of our agriculture industry cannot be overstated. By investing in our farmers and strengthening the safety net, we can ensure that America and American families remain food secure.

REMEMBERING ALAN G. SIEROTY

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, today, I honor the life and legacy of my friend and mentor, former California State Senator Alan Sieroty.

A champion of California's environment, arts, and civil rights, Alan paved the way for the creation of the California Coastal Commission so our beautiful coastlines could remain accessible for all.

His passion for the arts led him to establish the California State Summer School for the Arts, training the next generation of artists, filmmakers, and writers to this day.

Alan was also a tireless advocate for disability rights, civil rights, and gave back through his work with numerous nonprofits including connecting unhoused seniors to shelter.

Beyond politics and the arts, Alan was also a lover of jazz. He was a true Renaissance man.

I extend my deepest sympathies to Alan's family, to Michele, and to all who loved him. As we mourn the loss of an incredible public servant, let us celebrate his enduring legacy.

Alan was a model public servant, and I had such admiration and affection for him. May he continue to inspire us all, and may his memory be a blessing.

CHICKENS COMING HOME TO ROOST

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I had planned today to congratulate a poultry judging team in my district, but I need to address what happened at Marine Corps Base Quantico in Triangle, Virginia, because what happened there are the chickens coming home to roost from the broken Biden border policy.

Madam Speaker, on May 3, 2024, two Jordanian foreign nationals that entered the United States unlawfully attempted to breach the Quantico Marine Corps Base in Triangle, Virginia. Press reports indicate that they were in a van posing as delivery men and tried to ram their way through.

I am quoting from a letter that our Governor has sent to the President because he has not received a briefing on what happened in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The American people didn't learn about what happened at Quantico for 2 weeks.

During that time, we don't know who else had entered this country illegally or what else their designs were, but it is proven that the broken Biden border policy is having an effect on the national security of this country.

The President needs to take action now, or Congress and the Senate need to take action on H.R. 2.

HOLDING BANK EXECUTIVES ACCOUNTABLE

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, after the 2008 financial crisis, Congress tasked our financial regulatory agencies with implementing a rule that bans pay packages for bank executives that incentivize excessive risk-taking. More than 13 years later, we are still waiting for this rule to be finalized. As the banking failures last year proved, these incentives continue to pose a serious threat to our financial system.

That is why I introduced the FAIR Fund Act, which requires large financial institutions to defer a portion of the executive compensation that would get paid out, unless there was misconduct or some sort of firm failure, after a period of between 2 and 8 years, depending on the size of the institution. In the case of misconduct or failure, deferred funds would be used to

cover the costs of any fines levied on the bank and make depositors whole.

I urge my colleagues to help us hold these bank executives accountable. This is a huge financial risk that we continue to have not only on small businesses but retirees and so many others that are directly connected to the risk-taking and very negligent actions by bank executives.

REMEMBERING THOSE WHO HAVE FALLEN TO DEFEND OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, as we are on the precipice of another Memorial Day in this country, we have so much to be thankful for and grateful for as we pause to remember those who have fallen to defend our country, our way of life, and our Constitution.

From the fields of Valley Forge to Tripoli to our own homeland in the Civil War to San Juan Hill, the trenches of France, Pearl Harbor, Normandy, Iwo Jima, the 38th parallel, the jungles of Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan, and others, we are grateful for those that stood up and stood in the line of fire for us and for our values.

Indeed, from John 15:13: "Greater love has no one than this: To lay down one's life for one's friends."

We owe them a lot. We can never pay that back other than to be grateful and to remember those who have fallen for our Nation.

EXTENDING AFFORDABLE INTERNET CONNECTIVITY

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Affordable Connectivity Program, a critical program that helps millions access affordable internet.

Families rely on the internet to do their jobs, go to school, meet with their doctors, and stay in contact with family and loved ones. Access to the internet is essential in the 21st century.

ACP, the Affordable Connectivity Program, helps more than 23 million households afford internet access. In Illinois, more than 700,000 households, 1 in 7, enrolled in ACP, including 21,000 in my district.

Despite this success, Republicans refuse to extend this program.

We cannot delay. Through their inaction, Republicans are forcing millions of families to face higher internet bills, or worse, to have their internet access cut off entirely.

If Speaker JOHNSON would bring the ACP extension to the floor for a vote, I know it would pass overwhelmingly. Instead, Republicans are wasting time voting on bogus messaging bills.

I implore Speaker JOHNSON to save the Affordable Connectivity Program. Let's bring it to the floor for a vote for an extension. We can get this done.

□ 1015

SANTA FE SHOOTING ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, Saturday marked the 6-year anniversary of the shooting at Santa Fe High School where 10 innocent lives were lost at the hands of evil. We will never forget that tragic day that forever changed Santa Fe, Texas.

As a community, we have witnessed the resilience of Santa Fe. The community's strength, their courage, and unity have been inspiring. We honor the victims by remembering their lives each and every day.

Thank you for the bravery of the first responders and everyday heroes who showed remarkable courage on that day and in the days that followed.

Madam Speaker, 6 years have passed, and not a day goes by that I don't think about each life that was taken on May 10, 2018. That day will be ingrained in my memory and our community until the end of time.

Let us continue to work together to ensure that such a tragedy never happens again.

TAX WAIVER

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

Mr. DELUZIO. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the large majority of us came together to pass the Federal Disaster Tax Relief Act.

The bill includes a provision to exempt from Federal taxes payments for residents like my constituents who were impacted by the East Palestine train derailment and who received payments from Norfolk Southern Railroad.

This is something I have been pushing for along with many others.

The East Palestine derailment was a disaster for a lot of families in Beaver County, which is just over the State line from our neighbors in Ohio.

It is ridiculous to me that folks who were hurt by this toxic train derailment in their backyard or their farm have to pay taxes on Norfolk Southern's payments to them.

Let's remember: It was the railroad's negligence and incompetence that caused this whole mess in the first place.

I was glad on Tuesday night that we passed a bill to help folks who were hurt.

If the Senate follows suit, as they should, these payments will be exempted from Federal taxes, as they should be.

Let's keep going to hold big railroads accountable and make freight rails safer. Madam Speaker, we can do that by passing my bill, the Railway Safety Act.

CELEBRATING ASIAN AMERICAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

Our AANHPI community is a diverse diaspora, but too often we are lumped together as one monolithic, model minority group, often forced to choose identity between Asian, Pacific Islander, or for me at the very worst, other.

We are so much more than "other." We are the fastest growing population in the country. We are made up of 70 ethnic groups. We speak over 100 different languages and dialects. We are the descendants of people, cultures, and traditions that are centuries older than this country we now call home, and we deserve to be seen, to be heard, to be recognized for who we are, where we come from, and what we stand for.

We are so much more than "other." During this month and every month, I challenge my colleagues to join us in uplifting the achievements, the voices, and the struggles facing our AANHPI community and commit to working toward a future where we are all truly seen, engaged, and represented.

LIFT THE HOLD

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank my colleagues, Congresswoman SHEILA CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Senator TIM KAINE, and many other Members of both Chambers who are urging House Foreign Affairs Committee Chair MICHAEL MCCAUL and Senate Foreign Relations Committee Ranking Member JAMES RISCH to lift the hold on the State Department's request for \$94 million for the multinational security support mission in Haiti.

Congressional Republicans' refusal to support this mission is a serious obstacle to restoring peace, security, and democratic governance in Haiti. As Kenyan President William Ruto visits Washington this week, it is crucial that we find a path forward on these funds. Establishing the MSS is vital to advancing U.S. national security interests, demonstrating American leadership in the Caribbean, and providing a lifeline to the Haitian people.

We must act decisively and together. Haiti has a fighting chance to mitigate

the chaos plunging and plaguing its communities if we support the MSS mission now.

INTENT TO DESIGNATE KENYA AS A MAJOR NON-NATO ALLY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-144)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2321k), I am providing notice of my intent to designate Kenya as a Major Non-NATO Ally.

I am making this designation in recognition of Kenya's many years of contributions to the United States Africa Command area of responsibility and globally and in recognition of our own national interest in deepening bilateral defense and security cooperation with the Government of Kenya. Kenya is one of the United States Government's top counterterrorism and security partners in sub-Saharan Africa, and the designation will demonstrate that the United States sees African contributions to global peace and security as equivalent to those of our Major Non-NATO Allies in other regions. I appreciate the support of the Congress in this action.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 2024.

PROHIBITING VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1243, I call up the bill (H.R. 192) to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 1243, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 192

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

SECTION 1. PROHIBITING VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS.

An individual who is not a citizen of the United States may not vote in an election for public office in the District of Columbia or in any ballot initiative or referendum in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF LOCAL RESIDENT VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022.

The Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24-242) is repealed, and

any provision of law amended or repealed by such Act shall be restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted into law.

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

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 192, an act to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital.

In reporting out H.R. 192, the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability holds that Congress must act to exert its constitutional responsibility to oversee the District of Columbia and make certain necessary amendments to the District's law.

Since the voters entrusted Republicans with control of the House in the 118th Congress, the Oversight Committee has conducted long overdue oversight of our Nation's Capital City, including holding hearings on the District of Columbia.

Specifically, to the topic we are discussing today, the Oversight Committee held a joint hearing with the Committee on House Administration on election integrity in the District.

At that hearing, the committees examined the District government's Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act, which allowed noncitizen residents to vote in D.C. local elections.

This act includes illegal immigrants and even foreign diplomats, whose interests may be opposed to the interests of Americans. This radical change to our election laws upset lawmakers on both sides of the aisle, Madam Speaker.

D.C. Mayor Bowser withheld her signature on the Act, something she had done only a handful of times in her tenure.

On February 9, 2023, 260 Members of this House voted to overturn the D.C. act through a resolution of disapproval.

In that vote, 42 House Democrats voted to block the D.C. law.

However, the bipartisan resolution of disapproval was not considered in the

Democratic-controlled Senate, so D.C.'s noncitizen voting law went into effect. This, in my opinion, and the opinion of many Americans across the country, is unacceptable.

The primary factor that differentiates American citizens from noncitizens is the right to vote.

D.C. residents should be confident that their local government vote is not being diluted by noncitizen residents or illegal immigrants casting votes.

Article I of the Constitution grants Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the Nation's Capital, and the rules of the U.S. House charge the Committee on Oversight and Accountability with a duty to oversee the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia.

I urge my colleagues to support Representative PFLUGER's commonsense bill to ensure that only United States citizens have the right to vote in local D.C. elections and to support the repeal of D.C.'s radical law.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today to oppose H.R. 192, yet another attack on home rule in the District of Columbia. I wish we were here today talking about climate change, which is a dagger at the throat of humanity.

We have seen record drought in the Midwest, record forest fires in the West, record flooding in the East, hurricanes of record velocity in the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana's beloved Gulf Coast. There were mosquitoes in the north pole last summer. The sea levels are rising everywhere.

However, we are not here to talk about that emergency.

I do have a book for my friend, Mr. HIGGINS, called "Bayou Farewell" written by one of my constituents about what has been taking place on the Louisiana coast that I am going to offer to him today.

We are not talking about climate change, and we are not talking about gun violence, despite the fact that America now has rates of gun violence and gun-related mortality 20 times higher than the nations of the European Union. Gun violence is now the leading cause of death among children and young people under 18 in America. It is out of control.

However, we are not talking about that.

We are exercising our constitutional authority, as my distinguished colleague from Louisiana says, to oversee the District of Columbia. Here today what has caught our eye is that they have legislation which passed and has become law in the District of Columbia which allows permanent residents and other noncitizens to register to vote.

As a result, they have nearly a half million registered voters in the District of Columbia. Madam Speaker, 512 of them are noncitizens. A little bit more than one-tenth of 1 percent of registered voters are noncitizens.

Their primary election in 2024 has already begun. The D.C. voters received their ballots or began receiving ballots in the mail on April 29, and the District has already begun accepting ballots.

The D.C. Council had transmitted the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 to Congress for the required review period on January 10, 2023.

The House passed a disapproval resolution, as my friend mentioned, on February 9, 2023. The Senate did not pass the disapproval resolution.

The act became law in March of 2023.

What we are talking about now is passing legislation to overturn a practice that is literally taking place as we speak within the District of Columbia.

Now the critical point everybody needs to understand is that the District of Columbia has no voting representation in the House of Representatives, nor does the District of Columbia have any voting representation in the United States Senate. Their legislation doesn't apply even to their non-voting delegate in the House, nor does it apply, of course, to Presidential elections.

What we are talking about is should these 500 or so people in the District of Columbia be allowed to vote for advisory neighborhood commission, school board, and members of the D.C. Council and mayoral elections.

□ 1030

The practice of noncitizen voting, my friend may be interested to learn, is one that actually was adopted in the vast majority of American States at different points in American history, including, I checked, in Louisiana, where it existed for around a decade.

It started, as far as I could tell, with this basic premise, that when the country began, there was a race qualification, a gender qualification, and property, wealth, and religion qualifications in different places, but the basic logic of it was that if you are a White male property owner, it doesn't make any difference what your citizenship status is. That lasted really up until the Civil War.

The practice of alien suffrage at the local level was one that became hotly contested before the Civil War. The Southern States opposed it because they said that the immigrants who were coming in who were being given the right to vote were antislavery, abolitionists. The Northern States, specifically the Republican Party and Abraham Lincoln, defended the practice of noncitizen voting. This was a major bone of contention geographically, sectionally, in the country with legislation like the Kansas-Nebraska Act and other statehood admission struggles.

When the South seceded from the Union and wrote their own constitution, the very first article of the Confederate Constitution banned the practice, which we are discussing in a very modified form today. They banned anybody from voting in the Confederacy

who was not a citizen of the Confederacy. When the Union won the war, and secession was put down, alien suffrage spread across the country.

Again, the Republican Party championed it, and they championed it in the form of something called declarant alien suffrage, which is, for people who were permanent residents of the country who were on the pathway to citizenship, they were given the right to vote, especially in a lot of the Western States, as those States tried to attract population westward.

The practice appears to have been diminished and eliminated in a lot of places around the turn of 20th century and before World War I. It survives today in the form that the District of Columbia has fastened onto it for local voting on the theory that you want people at the local level to be involved in their kids' schools and you want people to be engaged in local government.

We ban noncitizen voting at the Federal level, which means we also ban it at the State level because they are linked constitutionally in Article I. So, what we are talking about is noncitizen voting chosen by a local government at the local level simply for municipal elections.

The basic logic of it there, as I understand it from just trying to read up on what the people in D.C. did, was that they saw that while noncitizens from Canada or Mexico, for example, shouldn't be able to vote in national elections because the interests of the United States and Canada and Mexico may diverge, at the local level, everybody presumably has the same basic interests in efficient garbage collection, excellent public schools, and so on.

That is why they have done it. It affects a relative handful of people. I am not quite certain why we would be engaging in legislative action to overturn it, except for the purposes of sending some kind of message about it.

The gentleman also mentioned diplomatic personnel and undocumented people. As for the diplomatic personnel, a foreign passport may not be used to register to vote in the District of Columbia. The person has to have a residential address in the District of Columbia, and it cannot be an embassy or another diplomatic site because you can't register at your place of work. I don't know whether the gentleman has actually any evidence of this happening. I think, if there were, that would be something we would be interested in.

The same thing with undocumented people. It would, of course, be crazy for an undocumented person to attach their name to a public and transparent document like a voter registration document. I don't know if they have any evidence that this has happened, but we were not able to find any evidence that there were any undocumented people doing so.

In other words, the District's use of this practice for local elections and

local government functions appears to be in accord with the way it has always been used, which is for permanent residents who are part of the community who are on the pathway to citizenship.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, my friend and colleague has mentioned in his opening statement that 500 noncitizens are registered to vote in D.C. My colleague is clever to point this out, but I am quite sure he is also aware that it has been estimated that 50,000 noncitizens are eligible to vote. As the election cycles move forward, they will no doubt consider registering and casting their vote should we not turn this law.

My colleague also mentioned the topic of representation in our Nation's Capital. As a constitutional scholar and professor, he is well aware that our Founders envisioned our Nation's Capital would necessarily develop a robust citizenry and that those residents would enjoy unique access to the Republic's elected and appointed highest officials, equaling a form of representation that no other citizenry in any other city of sovereign States would enjoy.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), the author of this bill that we are considering today.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 192, which would prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia.

I think there has been a lot of talk about our Founding Fathers. I point out that I think one of the things that they envisioned was a healthy, functioning Republic with accountability, with D.C. at the epicenter, and D.C. not being a State but a District because they knew that that would change the dynamics of this place.

I, like many others, think that this Federal District is very special, and it is worth having the accountability, and that accountability is here in the United States Congress. It is Congress through the Constitution that our Founders entrusted the care of D.C., specifically "exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District.

Washington, D.C., is going through a tough time. It has not been going well in the last couple of years. In fact, let me just point out that, in 2023, this was the deadliest year on record in Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, 274 people were killed. Violent crime spiked by nearly 40 percent. There were proceedings that even the Mayor opposed that had to do with violent crime, carjackings, lowering the penalties and thresholds, and making it a little bit easier. It was a strategy of appeasement that even the Mayor opposed.

In this Congress, last year, we acted and did something. What we did was said no, Washington, D.C., is not going

to lower those penalties for things like carjackings.

It was said that we would never get that through the Senate. Guess what? The Senate passed it, and President Biden signed it into law because he said it was ridiculous to reduce accountability measures in the District of Columbia.

So, here we are. In this case, the D.C. City Council has made a very shortsighted decision that I fear could be a harbinger around the country. That decision, I believe, lessens and cheapens citizenship. We see that in other areas, but the D.C. City Council has moved to allow noncitizens, including illegal aliens and foreign agents, to vote in local D.C. elections.

In fact, not only are they allowed to vote, but they are being encouraged. You can look at this flyer right here. This was just sent out by Washington, D.C., to encourage people to vote.

Yes, there may be 500 who are registered—this is a year old—but there are 50,000, according to Washington, D.C., statistics, who are eligible. They are encouraging people to vote for Mayor, for attorney general, for members of the board of education, and more.

Some may argue that, yes, these are just local elections. They are democratic elections that regularly determine taxation, the criminal code that I just referenced, and the election of the very city councilmembers who decide ordinances like who gets to vote, not to mention that many of these are decided by close margins.

I find it inconceivable that the city council and now other city councils around the United States would intentionally dilute the voting power of their constituents for noncitizens who otherwise might not meet the requirements, might not pay taxes, might not be members of the community who want the same things as those who are citizens. Therefore, I believe it is cheapening and lessening citizenship.

As the Capital of our democracy, Washington, D.C., ought to be leading the way, setting the example, not incentivizing the exact practices that our adversaries would relish. Take a look at what happened in San Francisco, where they just swore in somebody who is not a citizen to be an election administrator. The election administrator will administrate elections in that part of California, not just for local and municipal elections but all the elections.

Let's look beyond the Democrats' call for this bill to be deemed discriminatory or false claims about its intended purpose. I am asking my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to look ahead and put citizenship back in its rightful place as the gold standard. Free and fair elections are a prerequisite for a healthy republic. I believe that is what our Founders intended. Noncitizen voting, whether it is one vote or a million votes, dilutes the voting power of the citizen.

Madam Speaker, I believe Congress must act clearly and decisively to bar noncitizens from voting in any election, including Washington, D.C., and I urge my colleagues to support my resolution.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, just a couple of quick points about the distinguished gentleman's remarks.

First after all, what we are talking about is making a Federal decision or a congressional decision for a locality.

The gentleman's native Texas had noncitizen voting from 1869 to 1921. For a half-century, Texas had it. That policy is one that was completely up to them. It was never overruled by the Federal Government.

The gentleman says that foreign agents could vote under this legislation. Of course, foreign agents can vote all across the country today. People who register under the Foreign Agent Registration Act or fail to register under FARA and are convicted for that still have the right to vote. I believe Michael Flynn is still voting despite the fact that he failed to register under FARA. Paul Manafort is still voting. Other people who have been foreign agents don't automatically lose their right to vote because of that.

In the District of Columbia, if somebody wants to register from a foreign country, they effectively have to renounce their right to vote in a foreign country because the District of Columbia says you can't be voting in another country.

Incidentally, that is not the rule all over the world. Under the Maastricht Treaty, Americans who are living in European countries and are effectively domiciled there, which is defined as having physical residence plus the indefinite intention to remain, are given the right to vote in European localities—again, in just European local elections, not in EU elections or national elections. If you are an American living in Barcelona or Spain indefinitely, you get to vote in local elections there. They have adopted basically the same logic that the people in D.C. adopted, which is that they want people who are living there indefinitely to be engaged in local government.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

□ 1045

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I strongly oppose this undemocratic, paternalistic bill.

This Congress, Republicans have introduced 22 bills to overturn the District of Columbia's election laws, yet Republicans have refused to make the one and only change to D.C. election laws that D.C. residents have requested, which is to be given voting representation in the House and Senate.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the D.C. Council Chairman Phil Mendelson and D.C. At-

torney General Brian Schwalb opposing H.R. 192.

MAY 22, 2024.

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

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

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: We write today as two of the District's top elected local officials to express our opposition to H.R. 192, which will overturn the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 (Act). At its core, H.R. 192 is undemocratic. The District of Columbia should be allowed to govern itself without interference from Congress. District residents pay more federal taxes per capita than any state, serve in the military, and contribute to the national welfare just the same as people everywhere else. Yet, over the past two years, our residents have repeatedly suffered the indignity of having politicians elected elsewhere—politicians who aren't accountable to District residents attempt to usurp the authority of our elected officials.

Reasonable people can disagree about the merits of the Act. But the District's democratically elected Council voted on it and approved it. Regardless of our own views on the Act, we stand united in our belief that Washingtonians should enjoy the same right to self-determination and self-governance as people in every other state. That includes the right to determine who should participate in purely local—not federal—elections. H.R. 192 would deny District residents this fundamental right.

H.R. 192 is ill-conceived for another reason: if passed, it could sow chaos and confusion in the District's elections this year. In fact, early and mail-in voting is already underway for the District's primary election.

Congress already attempted to overturn the Act, introducing no fewer than four resolutions to repudiate the will of District voters. Each time, the resolutions have failed. We urge Congress to once again rebuff this undemocratic attack on District residents, affirm our right to self-governance, and reject H.R. 192.

Sincerely,

BRIAN L. SCHWALB,
Attorney General for
the District of Columbia.

PHIL MENDELSON,
Chairman, Council of
the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, before I discuss the substance of H.R. 192, I will discuss democracy and the lack of it in D.C. The nearly 700,000 District residents have no voting representation in Congress, and Congress has the ultimate say, even on local D.C. matters.

My Republican colleagues are correct that Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, but the majority is wrong that Congress has a constitutional duty to do so. Instead, legislating on local D.C. matters is a choice.

In Federalist No. 43, James Madison said of the residents of the future D.C.: "As a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them. . . ."

The Supreme Court held in 1953 that: ". . . there is no constitutional barrier

to the delegation by Congress to the District of Columbia of full legislative power."

D.C.'s local legislature, the Council, has 13 members. The members are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, they can vote them out of office. That is called democracy.

Congress has 535 Members. The Members are elected by residents of their States. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the Members vote on local D.C. matters, they cannot vote them out of office. That is the antithesis of democracy.

The merits of H.R. 192 should be irrelevant since there is never justification for Congress legislating on local D.C. matters. However, I will discuss H.R. 192.

D.C.'s Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022, allows D.C. residents who are noncitizens to vote only in local D.C. elections.

D.C.'s law is not unique. More than a dozen cities today allow noncitizens to vote in local elections. While the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act applies only to local D.C. elections, there is a long history in the United States, including before its founding, of allowing noncitizens to vote in State, local, territorial, and Federal elections. At various points, 40 States have allowed noncitizens to vote, including Texas, the home of the sponsor of H.R. 192.

Congress only first prohibited noncitizens from voting in Federal elections in 1996. The House passed the disapproval resolution on the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act in February 2023. The Senate did not vote on the disapproval resolution, and the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act became law in March 2023.

Voting, including by noncitizens, started earlier this month in D.C. primary elections. Why did Republicans wait to bring H.R. 192 to the floor until voting had already started? The majority did so to disrupt the elections.

The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation. Yet D.C. residents cannot consent to any action taken by Congress, and they pay full Federal taxes while being denied voting representation in Congress. Indeed, D.C. pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State and more total Federal taxes than 20 States.

If House Republicans cared about elections or D.C. residents, Republicans would bring to the floor the D.C. statehood bill, H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. The act would give D.C. residents voting representation in Congress and full local self-government. Congress has the constitutional

authority to admit the State of Washington, D.C. It simply lacks the will. D.C. residents, a majority of whom are Black and Brown, are worthy and capable of self-government.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to vote “no” on H.R. 192.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I have not heard my Democratic colleagues address the fact that even one noncitizen’s vote will, in fact, dilute the votes of American citizens.

The gentlewoman mentioned Republicans’ efforts to disrupt D.C. elections. Quite to the contrary, Madam Speaker. We seek to restore the integrity of D.C. elections. We stood in support of an American’s right to have their vote fully counted, including, most certainly, in our Nation’s Capital. When there are 50,000 potential noncitizen voters in the Nation’s Capital poised to cast a vote, that is the disruption of the D.C. voting process for the American citizens of D.C., whom we do indeed care for, love, and hope to represent.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) to speak on this bill.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, in America, the citizens are the sovereign, and we govern through the votes we cast. Allowing foreign nationals to cancel out the votes of American citizens makes a mockery of our democracy, and it robs Americans of our sovereign right to direct our own government and decide our own destiny.

The fact that Democrats enacted such a law into the Capital City of our Nation and in other jurisdictions across the country and defend it today on this floor speaks volumes of how far that party has drifted to the left and what a grave threat their policies now pose to the most fundamental institutions and rights that we cherish as Americans. Only the American people can change that, and only if the sanctity of our elections can be protected.

One more point: Washington, D.C., is unlike any other town or community in our Nation. Washington, D.C., belongs to the American people, who retain through their Constitution the exclusive right to govern it through their elected Representatives. This outrageous law is the strongest argument yet for Congress to take back America’s Capital City for America and to take back America from the radical left.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I quote Justice Scalia on what the very distinguished gentleman from California just described as a radical practice: In general, noncitizen voting “has been open, widespread, and unchallenged since the early days of the Republic.”

What my Republican colleagues would like to portray as some kind of outlandish practice is one that has been used at various points in our history by a majority of the States, certainly at the local level. It was the Republican Party, again, I reemphasize,

which was the great champion of non-citizen voting and stood up for it against the States that ended up seceding from the Union in the Civil War.

We were debating the very point that the gentleman fastened upon when we talked about the Census. The Supreme Court has been emphatic repeatedly that the Census counts everyone in America, citizens and noncitizens alike.

Now, we know Republicans don’t like that. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been trying to get around it in a dozen different ways, but the Supreme Court has been perfectly clear that everyone is counted in the Census, even if they don’t have the right to vote and even if they are not a citizen.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ).

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding. I couldn’t agree more with the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 192. This is another condescending Republican attempt to do three really specific things: Meddle in local D.C. elections; disfranchise Black and Brown voters who are fully capable of governing themselves, by the way; and eroding the trust of Americans in our Federal elections.

In the 118th Congress alone, Republicans have introduced 17 bills to overturn D.C.’s election laws, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have refused to do the one thing that the residents of D.C. have asked for, and that is equal representation through statehood.

In the Republican tradition of undermining elections, the majority is pushing this bill while the primary elections in D.C. are underway.

Let’s be clear: It is all intentional to stoke fear among voters and raise false alarms around the integrity of D.C.’s voting process. H.R. 192 is another sorry Republican effort to continue to carry on this baseless MAGA narrative about noncitizens affecting the outcomes of Federal elections.

Let’s put this into context. A 2016 study of our Federal elections found only 0.001 percent of votes cast were cases of suspected, not proven, noncitizen voting. Even the former President’s appointed commission to investigate his claims of voter fraud by noncitizens was disbanded without identifying one single case.

In the meantime, a third of working-age Americans are living through crushing medical debt, families are spending up to 75 percent of their income on rent and utilities, and scientists agree that the climate crisis may cost 14.5 million deaths by 2050. Yet, here we are again.

Madam Speaker, we need to stop entertaining legislation based on Republican lies. There are real problems that need to be addressed and comprehensive solutions.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana has 17½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Maryland has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW), my colleague.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, in what other country than Joe Biden’s America can illegal immigrants waltz over an unsecure border?

In what other country can an illegal immigrant get immediate housing, free food, legal counseling, and free educational subsidies?

In what other country can illegal immigrants get free flights and bus rides and transportation to the city or the town of their choosing?

There is none that I know of. There is none that most Americans would know of. No country in the world would be stupid enough to allow so many unknown people, with unknown desires, with unknown intentions, to cross their border.

Why is our country the only one dumb enough to offer incentive after incentive to the millions of illegal immigrants pouring over our border every single year? To truly understand what is happening here, we have to see the big picture, and then we will realize the border policy that we have now isn’t about bad policy or dumb policy. In fact, the policy is working exactly as the orchestrators want it to work.

The left knows they can flood this country with millions of people. If the left can promise those millions of people that the Democrats are the party that will feed them, will house them, will transport them, will educate them for free on the American taxpayer’s back and that Republicans will take that away, then the Democrats can use the millions of illegal immigrants as political pawns to increase their power.

It is shameless. It is wrong. It is un-American. For years, conservatives have warned about this. We have warned about the left attempting to allow illegals to vote in elections, but it was made fun of. It was a joke. It would never happen. It was labeled, in fact, as a conspiracy theory. Yet, here we are. Here we are today. D.C., our Nation’s own Capital, allowing illegal immigrants to vote in its local elections.

□ 1100

Yesterday’s conspiracy, yesterday’s conspiracy is today’s reality.

I strongly support H.R. 192 to prohibit noncitizens from voting in elections here in D.C. This is a dangerous and bad precedent and an un-American attempt at gaining power, and it needs to be stopped here and it needs to be stopped now. We have to stand up.

If we allow illegal immigrants to vote in elections now, Madam Speaker,

how long is it going to be before we are back on this floor attempting to stop a State from allowing illegal immigrants to vote in our Federal elections? American elections should be voted on by American citizens.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, H.R. 192, quite simply, prohibits noncitizens from voting in D.C. local elections and repeals the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act. This is common sense.

Congress has a constitutional duty to oversee our Nation's Capital and H.R. 192 represents the exact role Congress should take in regard to the matters of the District's governance.

Under the United States Constitution, Congress is granted exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever regarding our Nation's Capital. We recognize, as my colleagues have stated, the jurisdictional authority within the municipality and the local elected officials of our Nation's Capital, but when those local elected officials take actions which are injurious to the operations of our Nation's Capital, then we have constitutional authority and, indeed, duty to respond. Hence, why in February of last year, 260 Members of this House voted to overturn the D.C. act in question as being repealed through this bill and in that vote, 42 House Democrats did, indeed, vote to overturn that D.C. law.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman from New Jersey has left the Chamber because I could reassure and console him very quickly. It is against the law for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections. That is embodied in Federal statute, and it is a crime for someone to attempt to do that. That is not what is on the table here today.

What is on the table is whether a locality, in this case, the District of Columbia, should be permitted to allow noncitizens to participate in local elections for things like school board and city council and advisory neighborhood commissions.

The gentleman from New Jersey should be apprised at some point that the great State of New Jersey allowed noncitizen voting between 1776 when the country began and 1820. For a half century, it was allowed in his State and obviously did not lead to the downfall of the Republic.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Oversight Committee for yielding. I also thank my colleague, the Representative from Washington, D.C., who tragically and outrageously does not have full voting rights here in this Chamber, but whose arguments and points are very well received.

Madam Speaker, I am rising in stark opposition to H.R. 192, another unbelievable attempt by my colleagues on

the other side of the aisle to legislate specifically on the District of Columbia. We are individual Representatives duly elected by our constituents to legislate for this country and our constituents have representation, and yet the District of Columbia, who we are obsessively seeing our colleagues try and legislate on, does not have representation.

Why not look at the host of issues this country is facing? We only have so much time in this body. We are almost to the halfway point left of this term. We could be working on paid leave, decreasing maternal mortality, fully funding special education, the climate crisis, a national gun violence epidemic, women's rights, real voting rights for this country.

Give me a break. This is how we are choosing to use our time, a fifth effort to legislate specifically to the Nation's Capital, the only capital of a country that does not have full voting rights in a Federal Chamber?

This is outrageous, and it is anti-democratic. Frankly, what this also is, as we have seen this playbook before and the ranking member knows this, this is another attempt to fearmonger around national elections that are coming, that supposedly those who are voting shouldn't. We need more people to be voting.

Madam Speaker, I fiercely oppose this legislation.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her trenchant remarks. She makes an excellent point. Washington, D.C., is the only National Capital on the planet Earth disenfranchised in its own legislature, which is the vulnerability that is being exploited today by our colleagues.

Can you imagine if they told the people of Paris that they could not be represented in L'Assemblée nationale simply because they breathed the same air as representatives coming from other parts of France? You would have another French Revolution on your hands.

I will thank the people of Washington that Ms. NORTON represents, who have a valid bona fide political grievance and yet did not come down here and beat the daylights out of our police officers, wounding and brutalizing and hospitalizing nearly 150 of them.

They have gone about it the right way. They have petitioned for statehood, and they are trying to defend their rights to govern themselves.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, my distinguished colleague has mentioned that it is already against the law for an illegal to cast a vote.

We understand this, but surely the gentleman knows that corruption is

borne in the heart of man, not the mechanisms of man.

We have a duty and a responsibility as Members of this Congress to oversee the actions of the Nation's Capital City and it is our duty to mitigate against the violation of law.

We recognize that it is against the law for an illegal to cast a vote in a Federal election. We know this, but we also know that burglary is against the law, yet we have fences and gates and doors and locks. We mitigate against the actions of man, though, we know that some of those actions may be, indeed, against the law.

The existence of the statute itself does not overcome the corruption born in the heart of man. We have an obligation as a body to exercise our constitutional jurisdictional authority in the one municipality in the entire country that falls under that constitutional jurisdictional authority; that is, our Nation's Capital as the city whose laws we address today.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I will clearly communicate to the folks at home what it is that we are doing here. What we are doing is, we are talking about passing a law that prohibits citizens of foreign countries from voting in elections in D.C.

It prohibits people that are here illegally from voting in elections. It prohibits spies from China from voting in elections. It prohibits people who are here from Russia that have wishes of ill will on the United States from voting in the elections in D.C.

Now, I have heard my friends on the other side say that this would disenfranchise voters in Washington.

Let's think through that for just a minute. If you are allowing people that are not citizens of Washington, that are not citizens of the United States to vote here, you are diluting the vote of the people that are citizens of this city. You are diluting it. Which policy disenfranchises? It is absurd to hear people make these allegations.

Now, let's talk about some of the people that largely agree with what we are saying. The mayor didn't sign this. Even the Mayor of Washington, D.C., didn't sign this because she knows that this is outrageous. The Washington Post, that I wouldn't argue is a bastion of conservative thought, even said that "voting is a foundational right of citizenship."

Madam Speaker, I have heard my friends on the other side argue or allege that we are meddling. We are meddling.

Madam Speaker, there is this pesky little document that we take an oath to called the Constitution and, of course, I say that in jest. In the Constitution, it says: Congress is granted exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over Washington. We are doing exactly what we took an oath to do.

Let's summarize. If you want Chinese spies, if you want people who are here

illegally that also can vote in their actual home country, then you would vote “no.” You would say no, we want the status quo. We want spies to vote. We want Russian Embassy employees to vote. We want people who are here illegally to vote. That is fine. You vote “no.” However, if you think that D.C. residents, that their vote should actually count for local elections, then you vote “yes.”

Now, my friends are going to say: What about voting in Federal elections? I am sorry for anybody who moved here and found out by surprise that that is not how it works because this was established originally as a Federal District distinguishing it from the States.

I am sorry if folks just woke up and realized that, or maybe after they bought their house.

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, it is unbelievable that we are even here having to debate this, once again, about whether it is appropriate for people who are citizens of foreign countries, people who are here illegally, people who can vote for Vladimir Putin would also get to vote for the Mayor of D.C.

It is unbelievable that people in this body who represent hundreds of thousands of citizens of this country believe that that is the appropriate path.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA).

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member RASKIN for the time.

Madam Speaker, this is an incredible debate we have here. Of course, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 192. It is interesting that the majority keeps talking about fair elections, ensuring that elections are done the right way, when 147 of them wouldn't even vote to certify the last Presidential election that we had here in this country. A majority of the Republican Party won't even admit or certify the last election on who actually won the last Presidential election, yet you want to talk about an attack on local neighborhood councils here in Washington, D.C., and local elections.

It is hypocrisy what we are seeing here today in this debate.

This is nothing more than the majority's attempt to attack D.C. over and over again. They want to talk about Chinese spies voting in elections. The only Chinese spies that are here in D.C. are the ones being invited by the majority to come testify at our Oversight Committee hearing to actually attack the current President of the United States. This is a ridiculous debate we are having here by the majority.

Now it sounds also that the majority is obsessed, as they always are, with

the local laws of D.C., and as I said before, if they are so interested in local government, they should resign from Congress and run for the local city council or mayor.

It is a great job. I was mayor of my community. I was on the local city council. That is what they seem to be most interested in doing.

Instead of wasting our time here, we should be focused on the real issues that Americans are facing. That is why today I will make a motion to recommit this bill back to committee and instead call up H.R. 16, the American Dream and Promise Act.

Dreamers have come to our country as children. They know no other country or have no other allegiance than to the United States, and we all know that this is true.

□ 1115

The American Dream and Promise Act is a landmark, bipartisan piece of legislation that would give these children and young adults a pathway to lawful, permanent residency. This is actually a transformational law that could impact our country. It would change the lives of nearly 2.3 million people in all 50 States.

Madam Speaker, I thank the countless Members who have worked to pass the Dream Act, including this year's sponsor, Congresswoman SYLVIA GARCIA, and advocates and community members.

Dreamers are our friends, family members, classmates, and coworkers. They are estimated to contribute about \$45 billion a year to the American economy and \$13 billion in taxes every single year. The data is clear: Dreamers, like all immigrants, make our country stronger.

I offer this amendment today to get this back on track and get this legislation through. Let's let the Dream Act come to the floor today and vote to protect these 2.3 million people.

For me, this is personal. As an immigrant myself, and as someone who has lived with immigrants, I know how important the Dream Act is to our country and to so many.

Instead of wasting our time on this bill, we should be focused on actually helping people in this country who are making our country better every single day. Today, Republicans and Democrats once again have the chance to work across the aisle to protect millions of people who have put down roots and invested in our country and our economy. It is the right thing to do.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, today, I hope my col-

leagues will join me in voting for this motion.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), the author of the bill.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I thank all those who have risen in support of this. Let's just think about it in simple terms.

If we go back to our constituents and tell them that Washington, D.C., is allowing noncitizens to vote in local elections, they can't believe it. It has been said by several colleagues on the other side of the aisle that multiple States allowed noncitizens to vote. In the case of Texas, that was literally over 100 years ago, and we figured out it was not a good idea.

It is absolutely ridiculous that this is even a thought. I said it a little bit ago, but Washington, D.C., is not exactly having an easy time with accountability. When you look at the crime rates, violent crime is spiking by 40 percent, and 2023 was the deadliest year on record here, with 274 people killed. Look at what Congress had to do, what President Biden signed into law, to maintain the penalties on violent offenders, specifically in carjackings, because the city council in Washington, D.C., decided to lessen those penalties. This Congress voted on that last year, and the President signed it into law. That is the kind of accountability that Americans are wanting. They want that accountability.

To think that Americans are in favor of having noncitizens vote in Washington, D.C., is ludicrous. That is why this legislation is so important. Washington, D.C., should be the standard. It should be the standard. It is a unique case. It is a unique case in our country because it is not a State.

Congress has jurisdiction constitutionally authorized to us, and we are acting because the city council overstepped. They have done something that even the Mayor is not in favor of.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation to put citizenship on the pedestal that it deserves and to stop lessening and cheapening citizenship in this country. I urge support of H.R. 192.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Louisiana for a very substantive and dignified debate on this subject, which I know attracts strong views across the aisle.

I want to restate some essential points for people to keep in mind. One is that what we are talking about is local elections in the District of Columbia, so the question is who will get to vote for the school board members and the councilmembers and who will

get to vote for the neighborhood advisory commissioners. That is an institution that I think is unique to the District of Columbia, where neighborhoods have elected representatives who get to weigh in on things like the times that bars close, restaurant licenses, and stuff like that. That is really what we are talking about here.

The people in D.C. have only one non-voting Delegate for the District of Columbia, no voting representation here, no voting representation in the Senate, so the noncitizens, the 500 or so who are registered today, can't even vote for ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. It goes to the question of local elections.

I am certain that most Members of Congress and most Americans certainly didn't expect that the House of Representatives would be spending so much time debating this relatively minute matter and, I daresay, trivial matter in the context of all the national emergencies and crises we are facing today, but it does seem to be part of an election year assault on the District of Columbia.

It is a lot easier to kick D.C. around a little bit than to solve the gun crisis, which has gotten to the point where gun violence is now the leading cause of death in America for young people under the age of 18. It is a lot easier to kick D.C. around a little bit than to confront the climate crisis, which is bearing down on all of us across the country.

The gentleman has made one very powerful point, which is, constitutionally, we have the authority to do this because the people in D.C. are still under the authority of Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17. That is why they want out. They want us to use our power over the District in all cases whatsoever to modify the boundaries of the District of Columbia and to yield the residential areas to the creation of a new State.

The power of Congress to do that was established in 1846 when Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax County were retroceded to Virginia. We have the power to redraw it. We can redraw it, and D.C. would actually be larger populationwise than two other States in the Union.

They want to exist on a plane of political equality. They want to be able to have the right to go through the same political experience the gentleman talked about in Texas. At one point, they wanted to grant noncitizens the right to vote in local elections. At another point, they didn't. That is all they are asking for, the right to make their own decisions for themselves.

I daresay, no matter how benevolently motivated the gentleman from Louisiana is, or I am as a Representative from Maryland, no one is more interested in the welfare of the people in the District of Columbia than the people who actually live there.

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I express my sincere gratitude to my friend and colleague, Representative RASKIN, for conducting this debate in a vigorous yet respectful manner. I am certain that he will agree that this is the manner in which our Founders envisioned we may debate.

The subject of congressional interaction, exercising constitutional authority within the parameters of our Nation's Capital municipality, is a legitimate discussion. It is part of our Nation's narrative and broad debate, and this is the body, Madam Speaker, wherein such debate should take place. I am hopeful that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle may engage in this as we move forward in the spirit with which we have discussed and debated today.

Madam Speaker, D.C.'s noncitizen voting law does, indeed, disenfranchise American citizens. It is a dangerous policy that undermines the ability of the citizens of D.C. to have a free and fair election. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to prohibit those who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1243, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Robert Garcia of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 192 to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

The material previously referred to by Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California is as follows:

Mr. Robert Garcia of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 192 to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Strike section 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "American Dream and Promise Act of 2023".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—DREAM ACT OF 2023

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Permanent resident status on a conditional basis for certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children.

Sec. 103. Terms of permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

Sec. 104. Removal of conditional basis of permanent resident status.

Sec. 105. Restoration of State option to determine residency for purposes of higher education benefits.

TITLE II—AMERICAN PROMISE ACT OF 2023

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Adjustment of status for certain nationals of certain countries designated for temporary protected status or deferred enforced departure.

Sec. 203. Clarification.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Definitions.

Sec. 302. Submission of biometric and biographic data; background checks.

Sec. 303. Limitation on removal; application and fee exemption; and other conditions on eligible individuals.

Sec. 304. Determination of continuous presence and residence.

Sec. 305. Exemption from numerical limitations.

Sec. 306. Availability of administrative and judicial review.

Sec. 307. Documentation requirements.

Sec. 308. Rulemaking.

Sec. 309. Confidentiality of information.

Sec. 310. Grant program to assist eligible applicants.

Sec. 311. Provisions affecting eligibility for adjustment of status.

Sec. 312. Supplementary surcharge for appointed counsel.

Sec. 313. Annual report on provisional denial authority.

(For full text, please see H.R. 16.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CBDC ANTI-SURVEILLANCE STATE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 5403.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SELF). Pursuant to House Resolution 1243 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5403.

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

□ 1129

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5403) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit the Federal reserve banks from offering certain products or services directly to an individual, to prohibit the use of central bank digital currency for monetary policy, and for other purposes, with Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in section 2 of House Resolution 1243 and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

□ 1130

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

Today we are considering Majority Whip TOM EMMER's H.R. 5403, the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act. This bill is straightforward. It halts unelected bureaucrats from issuing a central bank digital currency, or CBDC.

We believe that a central bank digital currency would be detrimental to Americans' rights to financial privacy.

We have previously seen examples of governments around the world weaponizing the financial system against their own citizens.

For example, the Chinese Communist Party used a central bank digital currency to track spending habits of its citizens.

This data is being used to create a social credit system that rewards or punishes people based on their behavior.

This type of financial surveillance has no place in the United States. After all, we have the Bill of Rights, and they do not.

Concerningly, it appears that the current administration does not agree that financial surveillance has no place in the United States.

In 2022, the White House issued an executive order pushing for CBDC research and development. The corresponding report and the data related to the executive order the President issued does nothing to ease the concerns about financial snooping on citizens.

This is why the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act is necessary. The bill requires authorizing legislation from

Congress for the issuance of any central bank digital currency, ensuring that it must reflect American values and civil liberties protections.

If not open, permissionless, and private, a central bank digital currency is no more than a CCP-style surveillance tool waiting to be weaponized.

I thank my friend, Whip Emmer, for his work on spearheading this legislation, along with Representatives HILL and MOONEY for their leadership on this issue. I also thank Representative DAVIDSON for his commitment to financial privacy in a larger context.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5403, which would not only prohibit the issuance of a central bank digital currency, or CBDC, but would go so far as to prohibit the Federal Reserve from holding bank reserves that are critical to operating payment systems and combating inflation.

Let me start with the harmful implications of the bill's prohibitions on the issuance of a CBDC.

A CBDC is a type of digital asset issued by a country's central bank, which in the United States is the Federal Reserve.

Compared to other digital assets, CBDCs have a greater potential to maintain a stable value, garner public trust, and become a viable means of payment transactions.

There are two main types of CBDCs, retail CBDCs that consumers could get from the Fed or a financial institution to pay for everyday things like a cup of coffee, and wholesale CBDCs that would not be used by individual consumers and instead only used for transactions among financial institutions and the Fed.

CBDCs are no longer a remote, futuristic possibility. Madam Chair, 134 countries and currency unions around the world, representing 98 percent of global GDP, are currently exploring or implementing a CBDC.

Some have referred to the development of a CBDC as the next space race, but the United States is way behind the curve.

What is more, there is growing concern that China, which has already issued its own CBDC that has been used by hundreds of millions of people, will be able to significantly influence the rest of the world's CBDC development because the U.S. is so far behind.

This is especially problematic, given the Chinese CBDC has government surveillance baked in while a United States CBDC could be designed to protect consumer privacy and other deeply held American values.

This bill exacerbates these concerns by proposing to make the United States the first and only country in the world to ban a CBDC.

By allowing other countries, especially China, to race ahead of us, H.R.

5403 directly threatens the primacy of the United States dollar.

Today, more than half of all international trade and more than 90 percent of all foreign exchange transactions are done in dollars. The dollar's dominance provides significant benefits to the United States, like lower borrowing costs for consumers, lower capital costs for United States businesses, and the ability to better implement U.S. foreign policy goals.

In fact, the dollar's widespread use is what makes our sanctions so powerful, allowing us to block adversaries like Russia and Iran from doing business not just with the United States but with anyone who uses the dollar.

That is why countries, including China and Russia, are trying to establish an alternative to the dollar, including developing alternative digital currencies so they can more effectively evade United States sanctions.

CBDCs also have the potential to offer benefits compared to United States dollars like faster and cheaper transactions.

If the United States sits on the sidelines as other major economies move forward with CBDC development, another digital currency like the digital euro could very well become the world's preferred currency for international trade.

If this weren't bad enough, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, has pointed out that the ban on CBDCs in this bill can be interpreted to encompass the Federal Reserve's bank reserves.

These reserves are instrumental to several core functions of the Fed, including their ability to conduct monetary policy.

This means that H.R. 5403 would undermine the Federal Reserve's set of tools needed to ensure our economy does not enter a recession as inflation comes down.

It also means that the bill could disrupt our banking system by preventing the Fed from using payment systems like Fedwire to quickly move funds between financial institutions.

While some may think that this is merely a drafting error, it appears to be deliberate. During the markup of their bill, Democrats pointed out on the record how this overly broad definition of CBDC could harm the Fed's broader ability to conduct monetary policy.

Despite having every opportunity to fix the bill before it was considered here today, Republicans have kept the language the same.

Let's not forget that Donald Trump has made clear his intention to undermine the Fed with repeated threats to fire the Fed Chair when he was in office, and more recently, with reports that he would want to set interest rates from the Oval Office.

Furthermore, Project 2025, which is an extreme MAGA transition playbook for a Trump administration, would abolish the Fed. House Republicans

have already introduced a bill to do just that.

I urge Members to see this bill for what it is. It is not about protecting consumer privacy. After all, our current financial system has a number of data privacy shortcomings that this bill would do nothing to address.

Moreover, there is nothing inherent about a CBDC that would compromise privacy. That is a design feature that is within our control.

This bill is, instead, an attempt to stifle U.S. innovation and competitiveness abroad and to undermine the Federal agency that is the most critical to fighting inflation. Unbelievable.

I urge Members to vote “no” on this bill. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), the majority whip, a great leader in the Financial Services Committee and an original actor in the space of cryptocurrency.

Mr. EMMER. Madam Chair, these last 2 weeks have been historic for financial innovation in Congress. Adoption of SAB 121, the resolution by both Chambers, and bipartisan passage of the Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act just yesterday, shows that digital asset policy is no longer a back-burner issue in Congress. It is now front and center, and we are just getting started.

The policies we have recently debated and adopted are in response to an administration that has failed to provide the clarity and guidance the budding digital asset industry in the United States has been begging for.

Because of their failures, Congress has voted to reverse incoherent regulation and establish new standards that will allow our economy to move deeper into the 21st century economy.

Today, we continue these efforts to once again do what this administration has failed to do, and I am proud to have my legislation, the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act, on the floor for a vote.

This bill was the first anti-central bank digital currency legislative effort introduced in the United States, and for the past two Congresses, I have worked with my colleagues to update, improve, and grow support for it.

The bill is simple. It halts the efforts of this administrative state under President Biden from issuing a financial surveillance tool that, if not done correctly, will fundamentally alter the lives of every American.

Unlike decentralized cryptocurrencies, a CBDC is a digital form of sovereign currency that is designed, issued, and monitored by the Federal Government.

It is government controlled, programmable money that, if it is not designed to emulate cash, could give the Federal Government the ability to surveil and restrict Americans' transactions and monitor every aspect of their daily lives.

This is not hyperbole. We have already seen examples of governments

developing these types of tools and using them to weaponize their financial systems against their citizens.

In China, the Communist Party employs a CBDC that can be used to monitor citizens' spending habits. Closer to home in the Western Hemisphere, the Canadian Government demonstrated the power of Federal financial surveillance and control when it froze the bank accounts of hundreds of truckers protesting the COVID vaccine mandate in 2022.

It is naive to believe that your government won't weaponize the tools it has to control you, so it shouldn't come as any surprise that the appetite for financial surveillance can be an attractive proposition right here at home.

□ 1145

In 2023, the White House issued an executive order placing an “urgency” on CBDC research and development, and the agency reports to that executive order have made it clear that the Biden administration is not only itching to create a CBDC, but they are interested in developing and deploying one, potentially undermining the privacy rights of every one of our citizens. Congress can't allow this to happen.

My bill ensures the United States digital currency policy remains in the hands of the American people, not the administrative state, so that any development of digital money will reflect our American values of privacy, individual sovereignty, and free market competitiveness.

This legislation affirms that if the Federal Government seeks to create a digital version of the U.S. dollar, they can only do that with the explicit authorization of Congress. It doesn't stop them. They can do that, but they have got to get authorization from Congress, and they have got to make it open, permissionless, and private. Whatever is ultimately developed must emulate the core tenets of cash.

Simply put: any digital currency issued by the government, again, must be open, permissionless, and private. It cannot be used in the way the Chinese have deployed their digital yuan to build social credit scores on their citizens based on their purchases and their behavior. These types of tools cannot exist in a free society like ours, and we should only accept a digital currency that is consistent with our values, American values.

This is what the future global digital economy needs. If not open, permissionless, and private, like cash, a CBDC is nothing more than a CCP-style surveillance tool that will ultimately be used to oppress our American way of life.

If China embraces it, you know it is something worth standing against.

We can and will continue to launch our economy deeper into the digital age without jeopardizing who we are as Americans, and this bill is designed to ensure that that happens.

I thank the 165 Members of Congress who have joined as cosponsors of my legislation, in addition to Chairman MCHENRY, Chairman HILL, Chairman DAVIDSON, and the many others on both sides of the political aisle who have worked tirelessly with me and my team to make sure we keep the United States the beacon of innovation and global economic strength without undermining what makes our Nation so special.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Digital Assets, Financial Technology and Inclusion.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Digital Assets, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5403, the so-called CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act.

At the expense of U.S. global economic leadership, this misguided legislation would effectively prevent the Federal Reserve from researching or issuing a central bank digital currency, also known as a CBDC.

Unfortunately, the facts surrounding the development of a central bank digital currency have been obscured by disinformation and infected by wrong-headed political ideology. Earlier this year, former President Trump vowed to protect Americans from tyranny and never allow the creation of a central bank digital currency.

God help us.

In Congress, Members of the House and Senate have also followed suit, introducing bill after bill to block the development and even the examination of a central bank digital currency based on unfounded claims that it violates user privacy and will be used as a surveillance tool by the Federal Government.

The gentleman is correct when he says that China has developed a CBDC and conducts full-spectrum surveillance of their population. That is what they do. China is China. There is no Bill of Rights. There is no U.S.-like constitution that prohibits their government from doing that. They live in a communist regime. They don't have individual rights.

That is not the case here in the United States. We have the ability to require any architecture that was developed for a central bank digital currency to preserve the individual rights of citizens in this country. This is like saying somebody used a car to rob a bank, so we are just going to ban cars because we don't want them to be used in that fashion.

This is a technology. There is an architecture that underlies every CBDC. China does use their CBDC to conduct that surveillance, but we don't want that to be the dominant model. We

would like to have the Federal Reserve have the ability to develop a CBDC that actually protects the privacy of American citizens.

In my own congressional district, the Boston Federal Reserve recently partnered with the Digital Currency Initiative at MIT on Project Hamilton, an initiative to build a potential CBDC whose architecture maximizes privacy, cybersecurity, and infrastructure resilience. According to researchers, CBDC architecture can serve as a rigorous privacy-preserving tool.

I have also introduced legislation called the ECASH Act which would require the incorporation of the same security features associated with physical cash, which today is anonymous, into the development of a digital dollar. That would also be the goal of a CBDC.

Currently, there are more than 130 countries, representing 98 percent of the global GDP, who are exploring the implementation or going forward with the implementation of a central bank digital currency. There is a widening gap between the U.S. and its G7 peers, all of whom have stronger privacy laws and personal data laws than the United States and who are far more advanced in this development of a CBDC.

This bill would halt research in the U.S., but offshore researchers would continue to draw the talent necessary to develop a CBDC to our detriment and I think to the detriment of the primacy of the U.S. dollar.

My Republican colleagues often argue that the U.S. cannot afford to fall behind in digital currency, but they insist on the U.S. shutting down a central bank digital currency before we even begin to explore or to research. The best researchers will move to other countries to conduct that research.

Even if we did not want to deploy a central bank digital currency, we should want to know what the other 130 countries that are deploying central bank digital currencies are doing. We should yearn to understand it. We should be exploring the potential of a digital dollar to serve as an alternative to existing forms of payment and have benefits including instant payment settlement, provide a medium for cross-border transactions, and for greater financial inclusion.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this wrongheaded bill.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Digital Assets, Financial Technology and Inclusion, who had a great victory yesterday with 71 Democrats voting for his bill.

Mr. HILL. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Central Bank Anti-Surveillance State Act.

The Constitution and the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 create the foundation of our money and our economic policy in this country. Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution states that only Con-

gress has the authority to coin money and regulate the value of such money.

Today, Congress is exercising its Article I authority to state clearly that the Federal Reserve does not have the authority to create a central bank digital currency.

This shouldn't be controversial. It shouldn't be partisan. We know that is the case. We will see how the vote falls today, Madam Chair, but this legislation is necessary, as you have heard this morning, because we live in a world where government can abuse the tools that they have.

As noted by the whip, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau was freezing bank accounts of people protesting COVID-19 restrictions in his country. We read reports from the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government of how FinCEN, a bureau of the Treasury Department, pressured banks to screen private transactions of their customers for words like "MAGA" or "Trump" on behalf of Federal law enforcement.

Is that really the country we want to live in? They even tracked people, according to that subcommittee, if you shopped at Bass Pro Shops. I shop at Bass Pro Shops all the time in my district.

This kind of Big Brother-style surveillance of our financial lives by the government is alarming to Americans because it represents the political targeting of citizens in this country.

We don't need a retail central bank digital currency. We have a payment system that can capitalize on the private sector. For example, private sector payment stablecoins are a terrific innovation that will become a ubiquitous way for people to transact and expand and enhance the dollar dominance of our currency around the world.

Madam Chair, a vote for this bill is to vote to safeguard our freedom, protect our privacy, and preserve the integrity of our financial system.

I urge a "yes" vote.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am surprised by my friend Representative FRENCH HILL. Representatives FRENCH HILL and BILL FOSTER sent Fed Chair Jay Powell a letter on CBDCs stating:

The Federal Reserve, as the central bank of the United States, has the ability and the natural role to develop a national digital currency.

With the potential for digital currencies to further take on the characteristics and utility of paper money, it may become increasingly imperative that the Federal Reserve take up the project of developing a U.S. dollar digital currency.

We are concerned that the primacy of the U.S. dollar could be in long-term jeopardy from wide adoption of digital fiat currencies.

Relying on the private sector to develop digital currencies carries its own risks, including loss of control of monetary policy, as well as the ability to implement and enforce effective anti-money laundering and counterterrorism financing.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Chair, today the gross hypocrisy of crypto advocates is exposed. For several years, they were screaming: Don't touch crypto because it is innovative, and innovation is wonderful, and innovation shouldn't be stopped and if we don't innovate other countries will.

Today, the crypto forces bring a bill up that has one purpose: to block innovation.

Why do we block innovation? Because there might be a competitive payment system to the crypto payment system. In other words, the crypto bros need to innovate and create a better payment system, and if they face competition, we need a law to stop them.

This is a bad bill if it did what the authors say it will do. What it will actually do is hard to know because of how poorly drafted it is.

It bans a central bank digital currency or anything that comes close to one or anything that is substantially similar. The bill itself is a word salad of antigovernment and pro-crypto buzz words.

How does it define this digital currency that it prohibits? It simply says digital money is a direct liability of the Federal Reserve system.

Well, all our money is a direct liability to the Federal Reserve system. It bans that, presumably, if it is electronic, so it bans 20th century technology.

When the Fed buys \$100 million of Treasury bills from a large bank, do you think that they put it all in armored cars and send it to J.P. Morgan? No, it is electronic. They are paying for it with a digital liability, a direct liability of the Federal Reserve system.

This bill, as it is written, not as it is oratorically described, would require hundreds of thousands of armored cars if we are going to do the business that we have been doing since the 20th century.

I would ask any judge interpreting this bill to keep in mind not the words in the bill, because that would stop 20th century technology and all of our major financial transactions, but the purposes of the authors.

What is the purpose? The purpose is that we should not have an electronic payment system that does not achieve two purposes: Number one, the crypto bros must make a profit; and number two, it has to be a system that is effective for drug dealers and tax evaders.

□ 1200

Judges interpreting this word salad that calls itself a bill should keep those two objectives in mind.

Then we are told that we need a new payment system in this country so the government cannot freeze bank accounts because Canada froze bank accounts of anti-vax truckers. I have no

idea whether Canada should have frozen those bank accounts, but I do know this: If because Canada froze bank accounts of anti-vax truckers, we should have a payment system that makes it impossible for the American Government to freeze the bank accounts of convicted tax evaders, convicted drug dealers, and convicted charlatans. Then we enter into a new world that I call patriotic anarchism, the folks who demand that America be strong and that the government be totally defanged and inept and unable to do anything.

It is a wonderful world. You can believe in a strong America without an American Government or an American Government unable to freeze the bank accounts of convicted murderers. You want a strong America but not a government that is able to do that.

Now, this world of a surveillance state if we had a central bank digital currency, keep in mind the use of that currency is entirely voluntarily just as the use of a credit card is voluntary. If you use a credit card to buy a gun and then you kill somebody, there is a record. You are also free to use cash.

Cash has some disadvantages. In the example I just gave, those disadvantages are not apparent, but those disadvantages include that it is not electronic, that it is bulky, and that if you have over \$10,000 you want to deposit in bank, a report is made.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. MALOY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Chair, we have a bill, which if it is interpreted as written, blocks the American economy the way it operates today and has for decades and would create lots of American jobs building those armored cars because the Fed would have to deal with nonelectronic transactions.

If it is interpreted as intended, it is designed to create a world in which the American Government cannot conduct a criminal investigation that follows the money, and if someone is convicted, their bank accounts cannot be frozen because we have a new payment system without bank accounts that are not subject to being frozen.

Vote against this bill because of what is in it. Vote against this bill because of what they wanted to put in it and hoped to put in it but didn't.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, in responding to the gentleman's arguments, I don't know where to begin. The civil liberties protections in the United States are evident. We have a court of law. We have a provision for law enforcement to go after bad actors. This bill has nothing to do with this. It is a direct question of whether or not the Federal Reserve should be able to track your money without having to go to the courts, just evident in the technology.

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

chair of the Digital Assets Subcommittee and the chair of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee on the Financial Services Committee. The gentleman is a great leader in digital assets and a thoughtful member of the committee.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of banning central bank digital currency. Why do we do this? As Congressman HILL pointed out, Congress clearly has the Article I authority under the United States Constitution over money, and we should exert that.

In the absence of exerting that with respect to central bank digital currency, the Federal Reserve is plowing right ahead. They are actively hiring programmers to write code to develop a central bank digital currency. To have colleagues say: Oh, well, they won't turn it on, to me is equivalent to having the Empire in Star Wars build the Death Star but promising not to turn it on.

Once it exists, it poses a threat, and they are not responding to Congress right now. They are not. They are not listening to our values that are reflected in our Constitution to protect our civil liberties. In fact, our colleagues are encouraging them not to. They are saying in their own words: Oh, we have to be more like China.

The version of central bank digital currency, the version that Project Hamilton is embracing, is the same version China is developing, and it is being developed all over the world with more than 100 countries looking at implementing a central bank digital currency all under the same model that the Bank for International Settlements, the central bank for the central bankers in Switzerland, is proposing, and it is the same creepy surveillance tool that the Chinese Communist Party is using, which is centrally managed, centrally filtered.

What definition is used here? Well, I am not sure that we could gather that from Mr. SHERMAN's comments, but it is the same definition that was used on March 9 in 2022 when the Biden administration released Executive Order 14067. The definition of H.R. 5403, this bill, is the same definition that we are addressing chosen by the Biden administration.

We want to ban that.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chair, we don't want to ban that just to establish it. We want to ban the development of it.

Another fallacy that they point out though is that this would turn off research. No, by all means, study it, find all the problems with it, and make sure that the people know: Don't go down this path.

That is the point of this bill.

If Congress uses Article I authority to subsequently set the parameters, as

is our constitutional obligation, we could do that with a subsequent bill. The reality is, the Federal Reserve is not responding to dialogue. They need to respond to a law.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. AUCHINCLOSS).

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Madam Chair, the Framers of the Constitution understood the importance of a strong and stable national currency, which is why Article I, Section 8, grants Congress the exclusive power to coin money and regulate its value.

Congress must not forfeit this power to the Federal Reserve or the Department of Treasury when it comes to issuing a CBDC. CBDCs are digital liabilities issued by a central bank and made available to the public.

My bill, the Power of the Mint Act, which I introduced alongside my Republican colleague and chair of the Digital Assets Subcommittee, Congressman HILL, would prohibit the issuance of a CBDC without authorization from Congress. The Rules Committee, though, controlled by Republicans, refused to consider my amendment, which would have made the text of the Power of the Mint Act the base text of this bill.

Instead of voting on a bipartisan bill that I am confident would have secured a robust majority and achieved functionally similar ends, we are voting on one now that was thrown together haphazardly, ignoring the advice of legislative counsel, and combining our bills with no regard for duplicative sections. It was voted out of committee on a party-line vote.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding. In a rarity of Congress, the title of this bill actually reflects both the content and the gravity of the subject at hand.

Many of my constituents, my bosses, were rightfully concerned when the President's administration announced its intention to surveil their pocketbooks over transactions as low as \$600.

A central bank digital currency would be infinitely worse. It would give the government unprecedented visibility and control into Americans' transactions.

What does that mean in practice?

It means that it is much easier to track purchases of things that the government doesn't like, like firearms or other items disapproved by the government. It is much easier for the government to shut down dissenting voices, and it is much easier for the government to control Americans.

Now people on the other side say: Well, that would never happen. It would never happen that the government would tell you what kind of car you have to buy because they are not

going to make any others. The government would never tell you what kind of stove you cannot buy. That would never happen either.

We should learn the lessons from the oppressed citizens everywhere from Canada to the communist Chinese before it is too late. I urge adoption.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) who is also the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Chair, wow, the oppressed citizens of Canada, really? We have gone into conspiracy world here in what was otherwise a trajectory of remarkable bipartisan work on this new strange world of cryptocurrency and crypto assets. Now we are talking about the oppressed citizens of Canada, the surveillance state. They are going tell you what their cars and appliances are doing.

I guess we can't do too much bipartisanship before we have to revert to the madness of conspiracy theories.

Madam Chair, why did we do what we did yesterday with FIT21? It split my party. There were people of good will on both sides of that.

The reason a number of Democrats, including myself, supported FIT21, which was not our preferred bill, was because in the context of the possibility of innovation, you open options. We don't know what this stuff is going to look like 5 or 10 years from now, so we open options. That is why we did what we did yesterday.

Today, because of conspiracy world, we are closing options.

Now I don't know what a CBDC might look like 5 or 10 years from now. I suspect having written a white paper on it, that there might be a portion of the population that instead of using Joe's stablecoin might actually value a stablecoin that was backed by the full faith and credit.

I don't know and you don't know, so let's keep our options open. Let's allow for the possibility and research that, by the way, every other country out there, like the United Kingdom—not China but the United Kingdom—is doing, to see if we can open the path for innovation. Let's not close it.

I hear China, China, China. Guess what, we do contract law and police services and public safety radically different than China does, so don't scare us with China.

We can do this right. Let's just not in the context of innovation foreclose an option. Please vote against this bill, which is an anti-innovation bill.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act.

We must prohibit the Federal Reserve from issuing this currency. If you don't want to talk about China, let's talk about the United States. Mr. Chair, we just spent months debating

the Fourth Amendment is Not for Sale Act and the FISA reauthorization. The central debate surrounding these two bills was government surveillance of our citizens.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have fought to protect Americans from unconstitutional surveillance right here in America. This bill is another tool to protect our citizens' rights.

Mr. Chair, we don't have to guess what would be the use of this CBDC. We have witnessed various United States Government agencies from the IRS to the FBI targeting conservatives for their beliefs. Do you want your Buc-ee's coffee or your monthly mortgage payment or the ammo you purchase for your hunting trip to be visible to the Federal Government? I suggest not.

We must continue to fight back against the continuing and obvious weaponization of the Federal Government and prevent the creation of a central bank digital currency.

Mr. Chair, this could be the final step toward absolute and total surveillance by the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to support the freedom of Americans and vote for the underlying bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, the bill's sponsor has warned that a U.S. CBDC would mirror the surveillance tactics that are baked into the Chinese CBDC without explaining why the United States would ever choose to design its CBDC in a manner that mimics Chinese surveillance.

Privacy protections can be incorporated from the earliest development stages of a CBDC. This is what other privacy-focused jurisdictions have been doing with their CBDC development, like the European Union, because their constituents care about privacy, too.

□ 1215

In fact, research from the Atlantic Council has noted that CBDCs can be designed in a way that offer cash-like privacy through the use of zero-knowledge proofs, encryption, and other design features where a payment validator processes transactions but does not learn the identities of those involved without the permission of the parties.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PERRY). The gentleman from North Carolina has 14½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act. This would prohibit unelected bureaucrats at the Federal Reserve from issuing a central bank digital currency that would de-

stroy Americans' rights to financial privacy.

CBDCs are a digital form of sovereign currency designed and issued by the Federal Government and recorded on a ledger controlled by the Federal Government. In other words, if a political enemy of the deep state or, say, a Democratic regime says or does something that is not approved, the government could prohibit them from using their digital government-controlled financial assets or simply take them away. We are talking about Americans' money.

Never forget that, in the past few years, we just lived through a time—and Americans are very aware of it—where the government forced social media to censor Americans for their statements about the 2020 election, unconstitutional COVID lockdowns, and violations of Americans' medical freedoms, forcing them to take an experimental vaccine in order to work, go to school, shop, go to restaurants, and live.

Government tracking Americans on keywords like "MAGA" or "Trump" or Americans who care about their Second Amendment rights has also been something that has happened in the past few years and is still happening.

The very idea of our government controlling our money with the ability to turn it off whenever they see fit is terrifying.

Mr. Chair, I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah (Ms. MALOY).

Ms. MALOY. Mr. Chair, I rise to support the passage of H.R. 5403, the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act, which I cosponsor.

If improperly implemented, a CBDC can compete with private financial intermediaries, undermine long-term investment, invite more regulation into nearly every economic institution, and open the American people to Chinese-style government surveillance.

This is one of the reasons that the Utah Legislature this year passed a bill to block CBDC from being recognized as legal tender.

This is an issue that Americans are concerned about, particularly people in my State that I represent. We don't need to be more like China. Americans demand the right to participate in the economy without giving up our privacy.

We have to protect Americans' right to financial privacy. That is why this bill forbids the Federal Reserve from issuing CBDCs without specific congressional authorization. That is us protecting our own authority. It prohibits the Federal Reserve from using a CBDC as a tool to take full control of the U.S. economy through monetary policy, something Americans won't stand for. Finally, it protects the privacy of coins and bills, ensuring that

they remain open, permissionless, and private. Those three things are essential.

Rarely do the credit unions, banks, and Utah Legislature agree on anything. That is a sign that we should support this.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), the chair of the Small Business Committee and a great leader for business in America, capitalism, and freedom.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 5403, the CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act.

This necessary legislation would prevent the Federal Reserve from issuing a central bank digital currency to individuals directly or indirectly through a financial institution. This bill also prohibits the Fed from using a CBDC as a tool to implement monetary policy and control the economy.

Around the world, governments have weaponized central bank digital currencies to track the spending habits of their citizens. In China, the CCP uses CBDC to track spending of their citizens and created a social credit system, which punishes individuals based on their spending and behavior. We cannot allow this kind of surveillance to be imposed on American citizens.

The issuance of a CBDC by the Federal Government would lead to decreased competition as the Federal Government would then be in direct competition with banks. This is antibusiness for the benefit of Big Government. A government-controlled CBDC is an attack on Americans' privacy and free-market competitiveness.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5403. In God we trust.

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

Mr. Chair, I am struck by the way Republicans have so quickly changed their tune on how we should be promoting innovation. Here are just a couple of quotes from Republicans from the debate just yesterday.

Representative DAVIDSON: "For too long, we have pushed innovation and investment in digital asset projects overseas. . . . We finally have the chance to end this trend and solidify ourselves as the leaders in this industry."

Mr. MCHENRY: "We are falling behind Europe. This bill catches us up so that we do not lose out on innovation policy to the Europeans, to the folks in the U.K., to Singapore, to Japan, to Hong Kong, that all have regimes similar to what we are doing in this bill. . . . The next generation of internet technology is being written. It should be written by American innovators here in the United States. We can allow that innovation to pass us by, or we can seize the opportunity."

The double standard is simply stunning.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I will note for the record a couple of key things.

Number one, this is private-sector innovation. That was yesterday's bill. Two-thirds of the House spoke in favor of private-sector innovation for digital assets. I know the ranking member of the committee did not, but we had 71 of her Democratic colleagues vote with almost all the Republicans yesterday for private-sector innovation on digital assets. I know she did not.

Today, what they want to do is have public-sector innovation. The regimes I spoke of yesterday, fostering private-sector innovation, are not going down the route of central bank digital currency. I want to note that for the record.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman MCHENRY and Whip EMMER for being leaders on digital asset policy and specifically for this legislation preventing a Federal Reserve bank from offering central bank digital currency to an individual.

As advances in technology drive changes in the payments landscape, it is the responsibility of Congress to foster innovations while protecting consumers. Today, a Federal Reserve note, physical currency, is the only kind of central bank money available to the public, but a CBDC would be a new form of money, a digital dollar, which raises significant financial stability, privacy, and consumer protection concerns.

This legislation clarifies that the Fed cannot offer direct products or services, or maintain accounts on behalf of an individual, and specifies the congressional authorities needed for the Fed to set up a CBDC.

During the past 15 years, Congress has transferred a significant amount of authority to the Federal Reserve. In the case of a CBDC, congressional approval is essential before embarking on transformative policy changes with broad implications.

Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. EMMER and Mr. MCHENRY for offering this legislation.

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

Mr. Chair, if privacy is the main concern motivating the supporters of this bill, then it is wholly unclear why the bill would ban wholesale CBDCs, which do not pose privacy concerns because they would not be used by consumers at all. They would be used by banks and other institutions to reduce transaction costs and improve payment speed in cross-border transactions with other institutions.

For these reasons, it was the American Bankers Association that advocated for the exclusion of wholesale CBDCs from this bill when it was marked up by our committee.

Supporters of this bill can't explain to the American people why a prohibi-

tion on a wholesale CBDC would protect their privacy so they resort to baseless fearmongering.

Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, we are told to reject this because China is doing this. In China, they drink orange juice. Should we prohibit orange juice? Not everything that happens in China needs to be banned by statute in this Congress.

We are told we need to protect privacy, but this bill does not require anybody to use a digital currency. You are still going to have cash. You are still going to have a credit card. It is just one more option.

You may say the use of the credit card doesn't give you privacy because my wife then finds out I spent too much on a tie. So what do I do? I spend cash. You are going to have debit cards, credit cards, cash, and maybe a digital currency. If you want it to be private, don't use it. It is not mandatory.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I would note for the record that bow ties are cheaper than the long ties. I suggest the same to the gentleman.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the chair of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, last Congress, as a member of the Digital Assets Working Group, we established clear principles on how any proposed CBDC proposal should be evaluated.

First, the U.S. dollar must remain the world's reserve currency, and our payment systems must continue to be the envy of the world. American taxpayers should benefit, not be disadvantaged, by any legislation that Congress enacts.

Second, the private sector must lead the way. Digital asset policies must promote private-sector innovation and foster competition. That is what the bill was about yesterday, Mr. Chair.

Further, we must maintain privacy and security protections consistent with other currency transactions utilized today. That is in danger, based on what the Fed is proposing.

Lastly, it should come as no surprise that many Americans view a Fed-developed central bank digital currency with great skepticism, and I include myself in that category. Congress has not granted the Fed this authority, nor should it.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD), a leader in digital assets.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chair, this bill is necessary because a retail central bank digital currency would be a terrifying and powerful tool in the hands of any government entity.

I would like everybody in this Chamber to think and picture the politician

they dislike the most in their mind. Now, imagine that person and all the ill intentions you ascribe to them with the power to monitor, restrict, or even halt the financial transactions of their political opponents.

It is actually a horrifying thought, and it cuts to the core of why we need to reject a retail CBDC in this country.

Some of my colleagues across the aisle claim that arguments like this are alarmist. However, they fail to realize that once a CBDC is built, even if it was built with good intentions, it will endure through every political twist and turn our country has ahead, for better or for worse.

President Reagan famously said, freedom “is never more than one generation away from extinction.” If we issue a retail CBDC in this country, freedom would never be more than one election away from extinction.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1230

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, according to an analysis written by Jaret Seiberg with TD Cowen, published today, May 23, 2024:

We do see risk in the House looking today to pass a related bill that would ban the United States from launching a digital dollar.

We view such a ban as negative for the global dominance of U.S. banks and for the global role of the U.S. dollar. This is because the ban would apply to wholesale, as well as consumer use. That could give the euro or other currencies that are digitized an edge in being used for global trade as stablecoin digital dollars could lose value if there is a redemption run, while a digital euro would not face that threat.

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

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

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

Mr. Chair, yesterday, we debated a Republican bill that would substantially deregulate the crypto industry, allowing most crypto to operate without a primary regulator and with virtually no regulation. Where was the concern about a consumer’s privacy then?

Just yesterday, Republicans threw all of the existing protections for consumers, including privacy, out the window in the name of so-called crypto innovation and U.S. competitiveness. When it comes to the one crypto innovation that could impact our national security interests and economy, my colleagues want to stop that innovation in its tracks.

There is simply no reason to unilaterally tie our own hands in this respect and risk undermining the primacy of the U.S. dollar in the process, and it would be harmful to every American to make it harder for the Federal Reserve to combat inflation.

The stakes with this bill are incredibly high. The strength of the United

States dollar, our ability to innovate and compete globally, our ability to impose sanctions and protect our interests abroad, and our ability to stop inflation are all well on the line.

Mr. Chair, I certainly urge a “no” vote on this bill, H.R. 5403, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that this bill protects Americans’ rights to financial privacy. That is the core of this.

It was my hope that this bill would be the base text for an amendment process by which we get my Democratic colleagues and committee to agree with that principle. Nonetheless, we have brought this bill to the floor. It ensures Congress, not the current or future administration, retains authority over any potential central bank digital currency.

This is Congress making a statement. We have the commitment. The current chair of the Federal Reserve says we will not have a consumer-facing central bank digital currency under his tenure in the Federal Reserve. That is the commitment of the current chair. That is not a commitment from the Federal Reserve.

We have a legal ruling that says that, for this to be a consumer-facing central bank digital currency, the Fed would have to come back to Congress to ask for those authorities.

Secretary Yellen, today, in news reports, says that it is indeed the case, in her view, that the Fed would have to come back to Congress to ask for authorities for central bank digital currency.

We are making an affirmative stance and statement as a Congress that that is not just the opinion of the current chair of the Federal Reserve and the current Secretary of the Treasury, but the stance of the United States Government and the United States Congress.

It is important that we recognize civil liberties are highly important, and our system in the United States is different than every system around the globe in protecting individuals’ civil liberties from governmental encroachment. We should all agree that a central bank digital currency should reflect American values of privacy, individual sovereignty, and free market competitiveness.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is a very important statement for us, just like the important statement we made yesterday when 71 of my Democratic colleagues voted with almost all the Republicans to put forward a regulatory framework for digital assets and cryptocurrency.

It was a great bipartisan outcome with a huge number of Democratic support, even though the administration said they don’t want the bill, and even though the minority leader voted against us, and even though the ranking member on Financial Services

whipped hard against the bill. We had 71 of my Democratic colleagues who saw innovation and consumer protection were at the core of that piece of legislation, and my colleagues voted in favor of it.

It is my hope today that the minority will see that we need civil liberties protections from any governmental encroachment in the financial realm, and I hope we can make a nice bipartisan statement today, as well.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEBER of Texas). All time for general debate has expired.

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

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 5403

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS RELATING TO CERTAIN PRODUCTS OR SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS AND PROHIBITION ON DIRECTLY ISSUING A CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY.

Section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(18) A Federal reserve bank shall not—
“(A) offer products or services directly to an individual;

“(B) maintain an account on behalf of an individual; or

“(C) issue a central bank digital currency, or any digital asset that is substantially similar under any other name or label, directly to an individual.”.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS INDIRECTLY ISSUING A CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY.

Section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended by section 2, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(19)(A) A Federal reserve bank shall not offer a central bank digital currency, or any digital asset that is substantially similar under any other name or label, indirectly to an individual through a financial institution or other intermediary.

“(B) Subparagraph (A) may not be construed to prohibit any dollar-denominated currency that is open, permissionless, and private, and fully preserves the privacy protections of United States coins and physical currency.”.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY FOR MONETARY POLICY.

Section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(20) PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY FOR MONETARY POLICY.—The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market

Committee shall not use any central bank digital currency, or any digital asset that is substantially similar under any other name or label, to implement monetary policy.”

SEC. 5. CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 221 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 16 the following:

“SEC. 16A. CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY.

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may not, absent Congressional authorization, issue a central bank digital currency.

“(b) *CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY DEFINED.*—In this section, the term ‘central bank digital currency’ means a form of digital money or monetary value, denominated in the national unit of account, that is a direct liability of the Federal Reserve System.”

(b) *TREASURY.*—Chapter 3 of subtitle 1 of title 31 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after section 316 the following:

“SEC. 317. CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY.

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Treasury may not, absent Congressional authorization, direct the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue a central bank digital currency.

“(b) *CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY DEFINED.*—In this section, the term ‘central bank digital currency’ means a form of digital money or monetary value, denominated in the national unit of account, that is a direct liability of the central bank.”

SEC. 6. PROTECTION FOR OPEN, PERMISSIONLESS, AND PRIVATE CURRENCY.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply to any dollar-denominated currency that is open, permissionless, and private, and fully preserves the privacy protections of United States coins and physical currency.”

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 118–516. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 118–516.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System should not be permitted to develop, create, or implement a central bank digital currency, or use any such tool to implement monetary policy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1243, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, my amendment adds the sense of Congress that

the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System should not be permitted to develop, create, or implement a central bank digital currency or use any such tool to implement monetary policy.

A major concern surrounding a government-run CBDC is the potential for the government to block transactions and exert control over people’s finances. Not only that, but it would give the Federal Government unprecedented power to intervene in private transactions, deciding who can buy and sell and what they can buy and sell.

It would also give the government unprecedented access to information about their daily lives. The government could keep a record of every transaction.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, which doubles down on the Republican efforts to prohibit CBDCs, which, if Republicans read their own bill, is already prohibited in the bill.

This sense of Congress only causes further confusion on how the bill should be interpreted as a whole by duplicating things that are already in the bill by wording them in a slightly different manner.

Experts from Atlantic Council have warned that: “If this bill ever became law, the United States would be the only country in the world to have banned CBDCs. It would be a self-defeating move in the race for the future of money. It would undercut the national security role of the dollar as the decision would only accelerate other countries’ development of alternative payment systems that look to bypass the dollar in cross-border transactions. This would make U.S. sanctions less effective.”

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) for yielding the time.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Mr. OGLES’ commonsense resolution.

Yes, it doubles down on the views of Congress in this bill, no doubt. The underlying bill already prohibits the use of a central bank digital currency to implement monetary policy.

However, this sense of Congress further clarifies our intent. As Chairman MCHENRY just noted, the Federal Reserve is not permitted to develop, create, or implement a CBDC or to use a CBDC to implement monetary policy without authorization of Congress. Part of the reason we are here is due to the Fed officials having been ambig-

uous or noncommittal as to public statements related to their legal authorities under the Federal Reserve Act as it relates to a CBDC.

I agree with Mr. MCHENRY that certainly this Chairman, Jay Powell, has been quite clear to our committee that issuing a retail CBDC is not something he could do without an authorization of Congress.

That is why I think reiterating it in this resolution is an important step. I commend the gentleman from Tennessee for bringing this amendment. I hope all our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support it and the underlying bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, Republicans are focused on the bill’s prohibition on CBDCs, but according to the nonpartisan CBO: “The bill’s prohibition on the Federal Reserve’s use or issuance of a central bank digital currency could apply to bank reserves, which are a unit of value and a liability of the Federal Reserve.”

As the CBO also acknowledges, bank reserves are a primary tool for the Fed in conducting monetary policy. Prohibiting the Fed from holding bank reserves could very well take us backward, erasing all progress that the Fed has made so far in reducing inflation and achieving a soft landing. A vote for this bill is a vote for higher inflation and economic uncertainty.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, there is a reason that China, under the rule of the totalitarian Chinese Communist Party, has the most developed CBDC program. It is about control. Their CBDC enables them to combine intrusive monitoring of the public and control their lives with their Orwellian social credit scores.

Take what Canada did by cutting off money for the truckers. Look at what China is doing. If we go down this path, we are heading toward an Orwellian nightmare.

My sense of Congress doubles down on the fact that the greenback is the reserve currency of the world. A CBDC undermines that, and it should not be pursued.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is opposed by the following organizations: Americans for Financial Reform, Demand Progress, Public Citizen, and Take on Wall Street.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple, because it underscores that the Federal Reserve should not move forward with implementing a CBDC or use any policy that would forward that action.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, in closing, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and the underlying bill,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment. It is clear. It is concise. It is simple. It is just good policy.

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

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

□ 1245

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MOONEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 118-516.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION ON CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY TESTING.

Section 16A of the Federal Reserve Act, as added by section 5, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) PROHIBITION ON CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY TESTING.—Unless authorized by an Act of Congress enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks may not establish, carry out, or approve a program intended to test the practicability of issuing a central bank digital currency, including by partnering or coordinating with a private sector entity to carry out such a program.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1243, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

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

Mr. Chair, a central bank digital currency, or digital dollar, represents one of the greatest government surveillance threats of our time, and I am glad this Republican majority is taking it seriously.

House Republicans have been clear that the Federal Reserve does not have the authority to issue a digital dollar without an act of Congress first. It also does not have the ability to build and test one behind the scenes.

My amendment would stop the Federal Reserve's rogue digital dollar experimentation, known as the pilot program loophole, dead in its tracks.

Right now, the Federal Reserve is contracting with the private sector to build digital dollars for the United States far beyond what could be con-

sidered traditional research. Essentially, the Federal Reserve is creating a central bank digital currency to use at a moment's notice.

In Communist China, the digital yuan is being used to spy on its citizens and crack down on prodemocracy dissent. Soon, Chinese citizens will not even have a choice whether or not to use the digital yuan. In America, the Biden administration could use the digital dollar to track your gun purchases, for example.

Chairman Jerome Powell has said the Federal Reserve would not issue a digital dollar without an act of Congress, but doing so as a so-called pilot program is the same thing. That is why my amendment is important, because Congress cannot give an inch when it comes to the central bank digital currency.

My amendment would simply block the Federal Reserve from establishing, carrying out, or approving any program intended to test the feasibility of issuing a digital dollar. If the Federal Government wants to experiment with a surveillance tool that the overwhelming majority of American citizens oppose, that direction must come from a vote in Congress. Make no mistake: Central bank digital currencies are not about innovation. They are about control.

My amendment prevents the Federal Reserve from bypassing the will of the legislative branch by closing the pilot program loophole once and for all, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I urge Members to oppose the Mooney amendment, which explicitly bans CBDC pilot programs. Like the last amendment we just considered, this amendment bans something that H.R. 5403 already bans. Oddly, this amendment would exacerbate the confusing drafting in H.R. 5403, by prohibiting something in two places but in slightly different ways.

In fact, all three of these amendments that we are considering for this bill overlap with existing provisions in the underlying bill, which leads me to believe that Republicans simply don't understand what their own bill does.

Let me again try to explain their own bill. This amendment and the bill both prohibit the Fed from conducting a study on how to design a central bank digital currency using a pilot program. In case the public is wondering, the New York Fed is currently conducting a pilot through its New York Innovation Center to test the benefits and drawbacks of a wholesale CBDC in collaboration with U.S. banks and the Monetary Authority of Singapore.

This pilot does not mean that at the end the Fed will issue a CBDC or that Americans will have one. In fact, the

Fed has made it abundantly clear that it wants Congress to authorize it to do so, but how is Congress going to be able to make this decision if we don't have any research as to how a CBDC could be designed that reflects our values?

Again, importantly, to counter misinformation from the other side of the aisle, wholesale CBDCs are not used by individual consumers. They are only used by institutions to transfer funds, so there are no consumer privacy issues with wholesale CBDCs because consumers are not directly involved.

If the point of this bill is to protect consumer privacy, the sponsor should have directed the Fed to ensure that it only tests a CBDC that does that.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to oppose this harmful amendment and H.R. 5403, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, I rise to support Mr. MOONEY's amendment.

The CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act demonstrates House Republicans' unwavering and thorough conviction that the Federal Reserve must not issue or develop a central bank digital currency without expressed authorization from Congress.

While I support this bill wholeheartedly, I think it can go further with this amendment by being clear. Word weasels want to come up with phrases like pilot. Oh, we are not really doing that.

Yes, you are. The pilot project represents a first step that we could take, and, as you see, the Federal Reserve is spending time and resources building a team, actively hiring and staffing, and outsourcing for this. It is logically consistent that this pilot could be developed to something further.

Mr. MOONEY's amendment will not only remove the CBDC pipeline the Fed is already building, but it will also ensure that any future efforts to test or research CBDC are approved by Congress.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of our colleagues to support this amendment and this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, it seems that Republicans remain focused on CBDCs when, as I have explained, the CBO has pointed out that the definition of CBDC in this bill can be interpreted to include bank reserves held by the Fed. Bank reserves are used as the settlement funds for interbank transactions that are facilitated by the Fed via its payment systems. This means that prohibiting the Fed's ability to hold bank reserves would make it difficult, if not impossible, to administer these payment systems likely causing a massive disruption to our banking and payment systems.

A vote for this bill is a vote to disrupt our banking systems. Republicans are refusing to acknowledge the broader impacts of this bill to undermine the Fed, disrupt our banking and payment

systems, and risk higher inflation, but the American people should know the truth.

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

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, like the underlying bill, this amendment closes off opportunities for innovation and harming our influence around the world before we have even had a chance to fully study, test, and understand CBDCs.

This bill and amendment represent the wing of the Republican Party that is anti-science and, ironically, scared of the innovation they claim to like. Again, this amendment does not prohibit the issuance of a CBDC; it is prohibiting the research on how CBDCs work.

I can't stress how irresponsible it is for Congress to be passing blanket prohibitions on research based on unwarranted views. I can understand fears about potential outcomes, but I cannot understand fear of research.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment and H.R. 5403, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 118-516.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 10, insert "design, build, develop, establish, or" before "issue".

Page 5, line 22, insert "design, build, develop, establish, or" before "issue".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1243, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, I applaud Congressman EMMER's hard work on getting this important piece of legislation to where it is today. I am encouraged that so many of my colleagues like Mr. HILL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. BARR, Mrs. WAGNER, and subcommittee chairs on Financial Services are united on this. I wish that extended across the aisle because central bank digital currency is the

creepiest surveillance tool known to man.

Every dystopian fiction out there whether "Brave New World," "1984," what I consider Scriptures, the "Book of Revelation," shows the corruption of money from its proper use as a store of value and a means of exchange into a tool for coercion and control, something that can filter people's access to their own money and their ability to use it in a free society.

Why would we enable it? Everywhere it is depicted as evil. Why would we even tolerate that, but our own government is doing it. Frankly, the underlying text prevents the Federal Reserve from establishing a central bank digital currency, and this amendment is important because we should be clear: We don't want them to design it; we don't want them to build it; we don't want them to do development work on it; and we certainly don't want them to issue it. That authority is reserved for Congress.

There may come a point where our form of money looks different than it does today, but it should always have the characteristics of permissionless peer-to-peer payments like cash. Saying: But cash is one option in the system, doesn't cut it when the whole underlying architecture becomes permissioned, conditioned on your ability to be granted access to your own property from a central government.

This is a bad system, and it is great today for us to have the opportunity to ban it.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MORAN). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, with this amendment, my Republican colleagues are really piling on to ensure the Fed is prohibited from even thinking about CBDCs. Yet again, this amendment is not adding anything substantive that isn't already in the bill. Instead, it is making worse the internal drafting inconsistencies in H.R. 5403.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to oppose this amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, the gentlewoman correctly recognizes that we are piling on. We want it to be absolutely clear to the word weasels in the executive branch that try to find a way to scheme and maneuver and even, in spite of Supreme Court rulings, come up with new executive orders whether it is forgiving student debt, launching climate change initiatives, banning bump stocks, pistol braces, warrantless searches, you name it. They have got a way to get past the clear intent of Congress. We want to close every possible venue, absolutely.

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

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

□ 1300

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, I think we have made it clear with the amendments, with our statements, and with the bill text that we need to ban central bank digital currency. Do not let them design, develop, or build a death star only to promise not to turn it on.

We need to prevent the Federal Reserve from doing this. All this should make it clear that that is the clear intent of Congress.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, this amendment, like the underlying bill, is dangerous and rash. It would prohibit the U.S. from even training for a race that has already begun.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues not to cave to baseless fear-mongering. I have already explained in depth how the privacy concerns from Republicans do not align with the actual facts. I simply urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 118-516 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. OGLES of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1, printed in part C of House Report 118-516, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 176, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]
AYES—204

Aderholt Fulcher Moolenaar
Alford Gaetz Mooney
Allen Garcia, Mike Moore (AL)
Amodoi Gimenez Moore (UT)
Armstrong Golden (ME)
Arrington Gonzales, Tony Moylan
Babin Good (VA)
Bacon Gooden (TX) Newhouse
Baird Gosar Norman
Balderson Granger Nunn (IA)
Banks Graves (LA) Obernolte
Barr Graves (MO) Ogles
Bean (FL) Green (TN) Owens
Bentz Greene (GA) Palmer
Bergman Griffith Peltola
Bice Grothman Pence
Biggs Guest Perez
Bilirakis Guthrie Perry
Bost Hageman Pfluger
Brecheen Harris Posey
Buchanan Harshbarger Reschenthaler
Bucshon Hern Rodgers (WA)
Burchett Higgins (LA) Rogers (AL)
Burgess Hill Rogers (KY)
Burlison Hinson Rose
Calvert Houchin Rosendale
Cammack Hudson Rouzer
Carey Huizenga Roy
Carl Issa Rutherford
Carter (GA) Jackson (TX) Salazar
Carter (TX) James Scalise
Chavez-DeRemer Johnson (SD) Schweikert
Cline Joyce (PA) Scott, Austin
Cloud Kean (NJ) Self
Clyde Kelly (MS) Sessions
Cole Kelly (PA) Simpson
Collins Kiggans (VA) Smith (MO)
Comer Kiley Smith (NE)
Crane Kim (CA) Smith (NJ)
Crawford Kustoff Smucker
Crenshaw LaLota Stauber
Curtis LaMalfa Steel
D'Esposito Lamborn Stefanik
Davidson Langworthy Steil
De La Cruz Latta Steube
DesJarlais LaTurner Strong
Diaz-Balart Lawler Tenney
Donalds Lee (FL) Thompson (PA)
Duarte Lesko Tiffany
Duncan Letlow Timmons
Dunn (FL) Lucas Turner
Edwards Luna Valadao
Ellzey Luttrell Van Drew
Emmer Mace Van Dwyne
Estes Malliotakis Van Orden
Ezell Maloy Wagner
Fallon Mann Walberg
Feenstra Massie Waltz
Ferguson Mast Weber (TX)
Finstad McCaul Webster (FL)
Fischbach McClintock Wenstrup
Fitzgerald McHenry Williams (NY)
Fitzpatrick Meuser Williams (TX)
Fleischmann Miller (IL) Wilson (SC)
Flood Miller (OH) Wittman
Foxy Miller (WV) Womack
Franklin, Scott Miller-Meeks Yakym
Fry Molinaro Zinke

NOES—176

Adams Carson Davis (NC)
Aguilar Cartwright Dean (PA)
Allred Casar DeGette
Amo Case DeiBene
Auchincloss Casten Deluzio
Balint Castor (FL) DeSaulnier
Barragan Castro (TX) Dingell
Bera Chu Doggett
Beyer Clark (MA) Escobar
Bishop (GA) Clarke (NY) Eshoo
Blunt Rochester Clyburn Espaillat
Bonamici Cohen Fletcher
Bowman Connolly Foushee
Boyle (PA) Correa Gallego
Brown Costa Garcia (IL)
Brownley Courtney Garcia (TX)
Budzinski Craig Garcia, Robert
Bush Crockett Goldman (NY)
Caraveo Crow Gomez
Carbajal Cuellar Gonzalez,
Cardenas Davids (KS) Vicente

Gottheimer Meng
Harder (CA) Mfume
Hayes Morelle
Himes Moskowitz
Houlihan Moulton
Hoyer Mullin
Hoyle (OR) Nadler
Huffman Napolitano
Jackson (IL) Neal
Jacobs Neguse
Jayapal Nickel
Jeffries Norcross
Kaptur Norton
Keating Omar
Kelly (IL) Pallone
Kennedy Panetta
Khanna Pappas
Kildee Pascrell
Kilmer Pelosi
Krishnamoorthi Peters
Kuster Pettersen
Larsen (WA) Phillips
Larson (CT) Pingree
Lee (CA) Plaskett
Lee (NV) Pocan
Lee (PA) Porter
Leger Fernandez Pressley
Levin Quigley
Lieu Ramirez
Lofgren Raskin
Lynch Ross
Manning Ruiz
Matsui Ruppertsberger
McBath Ryan
McClellan Salinas
McCollum Sanchez
McGarvey Sarbanes
McGovern Schakowsky
Meeks Schiff

NOT VOTING—55

Beatty Grijalva Mills
Bishop (NC) Horsford Moore (WI)
Blumenauer Hunt Mrvan
Boebert Ivey Murphy
Carter (LA) Jackson (NC) Ocasio-Cortez
Cherfilus Jackson Lee Radewagen
McCormick Johnson (GA) Sablan
Ciscomani Jordan Scanlon
Cleaver Joyce (OH) Scholten
Davis (IL) Kamlager-Dove Spartz
DeLauro Kim (NJ) Stansbury
Evans LaHood Swalwell
Foster Landsman Titus
Frankel, Lois Loudermilk Torres (NY)
Frost Luetkemeyer Trone
Garamendi Magaziner Velazquez
Garbarino McClain Westerman
González-Colón McCormick Westernman
Green, Al (TX) Menendez Wilson (FL)

□ 1333

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas and Ms. SANCHEZ changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GROTHMAN and Mrs. PELTOLA changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted Aye on Roll Call No. 227.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted Aye on Roll Call No. 227.

Stated against:

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted NO on Roll Call No. 227.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I missed a recorded vote today. Had I been present, on Roll Call No. 227, Ogles Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 5403, CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act, I would have voted 'no'.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted NO on Roll Call No. 227.

Stated against:

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Chair, today I missed roll call vote 227. Had I been present, I would have voted NO on Roll Call No. 227.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MOONEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2, printed in part C of House Report 118-516, offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 193, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

AYES—206

Aderholt Gaetz Miller (IL)
Alford Garbarino Miller (OH)
Allen Garcia, Mike Miller (WV)
Armstrong Gimenez Miller-Meeks
Arrington Golden (ME) Mills
Babin Gonzales, Tony Molinaro
Baird Good (VA) Moolenaar
Balderson Gooden (TX) Mooney
Banks Gosar Moore (AL)
Barr Granger Moran
Bean (FL) Graves (LA) Moylan
Bentz Graves (MO) Nehls
Bergman Green (TN) Newhouse
Bice Greene (GA) Norman
Biggs Griffith Nunn (IA)
Bilirakis Grothman Obernolte
Bishop (NC) Guest Ogles
Bost Guthrie Owens
Buchanan Hageman Palmer
Bucshon Harris Peltola
Burchett Harshbarger Pence
Burgess Hern Perry
Burlison Higgins (LA) Pfluger
Carter (GA) Hill Posey
Carter (TX) Hunt Reschenthaler
Chavez-DeRemer Issa Rogers (AL)
Ciscomani Jackson (TX) Rogers (KY)
Cline James Rutherford
Cloud Johnson (SD) Scalise
Clyde Jordan Schweikert
Cole Joyce (OH) Scott, Austin
Collins Joyce (PA) Self
Comer Kean (NJ) Sessions
Crane Kelly (MS) Simpson
Crawford Kelly (PA) Smith (MO)
Crenshaw Kiggans (VA) Smith (NE)
Curtis Kiley Smith (NJ)
D'Esposito Kim (CA) Smucker
Davidson Kustoff Spartz
De La Cruz LaLota Stauber
DesJarlais LaMalfa Steel
Diaz-Balart Lamborn Stefanik
Donalds Langworthy Steil
Duarte Latta Steube
Duncan LaTurner Strong
Dunn (FL) Lawler Tenney
Edwards Lee (FL) Thompson (PA)
Ellzey Lesko Tiffany
Emmer Letlow Timmons
Estes Lucas Turner
Ezell Luna Valadao
Fallon Luttrell Van Drew
Feenstra Mace Van Dwyne
Ferguson Malliotakis Van Orden
Finstad Maloy Wagner
Fischbach Mann Walberg
Fitzgerald Massie Waltz
Fleischmann Mast Weber (TX)
Flood McCaul Webster (FL)
Foxy McClintock Wenstrup
Franklin, Scott McCormick Westerman
Fry McHenry Williams (NY)
Fulcher Meuser

Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack

Yakym
Zinke

NOES—193

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amo
Auchincloss
Bacon
Balint
Barragán
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)

Garcia (TX)
García, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas

Pascrell
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—36

Amodei
Beatty
Blumenauer
Boebert
Brecheen
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Cleaver
Evans
Frankel, Lois
González-Colón
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva

Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Kildee
Kim (NJ)
LaHood
Landsman
Lee (NV)
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Magaziner
McClain
Moore (UT)

Moore (WI)
Murphy
Ocasio-Cortez
Radewagen
Rodgers (WA)
Rose
Sablan
Sherman
Stansbury
Torres (NY)
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1337

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Chair, had I been
present, I would have voted Aye on Roll Call
No. 228.

Stated against:

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Chair, my vote was
not recorded today. Had it been recorded, I
would have voted No on Roll Call No. 228.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, had I been
present, I would have voted No on Roll Call
No. 228.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on amendment No. 3, printed in
part C of House Report 118–516, offered
by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DA-
VIDSON), on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 212, noes 195,
not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

AYES—212

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Benz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Coyne
Collins
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra

Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fox
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn

Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCauley
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Moylan
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obermolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Peltola
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert

Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil

Steube
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg

NOES—195

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amo
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
García, Robert
Goldman (NY)

Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell

Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Khanna
Kildee
Scholten
Schrier
Krishnamoorthi
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Amodei
Beatty
Blumenauer
Boebert
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Cleaver
Comer
Evans
Frankel, Lois

González-Colón
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Kim (NJ)
Landsman
Loudermilk
Magaziner
McClain

Miller (WV)
Moore (WI)
Murphy
Ocasio-Cortez
Radewagen
Sablan
Stansbury
Torres (NY)
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1341

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MORAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5403) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit the Federal reserve banks from offering certain products or services directly to an individual, to prohibit the use of central bank digital currency for monetary policy, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1243, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of H.R. 5403 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the motion to recommit H.R. 192; and

Passage of H.R. 192, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 192, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Bost	Collins
Alford	Brecheen	Comer
Allen	Buchanan	Crane
Amodoi	Bucshon	Crawford
Armstrong	Burchett	Crenshaw
Arrington	Burgess	Curtis
Babin	Burlison	D'Esposito
Bacon	Calvert	Davidson
Baird	Cammack	De La Cruz
Balderson	Carey	DesJarlais
Banks	Carl	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Carter (GA)	Donalds
Bean (FL)	Carter (TX)	Duarte
Bentz	Chavez-DeRemer	Duncan
Bergman	Ciscomani	Dunn (FL)
Bice	Cline	Edwards
Biggs	Clouse	Elizyey
Bilirakis	Clyde	Emmer
Bishop (NC)	Cole	Estes

Ezell	Kelly (PA)	Perry	Peters	Scholten	Thompson (MS)
Fallon	Kiggans (VA)	Pfluger	Pettersen	Schrier	Titus
Feenstra	Kiley	Posey	Phillips	Scott (VA)	Tlaib
Ferguson	Kim (CA)	Reschenthaler	Pingree	Scott, David	Tokuda
Finstad	Kustoff	Rodgers (WA)	Pocan	Sewell	Tonko
Fischbach	LaHood	Rogers (AL)	Porter	Sherman	Torres (CA)
Fitzgerald	LaLota	Rogers (KY)	Pressley	Sherrill	Trahan
Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa	Rose	Quigley	Slotkin	Trone
Fleischmann	Lamborn	Rosendale	Ramirez	Smith (WA)	Underwood
Flood	Langworthy	Rouzer	Raskin	Sorensen	Vargas
Foxx	Latta	Roy	Ross	Soto	Vasquez
Franklin, Scott	LaTurner	Rutherford	Ruiz	Spanberger	Veasey
Fry	Lawler	Salazar	Ruppersberger	Stanton	Wasserman
Fulcher	Lee (FL)	Scalise	Ryan	Stevens	Schultz
Gaetz	Lesko	Schweikert	Salinas	Strickland	Waters
Garbarino	Letlow	Scott, Austin	Sánchez	Suozi	Watson Coleman
Garcia, Mike	Lucas	Self	Sarbanes	Swalwell	Wexton
Jimenez	Luetkemeyer	Sessions	Scanlon	Sykes	Wild
Golden (ME)	Luna	Simpson	Schakowsky	Takano	Williams (GA)
Gonzales, Tony	Luttrell	Smith (MO)	Schiff	Thanedar	Wilson (FL)
Good (VA)	Mace	Smith (NE)	Schneider	Thompson (CA)	
Gooden (TX)	Malliotakis	Smith (NJ)			
Gosar	Maloy	Smucker			
Granger	Mann	Spartz			
Graves (LA)	Massie	Staubert			
Graves (MO)	Mast	Steel			
Green (TN)	McCauley	Stefanik			
Greene (GA)	McClintock	Steil			
Griffith	McCormick	Steube			
Grothman	McHenry	Strong			
Guest	Meuser	Tenney			
Guthrie	Miller (IL)	Thompson (PA)			
Hageman	Miller (OH)	Tiffany			
Harris	Miller (WV)	Timmons			
Harshbarger	Miller-Meeks	Turner			
Hern	Mills	Valadao			
Higgins (LA)	Molinaro	Van Drew			
Hill	Moolenaar	Van Dуйne			
Hinson	Mooney	Van Orden			
Houchin	Moore (AL)	Wagner			
Hudson	Moore (UT)	Walberg			
Huizenga	Moran	Waltz			
Hunt	Nehls	Weber (TX)			
Issa	Newhouse	Webster (FL)			
Jackson (TX)	Norman	Wenstrup			
James	Nunn (IA)	Westerman			
Johnson (LA)	Obermole	Williams (NY)			
Johnson (SD)	Ogles	Williams (TX)			
Jordan	Owens	Wilson (SC)			
Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Wittman			
Joyce (PA)	Peltola	Womack			
Kean (NJ)	Pence	Yakym			
Kelly (MS)	Perez	Zinke			

NOES—192

Adams	Davis (NC)	Kennedy
Aguilar	Dean (PA)	Khanna
Allred	DeGette	Kildee
Amo	DeLauro	Kilmer
Auchincloss	DelBene	Krishnamoorthi
Balint	Deluzio	Kuster
Barragan	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)
Bera	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Beyer	Doggett	Lee (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Escobar	Lee (NV)
Blunt Rochester	Eshoo	Lee (PA)
Bonamici	Espallat	Leger Fernandez
Bowman	Fletcher	Levin
Boyle (PA)	Foster	Lieu
Brown	Foushee	Lofgren
Brownley	Frost	Lynch
Budzinski	Gallego	Manning
Bush	Garamendi	Matsui
Caraveo	Garcia (IL)	McBath
Carbajal	Garcia (TX)	McClellan
Cárdenas	Garcia, Robert	McCollum
Carson	Goldman (NY)	McGarvey
Carter (LA)	Gomez	McGovern
Cartwright	Gonzalez,	Meeks
Casar	Vicente	Menendez
Case	Gottheimer	Meng
Casten	Harder (CA)	Mfume
Castor (FL)	Hayes	Morelle
Castro (TX)	Himes	Moskowitz
Chu	Horsford	Moulton
Houlihan	Hoyer	Mrvan
Huffman	Hoyle (OR)	Mullin
Ivey	Huffman	Nadler
Jackson (IL)	Conolly	Napolitano
Jacobs	Correa	Neal
Jayapal	Costa	Neguse
Jeffries	Courtney	Nickel
Johnson (GA)	Craig	Norcross
Kamlager-Dove	Crockett	Omar
Kaptur	Crow	Pallone
Keating	Cuellar	Panetta
Kelly (IL)	Davids (KS)	Pappas
	Davis (IL)	Pascrell
		Pelosi

Peters	Scholten	Thompson (MS)
Pettersen	Schrier	Titus
Phillips	Scott (VA)	Tlaib
Pingree	Scott, David	Tokuda
Pocan	Sewell	Tonko
Porter	Sherman	Torres (CA)
Pressley	Sherrill	Trahan
Quigley	Slotkin	Trone
Ramirez	Smith (WA)	Underwood
Raskin	Sorensen	Vargas
Ross	Soto	Vasquez
Ruiz	Spanberger	Veasey
Ruppersberger	Stanton	Wasserman
Ryan	Stevens	Schultz
Salinas	Strickland	Waters
Sánchez	Suozi	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Swalwell	Wexton
Scanlon	Sykes	Wild
Schakowsky	Takano	Williams (GA)
Schiff	Thanedar	Wilson (FL)
Schneider	Thompson (CA)	

NOT VOTING—22

Betty	Green, Al (TX)	McClain
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Moore (WI)
Boebert	Jackson (NC)	Murphy
Cherfilus-	Jackson Lee	Ocasio-Cortez
McCormick	Kim (NJ)	Stansbury
Cleaver	Landsman	Torres (NY)
Evans	Loudermilk	Velázquez
Frankel, Lois	Magaziner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1349

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 192) to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 212, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

YEAS—195

Adams	Bush	Connolly
Aguilar	Caraveo	Correa
Allred	Carbajal	Costa
Amo	Cárdenas	Courtney
Auchincloss	Carson	Craig
Balint	Carter (LA)	Crockett
Barragan	Cartwright	Crow
Bera	Casar	Cuellar
Beyer	Case	Davids (KS)
Bishop (GA)	Casten	Davis (IL)
Blunt Rochester	Castor (FL)	Davis (NC)
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Dean (PA)
Bowman	Chu	DeGette
Boyle (PA)	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Brown	Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Brownley	Clyburn	Deluzio
Budzinski	Cohen	DeSaulnier

Dingell Leger Fernandez Salinas
 Doggett Levin Sánchez
 Escobar Lieu Sarbanes
 Eshoo Lofgren Scanlon
 Espallat Lynch Schakowsky
 Fletcher Manning Schiff
 Foster Matsui Schneider
 Foushee McBath Scholten
 Frost McClellan Schrier
 Gallego McCollum Scott (VA)
 Garamendi McGarvey Scott, David
 Garcia (IL) McGovern Sewell
 Garcia (TX) Meeks Sherman
 Garcia, Robert Menendez Sherrill
 Golden (ME) Meng Slotkin
 Goldman (NY) Mfume Smith (WA)
 Gomez Morelle Sorensen
 Gonzalez, Moskowitz Soto
 Vicente Moulton Spanberger
 Gottheimer Mrvan Stanton
 Harder (CA) Mullin Stevens
 Hayes Nadler Strickland
 Himes Napolitano
 Horsford Neal Suozzi
 Houlihan Neguse Swalwell
 Hoyer Nickel Sykes
 Hoyle (OR) Norcross Takano
 Huffman Omar Thanedar
 Ivey Pallone Thompson (CA)
 Jackson (IL) Panetta Thompson (MS)
 Jacobs Pappas Titus
 Jayapal Pascrell Tlaib
 Jeffries Pelosi Tokuda
 Johnson (GA) Peltola Tonko
 Kamlager-Dove Perez Torres (CA)
 Kaptur Trahan
 Keating Pettersen Trone
 Kelly (IL) Phillips Underwood
 Kennedy Pingree Vargus
 Khanna Pocan Vasquez
 Kildee Porter Veasey
 Kilmer Pressley Wasserman
 Krishnamoorthi Quigley Schultz
 Kuster Ramirez Waters
 Larsen (WA) Raskin Watson Coleman
 Larson (CT) Ross Wexton
 Lee (CA) Ruiz Wild
 Lee (NV) Ruppertsberger Williams (GA)
 Lee (PA) Ryan Wilson (FL)

NAYS—212

Aderholt Diaz-Balart Hudson
 Alford Donalds Huizenga
 Allen Duarte Hunt
 Amodei Duncan Issa
 Armstrong Dunn (FL) Jackson (TX)
 Arrington Edwards James
 Babin Ellzey Johnson (LA)
 Bacon Emmer Johnson (SD)
 Baird Estes Jordan
 Balderson Ezell Joyce (OH)
 Banks Fallon Joyce (PA)
 Barr Feenstra Kean (NJ)
 Bean (FL) Ferguson Kelly (MS)
 Bentz Finstad Kelly (PA)
 Bergman Fischbach Kiggans (VA)
 Bice Fitzgerald Kiley
 Biggs Fitzpatrick Kim (CA)
 Bilirakis Fleischmann Kustoff
 Bishop (NC) Flood LaLota
 Bost Foxx LaMalfa
 Brecheen Franklin, Scott Lamborn
 Buchanan Fry Langworthy
 Bucshon Fulcher Latta
 Burchett Gaetz LaTurner
 Burgess Garbarino Lawler
 Burlison Garcia, Mike Lee (FL)
 Calvert Gimenez Lesko
 Cammack Gonzales, Tony Letlow
 Carey Good (VA) Lucas
 Carl Gooden (TX) Luetkemeyer
 Carter (GA) Gosar Luna
 Carter (TX) Granger Luttrell
 Chavez-DeRemer Graves (LA) Mace
 Ciscomani Graves (MO) Malliotakis
 Cline Green (TN) Maloy
 Cloud Greene (GA) Mann
 Clyde Griffith Massie
 Cole Grothman Mast
 Collins Guest McCaul
 Comer Guthrie McClintock
 Crane Hageman McCormick
 Crawford Harris McHenry
 Crenshaw Harshbarger Meuser
 Curtis Hern Miller (IL)
 D'Esposito Higgins (LA) Miller (OH)
 Davidson Hill Miller (WV)
 De La Cruz Hinson Miller-Meeks
 DesJarlais Houchin Mills

Molinaro Rosendale Thompson (PA)
 Moolenaar Rouzer Tiffany
 Mooney Roy Timmons
 Moore (AL) Rutherford Turner
 Moore (UT) Salazar Valadao
 Moran Scalise Van Drew
 Nehls Schweikert Van Dwyne
 Newhouse Scott, Austin Van Orden
 Norman Self Wagner
 Nunn (IA) Sessions Walberg
 Obernolte Simpson Waltz
 Ogles Smith (MO) Weber (TX)
 Owens Smith (NE) Webster (FL)
 Palmer Smith (NJ) Wenstrup
 Scholten Smucker Westerman
 Perry Spartz Williams (NY)
 Pfluger Stauber Williams (TX)
 Posey Steel Wilson (SC)
 Reschenthaler Stefanik Wittman
 Rodgers (WA) Steil Womack
 Rogers (AL) Steube Yakym
 Rogers (KY) Strong Zinke
 Rose Tenney

NOT VOTING—23

Green, Al (TX) Magaziner
 Grijalva McClain
 Jackson (NC) Moore (WI)
 Jackson Lee Murphy
 Kim (NJ) Ocasio-Cortez
 LaHood Stansbury
 Landsman Torres (NY)
 Loudermilk Velazquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remain-

□ 1356

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 262, noes 143, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

AYES—262

Aderholt Caraveo Dunn (FL)
 Alford Carey Edwards
 Allen Carl Ellzey
 Allred Carter (GA) Emmer
 Amodei Carter (TX) Eshoo
 Armstrong Cartwright Estes
 Arrington Castor (FL) Ezell
 Babin Chavez-DeRemer Feenstra
 Bacon Ciscomani Ferguson
 Baird Cline Finstad
 Balderson Cloud Fischbach
 Banks Clyde Fitzgerald
 Barr Cole Fitzpatrick
 Bean (FL) Comer Fleischmann
 Bentz Costa Flood
 Bergman Craig Foxx
 Bice Crane Franklin, Scott
 Biggs Crawford Fry
 Bilirakis Crenshaw Fulcher
 Bishop (GA) Cuellar Gaetz
 Bishop (NC) Curtis Gallego
 Bost D'Esposito Garbarino
 Boyle (PA) Davids (KS) Garcia, Mike
 Buchanan Davidson Gimenez
 Bucshon Davis (NC) Golden (ME)
 Budzinski De La Cruz Gonzales, Tony
 DesJarlais Burchett Gonzalez, Vicente
 Diaz-Balart Burgess Good (VA)
 Donalds Davidson Gooden (TX)
 Duarte Gosar

Gottheimer Lucas Roy
 Granger Luetkemeyer Rutherford
 Luna Ryan
 Graves (LA) Luttrell Salazar
 Graves (MO) Mace Salinas
 Green (TN) Mace Scalise
 Greene (GA) Malliotakis Maloy
 Griffith Maloy Schrier
 Grothman Mann Schweikert
 Guest Manning Scott, Austin
 Guthrie Massie Self
 Hageman Mast Sessions
 Harder (CA) McBath Sherrill
 Harris McCaul Simpson
 Harshbarger McClintock Slotkin
 Hern McCormick Smith (MO)
 Higgins (LA) McHenry Smith (NE)
 Hill Meuser Smith (NJ)
 Hinson Miller (IL) Smucker
 Horsford Miller (OH) Sorensen
 Houchin Miller (WV) Soto
 Houlihan Miller-Meeks Spanberger
 Hudson Mills Spartz
 Huizenga Molinaro Stanton
 Hunt Moolenaar Stauber
 Issa Mooney Steel
 Jackson (IL) Moore (AL) Stefanik
 Jackson (TX) Moore (UT) Steil
 James Moran Steube
 Johnson (LA) Moskowitz Strong
 Johnson (SD) Moulton Suozzi
 Jordan Mrvan Tenney
 Joyce (OH) Nehls Thompson (CA)
 Joyce (PA) Newhouse Thompson (PA)
 Kaptur Kuster
 Kean (NJ) Kaptur
 Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA)
 Kelly (PA) Kiggans (VA)
 Kiley
 Kilmer
 Kim (CA)
 Kuster
 Kustoff
 LaHood
 LaLota
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Langworthy
 Larsen (WA)
 Latta
 LaTurner
 Lawler
 Lee (FL)
 Lee (NV)
 Lesko
 Letlow
 Levin

NOES—143

Adams Doggett McGarvey
 Aguilar Escobar McGovern
 Amo Espallat Meeks
 Auchincloss Fletcher Menendez
 Balint Foster Meng
 Barragán Foushee Mfume
 Bera Frost Morelle
 Beyer Garamendi Mullin
 Blunt Rochester Garcia (IL) Nadler
 Bonamici Garcia (TX) Napolitano
 Bowman Garcia, Robert Neal
 Brown Goldman (NY) Neguse
 Brownley Gomez Norcross
 Bush Hayes Omar
 Carbajal Himes Pallone
 Cárdenas Hoyer Pascrell
 Carson Hoyle (OR) Pelosi
 Carter (LA) Huffman Peters
 Casar Ivey Pingree
 Case Jacobs Pocan
 Casten Jayapal Porter
 Castro (TX) Jeffries Pressley
 Chu Johnson (GA) Quigley
 Clark (MA) Kamlager-Dove Ramirez
 Clarke (NY) Keating Raskin
 Clyburn Kelly (IL) Ross
 Cohen Kennedy Ruiz
 Connolly Khanna Ruppertsberger
 Correa Kildee Sánchez
 Courtney Krishnamoorthi Sarbanes
 Crockett Larson (CT) Scanlon
 Crow Lee (CA) Schakowsky
 Davis (IL) Lee (PA) Schiff
 Dean (PA) Leger Fernandez Schneider
 DeGette Lieu Scholten
 DeLauro Lofgren Scott (VA)
 DelBene Lynch Scott, David
 Deluzio Matsui Sewell
 DeSaulnier McClellan Sherman
 Dingell McCollum Smith (WA)

Stevens	Tokuda	Wasserman
Strickland	Tonko	Schultz
Swalwell	Torres (CA)	Waters
Sykes	Trahan	Watson Coleman
Takano	Trone	Wexton
Thanedar	Underwood	Wild
Thompson (MS)	Vargas	Williams (GA)
Tlaib	Vasquez	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Beatty	Fallon	Magaziner
Blumenauer	Frankel, Lois	McClain
Boebert	Green, Al (TX)	Moore (WI)
Brecheen	Grijalva	Murphy
Cherfilus-	Jackson (NC)	Ocasio-Cortez
McCormick	Jackson Lee	Stansbury
Cleaver	Kim (NJ)	Torres (NY)
Collins	Landsman	Velázquez
Evans	Loudermilk	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1402

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia and to repeal the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on the House floor today, because this vote series conflicted with a family-related emergency outside of Washington, D.C. that required my presence. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 227, NAY on Roll Call No. 228, NAY on Roll Call No. 229, NAY on Roll Call No. 230, YEA on Roll Call No. 231, and NAY on Roll Call No. 232.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote today on Roll Call No. 227, Ogles Amendment No. 1, I would have voted "no." Had I been present for the vote on Roll Call No. 228, Mooney Amendment No. 2, I would have voted "no." Had I been present for the vote on Roll Call No. 229, Davidson Amendment No. 3, I would have voted "no." Had I been present for the vote on Roll Call No. 230, H.R. 5403, I would have voted "no." Had I been present for the vote on Roll Call No. 231, the Democratic Motion to Recommit on H.R. 192, I would have voted "aye." Had I been present for the vote on Roll Call No. 232, H.R. 192, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my votes due to a family conflict. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 227, YEA on Roll Call No. 228, YEA on Roll Call No. 229, YEA on Roll Call No. 230, NAY on Roll Call No. 231, and YEA on Roll Call No. 232.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend the vote series today, due to an unexpected absence. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 227, NAY on Roll Call No. 228, NAY on Roll Call No. 229, NAY on Roll Call No. 230, YEA on Roll Call No. 231, and NAY on Roll Call No. 232.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS PRIMARY SPONSOR OF H.R. 4105

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the primary sponsor of H.R. 4105, a bill originally introduced by Representative BUCK of Colorado, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS PRIMARY SPONSOR OF H.R. 895

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the primary sponsor of H.R. 895, a bill originally introduced by Representative BUCK of Colorado, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS PRIMARY SPONSOR OF H.R. 1402

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the primary sponsor of H.R. 1402, a bill originally introduced by Representative HIGGINS of New York, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 3498

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 3498, a bill originally introduced by Representative HIGGINS of New York, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 23, 2024.

I hereby designate the period from Thursday, May 23, 2024, through Sunday, June 2, 2024, as a "district work period" under section 3(z) of House Resolution 5.

MIKE JOHNSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MEXICO'S CONTINUED HARASSMENT OF VULCAN

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

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share my displeasure with the Mexican Government.

We have an Alabama-based company, Vulcan Materials, which has faced continuous harassment and intimidation from the Mexican Government since Mexico illegally invaded and shut down their operations 2 years ago.

The President of Mexico has unlawfully seized Vulcan's port, undermining trust in Mexico's commitment to foreign trade agreements.

If this is the way Mexico wants to do business with us, we should look long and hard at all our business dealings with them.

This jeopardizes the relationship when we should be prioritizing our strength in the Western Hemisphere and reducing our dependence on China.

I am working with the House Appropriations Committee to warn Mexico that if they continue ignoring the rule of law, then they will face consequences. Upholding the rule of law is essential for effective trade agreements. Violators, including Mexico, will be held accountable. We will investigate and potentially sanction any private citizens involved in this illegal scheme to prevent Vulcan from profiting from their land that was stolen.

CELEBRATING 100 YEARS AT MIKE LINNIG'S RESTAURANT

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

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 100 years of the legendary Mike Linnig's Restaurant in Louisville, Kentucky.

Mike Linnig's is a cultural institution. New York City has Katz's Deli. New Orleans has Cafe Du Monde. Louisville has Mike Linnig's.

It started as a simple roadside stand on a working farm along the Ohio River, offering fresh fruit, vegetables, and hospitality to those who stopped by.

Before long, Mike's Place started selling fried fish sandwiches. Through floods, world wars, and recessions, the Linnig family has never stopped. That modest roadside stand is now 20 acres that can accommodate 1,000 people from all walks of life with an appetite for getting together with friends and family over the best fried cod and onion rings in America.

I congratulate Mike's grandchildren, Bill, Theresa, and Nancy, who continue to run this beloved Louisville institution. Let's keep it going for another 100 years.

RECOGNIZING DEEJAY TED
"GUNNER" OUSLEY

(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, I would remind some of the Members in the back that it is crowded back there. There are a few more seats down front if they want to come down here.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize radio deejay Ted "Gunner" Ousley, who is retiring in June after a career that spanned six decades.

Gunner started his career at AM 1470 in Maryville, Tennessee, before working at 94.3 in Knoxville and the Hit Kicker 100.3 before moving to WIVK, or "WIVK" as we call it, 107.7, where he spent the last 28 years.

Gunner has interviewed some big names in country music over the years, like Jason Aldean, Blake Shelton, and Taylor Swift. Yes, she used to sing country music. When she was 15 years old, she did.

Gunner loved our veterans and troops and has used his job to help them however he can. Back in 2004, he spent 3 months with the 489th Special Operations in a combat zone of Iraq and started a weekly radio show called "Voices from the Front" that allowed troops to communicate with their families back home and was used by many troops all over the world through the years. He has also hosted the Veterans Day parade every year in Knoxville.

Gunner has also worked with other charities, like St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, Knoxville Area Rescue Mission, Alzheimer's Tennessee, and many others.

He is a man who truly loves his country and his community. He also became the first inductee into the Tennessee Radio Hall of Fame Career Class of 2024.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Gunner on a great career and wish him the best in retirement. I always remember him being good to my daddy, who was a World War II veteran.

IMPLEMENTING THE REPO ACT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a matter of profound importance: the implementation of the bipartisan and bicameral REPO Act.

This legislation, signed into law on April 24, grants the President the authority to seize Russian sovereign assets frozen in the United States and transfer them to Ukraine for its reconstruction.

As co-chair and cofounder of the Ukraine Caucus, I cannot overstate the urgency of this action.

Russia's illegal and unprovoked full-scale invasion of Ukraine demands a decisive response from the international community. By swiftly implementing the REPO Act, we can provide crucial support to Ukraine. REPO proceeds will demonstrate our unwavering commitment to Ukraine's sovereignty and efforts to rebuild once the war is over.

Let me commend the administration's efforts to collaborate with our G7 and European allies in this endeavor.

Together, we can establish an international compensation mechanism that leverages frozen Russian assets for Ukraine's benefit.

The time to act is now. Let us show the world America's resolve and stand resolute with Ukraine against Putin's aggression and tyranny.

□ 1415

IN MEMORY OF LUKE
RATHSCHMIDT

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

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, today I stand before you to honor the memory of Luke Rathschmidt, a dedicated veteran, community leader, and beloved father, who tragically passed away this past weekend.

Luke's sudden departure leaves a void in the hearts of all who knew him. Luke was the inspiration behind United for the Troops, a charity founded by his parents, Jim and Patty Rathschmidt, which sends care packages to our brave soldiers overseas. This initiative began with a simple act of love: A care package sent to Luke during his deployment with the U.S. Army.

His family's effort blossomed into a movement that has brought a touch of home to tens of thousands of our brave men and women abroad.

A revered member of the Mahopac community, Luke was also the commander of VFW Post 5491, where he was known for his leadership and being a pillar of support for fellow veterans. His commitment to service was paralleled only by his dedication to his family, including his two children, Jaelynn and Brandt, and the love of his life, Tracy.

Luke's legacy is in the lives he touched, the community he strengthened, and the country he served. We mourn his loss, but celebrate his incredible, impactful life.

I extend my deepest condolences to the Rathschmidt family and all who were fortunate enough to know Luke. He was truly larger than life, and his memory will indeed last a lifetime.

CONGRATULATING SELMA'S
ASHER HAVON ON WINNING
"THE VOICE" SEASON 25

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Selma's own Asher HaVon for winning season 25 of "The Voice." A native of my hometown of Selma, Alabama, Asher got his start singing in the church and even performed for President Obama during his visit for the 50th anniversary of the Selma and Montgomery march.

Throughout this season on "The Voice," Asher's outstanding vocal abilities have taken America by storm. His first-place win makes him not only the first Alabamian to win "The Voice," but also the first openly LGBTQ person to earn such a title.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the one and only Asher HaVon of Selma, Alabama, for his first-place finish as the winner of "The Voice."

We in Selma are so proud of you, and we can't wait to see everything that you will continue to achieve.

We are indeed Selma Strong.

MEXICAN GOVERNMENT'S INTER-
FERENCE IN OPERATIONS OF
VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY

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

Mr. STRONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding the Mexican Government's unprecedented interference in the lawful operation of Alabama-based Vulcan Materials Company.

Vulcan has maintained a presence in Quintana Roo, Mexico, since 1980, supporting thousands of American jobs and fostering both economic and infrastructure development in the U.S. and abroad.

This month marks the second year since the Mexican Government illegally invaded and shut down Vulcan's deep-water port in Mexico. Since then, Vulcan has faced increasing aggression and harassment by the Mexican Government, including President Lopez Obrador, threatening to unlawfully seize Vulcan's port and limestone quarry.

Mexico's actions not only jeopardize our bilateral relationship, but threaten U.S. jobs and infrastructure development. The Alabama delegation stands united behind Vulcan.

I call on the Mexican Government to immediately cease this brazen defiance of rule of law and end its unjust interference in the legitimate operations of American businesses.

HONORING JO ANNE BERNAL'S
CAREER IN SERVICE

(Ms. ESCOBAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor El Paso County Attorney, Jo Anne Bernal, a trailblazer and proud native El Pasoan whose unwavering dedication to public service has profoundly improved our community.

In November 2009, Ms. Bernal broke barriers as the first woman elected as county attorney in El Paso, marking a historic moment in local governance. Under her leadership, the County Attorney's office is a hub of legal expertise, protecting our community's values and interests.

Ms. Bernal's duties include representing and prosecuting juvenile offenses, addressing deceptive business practices, and aiding victims of domestic and sexual violence. She is a staunch advocate for victims' rights, prioritizing dignity and full legal support, including to undocumented individuals and the LGBTQIA+ community.

It is my privilege to recognize Ms. Bernal for her exemplary service, leadership, and dedication to our community, and I wish her and her family the best upon her retirement.

HONORING BRAVE MEN AND WOMEN WHO HAVE MADE THE ULTIMATE SACRIFICE

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

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day, we honor the brave men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice protecting our great country and preserving the freedoms we hold dear.

As Benjamin Franklin said: It is "... a Republic, if you can keep it." It has been kept for nearly 250 years, largely thanks to patriots who have sacrificed so much.

Let us renew our commitment to the ideals for which they fought. As Abraham Lincoln said: "We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

May we strive to build a Nation worthy of their sacrifice, where liberty and justice are more than words, but a reality. Their legacy will live on through our dedication to these principles.

On Memorial Day, we will be flying a flag to remember our Nation's heroes, but it is up to us, the people, to keep our flag flying, and we do this by continuing to strengthen our faith in America, our patriotism, our economy, and our national security.

May God bless America and those who have died protecting it.

JUSTICE SYSTEM

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court recently circulated guide-

lines to its employees that cautioned against anything "... that might signal a political display."

Those guidelines for employees are apparently lost on some of the Justices themselves, who fly upside-down American flags, display symbols of insurrection and Christian nationalism, and take gifts from political operatives. Supreme Court Justices should set the highest standard and avoid even the appearance of conflicts of interest.

Mr. Speaker, I am increasingly concerned about attacks on the American system of justice from the inside and out. As an attorney, I am bound by a code of ethics that states: "A lawyer should demonstrate respect for the legal system and for those who serve it, including judges, other lawyers, and public officials," which is why it is so shocking to see colleagues who have practiced law standing outside of the trial of the former President in an attempt to undermine those proceedings as they are going on.

They should know better, and they do know better, but loyalty to Donald Trump is apparently the only loyalty some attorneys serving in elected office adhere to these days. As Members of the House and members of the bar, we must do better.

HONORING 100 YEARS OF BORDER PATROL

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 100 years of the United States Border Patrol.

What began as a small unit of mounted watchmen has become one of our Nation's most important law enforcement agencies.

The Border Patrol is tasked with protecting the American people, securing our borders, and enhancing our Nation's economic prosperity. The mission has become increasingly more difficult because of the open-door policies enacted by this administration. While I condemn the policies that have led to the border crisis, I continue to stand with the frontline men and women of the United States Border Patrol.

These men and women place themselves in harm's way to stop the flow of illegal immigration and to stop human trafficking and drug trafficking into our country. These officers deserve our thanks, our support, and, most importantly, our prayers.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Mental Health Awareness Month, a time to reflect on the stark reality that more than one in five

adults in America live with a mental illness.

Adults aren't the only ones who struggle with their mental health. Children, teens, and young adults face unprecedented mental health challenges every day but are far less likely to get the support that they need. While mental health is important all year long, during May, we raise awareness, educate others, and remind those struggling: You are not alone.

I was proud to secure \$6 million in Federal funding for WakeMed's new Mental Health & Well-Being Hospital to improve access to mental healthcare in my community. Let's continue to fight for a future where every American has access to the resources that they need to live a healthy and fulfilling life.

JUSTICE ALITO

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

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the judicial code of conduct advises that a United States judge should uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary and avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.

Just days after January 6, the Alitos flew an upside-down American flag, an image that sickened me, an image that was adopted as a Stop the Steal emblem. The United States Flag Code states that an upside-down flag can be displayed only as a signal of dire distress and instances of extreme danger to life or property. Dire distress is not a political dispute and not a political fight with your neighbor.

Justice Alito has served on the bench for 18 years. He knows better. No matter why the Alitos flew our flag in this disrespectful way, Justice Alito has failed to avoid impropriety and even the appearance of impropriety itself.

I call on Justice Alito to recuse himself from all cases involving January 6 and the 2020 election.

This Justice knows better.

EXPANDING THE RIGHTS OF PASSENGERS WITH DISABILITIES

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, over 60 million Americans live with a disability, including many of our seniors and veterans. When they travel, these passengers deserve a safe and dignified flying experience, but I have heard all too often from constituents living with disabilities that their air travel experience can be anything but safe and dignified. Inaccessible restrooms and aircraft, damage to wheelchairs, or an absence of assistive devices can make air travel unpleasant or even impossible.

I was proud to vote for the bipartisan FAA Reauthorization Act, which expands the rights of passengers with disabilities and makes important strides for consumer protection and accessibility, including protections for powered wheelchairs, safer handling of assistive devices, new aircraft with accessibility standards, deadlines for DOT to investigate and respond to disability-related complaints, improved accessibility for airline mobile apps, and important updates to emergency medical kits on commercial planes.

Many of these measures are key provisions from the Air Carrier Access Amendments Act, which I have proudly fought to advance since coming to Congress and will continue working to include.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MS. FOUNDATION FOR WOMEN

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

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th anniversary of a trailblazing advocacy organization, the Ms. Foundation for Women. For a half century, the Ms. Foundation has been at the forefront of the fight for gender and racial equity in our country.

Since its founding in New York City by Gloria Steinem, Patricia Carbine, Letty Cottin Pogrebin, and Marlo Thomas, the Ms. Foundation has invested over \$90 million in 1,600 organizations fighting for equal justice worldwide. From working to end domestic violence to fighting for women's rights in the workplace and helping to lead the charge against the AIDS epidemic, the Ms. Foundation has always been at the forefront of critical national issues.

In the fight for reproductive justice and freedom alone following the disastrous Dobbs decision, the Ms. Foundation has distributed more than \$1 million in grants to organizations across the country to help vulnerable women and women of color access the healthcare they need.

For the past 50 years, the Ms. Foundation has been devoted to making the United States a more just place for all people, and I look forward to working alongside them for the next 50 years.

□ 1430

HOUSING CRISIS IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm on the housing crisis in the United States of America.

Over half of U.S. renters are paying more than 30 percent of their income in rent, and we have over 650,000 who are unhoused.

Here is what we need to do: Stop Wall Street from buying up single-family homes. I have a bill to end the corporate subsidies.

Second, cap rent so it doesn't go higher than inflation. The President can do this because many corporate landlords are reliant on financing from our Federal agencies.

Third, let's make sure that we build 7 million in new, affordable housing units.

Finally, let's make sure that those with prior criminal records aren't banned from public housing, and we have a tenant's bill of rights.

HONORING THE CAREER OF SENATOR LOU D'ALLESANDRO

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the career of a true New Hampshire original, the dean of our State Senate, Lou D'Allesandro.

Senator D'Allesandro, or Lou, as he is universally known, will be retiring from the New Hampshire State Senate after serving the people of District 20 for 26 years.

New Hampshire's working families and middle class have no greater champion than Lou D'Allesandro. The work he has done on their behalf to improve public education, to create jobs, and strengthen our economy will be felt for decades to come.

His legacy is as much the bills he has passed and the laws that bear his name as it is the generations of young men and women he has taught, coached, and mentored, leaving a lasting impression on them all.

In addition to being a lifelong public servant, Lou is an educator, a coach, and someone so dedicated to his family, including his amazing wife, Pat.

Lou's life work has made a tremendous difference on New Hampshire and all of its families and communities.

Mr. Speaker, I join all Granite Staters in thanking him for his years of service, and as he often says: I hope Lou D'Allesandro has a great, great American day.

HONORING NAVY SPECIAL WARFARE OPERATORS CHRISTOPHER J. CHAMBERS AND NATHAN G. INGRAM

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

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this Memorial Day weekend to honor Navy Special Warfare Operator 1st Class Christopher J. Chambers and Navy Special Warfare Operator 2nd Class Nathan Gage Ingram, who tragically died during a mission in the Arabian Sea on January 11 of this year.

I knew Chris personally. He was a native of Prince George's County, Maryland, and a beloved son of the Cheverly

community. He participated in the Boys and Girls Club and was a member of the Cheverly swim team.

Chris' presence as a leader impacted the lives of many, including my kids, while he coached them during their swim team participation.

He attended Bishop McNamara High School and graduated in 2009 from the University of Maryland, College Park.

Chris began his service in the United States Navy in 2012, graduating from SEAL training in 2014. A decorated servicemember, his awards include the Navy/Marine Corps Achievement Medal with Combat "C" and three Navy/Marine Corps Achievement Medals.

He is survived by his parents, Charles and Lois Chambers; his wife, Alyssa Chambers; and daughter, Kennedy Chambers.

Nathan Gage Ingram of Texas enlisted in the United States Navy in 2019 and went on to graduate from SEAL training in 2021.

As we approach this Memorial Day, let us pause to remember Chris, Nathan, and all brave servicemembers who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation. We thank them for their service, and our prayers are forever with their families and their loved ones.

CONDEMNING ANTI-SEMITISM AT U.S. UNIVERSITIES

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. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

CONGRATULATING MATTHEW GAPINSKI FOR 42 YEARS OF DEDICATED FEDERAL SERVICE

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Matthew Gapinski of Jacksonville, Florida, for his 42 years of dedicated Federal service to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and to our Nation.

He graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1984 and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Following graduation, he spent 8 years on Active-Duty assignments in Korea, North Carolina, and, Kevin, in your State, California.

He continued his service in the U.S. Army Reserves as commander of a company and served on Active Duty with the 350th Civil Affairs for Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003 and 2004. He retired from the Army Reserves in September 2008 at the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Matt graduated from Stanford University with his master's in environmental engineering and science and began his civilian career in 1994 working at the Presidio of San Francisco.

Following that role, he worked for the Army Corps at the San Francisco District in the planning division and then to the Savannah division as a project manager and eventually the Jacksonville District as a senior project manager.

Since 2007, Matt has been the executive assistant and congressional liaison for the Jacksonville District where he served as the main point of contact for all congressional inquiries related to the district's civil works and military programs.

I can tell you, in that role, he also supported Jacksonville District Commanders, the South Atlantic Division Commanders, Chief of Engineers, and the Assistant Secretaries of the Army for Civil Works in their annual testimony before Congress and in their written responses to inquiries from Congress.

During this time, Matt also served temporarily as the acting deputy commander of the Jacksonville District and chief of the Military, Interagency, and International branch.

Through his expert knowledge of the civil works process, Matt consistently provided timely and accurate information and service to the public, to Members of Congress and their staff, and really was just an amazing resource for all of us in northeast Florida.

Matt has received numerous awards in recognition of his outstanding efforts, including the Superior Civilian Service Medal and the Legion of Merit.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to join me today to thank Mr. Gapinski for his contributions to the Corps of Engineers, his local community, and the United States of America.

I sincerely wish Matt and his wife, Nina Kannatt, every success in the future and a very restful retirement.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for his words.

Today, the Education and the Workforce Committee held a hearing with the presidents of three universities: UCLA, Northwestern, and Rutgers.

At the hearing, I joined the Anti-Defamation League in calling for the resignation of at least one of them, but I will provide some reflection on what transpired today and what has transpired at several hearings that we have now had.

We have had the chance to hear testimony and question seven university presidents now, including Columbia, Penn, Harvard, and MIT. Two of those presidents, from Penn and from Harvard, have already resigned following the hearings.

What is striking about these hearings is just how difficult it is for these university presidents to answer in a straightforward way to the clearest questions of right and wrong. It is striking the way that they have been unable to take the most commonsense steps on their campuses to stop lawlessness and to curb this terrible rise in anti-Semitism.

When you look at the folks who testified today or, for that matter, any of

the seven presidents we have heard from, I don't think there is any of us who would suggest that these individuals are themselves anti-Semitic or prejudiced, and, yet, they seem to believe that appeasing anti-Semites, appeasing anti-Semitic constituencies on their campuses and thereby institutionalizing, normalizing, to use the word that the Anti-Defamation League does, anti-Semitism at their universities, they seem to believe that is what they have to do in order to keep their jobs.

This is, itself, a fundamental failure of leadership and a reason to doubt the fitness of any of these particular individuals to lead major universities, but it also speaks to the overarching challenges we now face in American higher education where they feel the need, these leaders of our top universities, to cater to the most bigoted and backward forces at the expense of their own students' safety, well-being, and education.

I think it is vitally important that the Education and the Workforce Committee continues to shine a light on the horrible things that are unfolding at American universities, while at the same time trying to direct our higher education system in the direction of badly needed reforms because we have seen how many longstanding problems have gotten us to this point.

Mr. Speaker, I will go into a little more detail about what transpired today. I asked each of the three university presidents, the president of Rutgers, the president of Northwestern, and the chancellor of UCLA, if physically blocking a student from entering their campus on the basis of the student's race, ethnicity, or religion is an expellable offense, and I was rather taken aback by the responses. Not one of them could give a simple "yes," that is, by its very nature, an expellable offense.

Instead, they said it depends upon the circumstances, the context, and so forth.

I found that to be a rather shocking response. I think the correct response would have been: Well, yes, of course. If the facts show that someone is physically blocking a student from entering campus, is using force to deny them access to our university that they are paying tuition to, and they are explicitly doing so in order to exclude people of that person's race, ethnicity, or religion, that is by its very nature something that would mean you should never be able to set foot on that campus again, any individual who would engage in such conduct. Yet, not one of them could give that response.

What is worse is this, of course, is not a hypothetical situation. It is something that we saw happen repeatedly at several campuses and, in particular, at UCLA.

I played a video clip for the chancellor that showed exactly this happening: A Jewish student with a Star of David who was trying to gain access to

his campus to go to class, who has his student ID card in his hand and a group of self-appointed enforcers lock arms and form a blockade to stop the student who tries to enter, who puts his hands in the air to show he means no harm, and they physically, by force, stop him from entering his own university.

I asked the chancellor of UCLA: Who are these people who formed these blockades? Are they students? He didn't know.

I asked: Have they been disciplined? He didn't know. It seems very clear that they got away with this absolutely monstrous conduct that should have no place in the United States of America.

To make things even worse, a member of the committee, the Representative from Minnesota, Congresswoman OMAR, actually tried to minimize what had happened.

In her questions, she suggested that this wasn't such a big deal because there are other pathways available to that student. Apparently it is okay to block people from moving about, their freedom of movement, based upon their Jewish identity if there are other places that they are allowed to walk. It is absolutely unbelievable.

UCLA's response to this situation was, of course, deeply problematic in a number of other ways. The situation there was allowed to build and build and build. The encampment got larger and larger and larger, and eventually things spiraled out of control until eventually the chancellor did the right thing and called upon law enforcement to come and enforce the rules for those who refused to leave.

□ 1445

It never should have gotten to that point. Indeed, we now know that the police chief had advised the university not to allow an encampment, yet UCLA allowed it anyway.

Chancellor Block claims that there is a systemwide UC policy that prevented them from moving more quickly. If this is so, the University of California needs to change its policy.

If it is really true that the university will not seek the assistance of law enforcement until violence actually manifests itself, that is a deeply problematic policy on a number of levels. Number one, it allows for the violence to happen until you actually do anything to protect students. Number two, it allows for all manner of other illegal activity to continue unabated so long as those engaging in it characterize their actions as a protest.

We saw all kinds of illegal activity in this anti-Semitic encampment at UCLA. We saw self-appointed students set up checkpoints, as I mentioned before, stopping Jewish students from being able to get to class.

The university did very little, it would seem, to stop this from happening. Indeed, the chancellor couldn't even tell me what happened to the students caught on video who were responsible.

This particular university leader, Chancellor Block, has served for 17 years and is retiring. He will not be at that university very soon. I would leave it to the judgment of the UC system to decide what the consequences for him, in particular, should be, with just a few months remaining in his tenure.

I will say there is news just today that a new encampment has started at UCLA, and I would suggest that the chancellor needs to learn from what just happened and make sure that that is taken care of in short order.

Generally, I don't think it is my role to be deciding which university leaders should stay and which should go. Ideally, that would be decided upon using the appropriate channels and that when you have clearly fireable conduct, the board of regents, the governance boards, would take appropriate action.

Where I would draw the line on a broad level, on a general level, and say that anyone who crosses that line is unfit to lead a university is the line that was drawn by the Anti-Defamation League as well as the Brandeis Institute and others in the specific case of the president of Northwestern, who also testified today.

What was different about what happened at Northwestern from some other universities—and I believe Northwestern was the first prominent university to do this—is that the university president actually ended the encampment by giving the lawless members of that encampment what they wanted. He agreed to their demands. I want to go through in detail, just to have it on the record, what those demands were.

First, I will read you the statement from the Anti-Defamation League as well as the Brandeis Center and StandWithUs.

It says as follows: "As the three leading organizations in the United States holding colleges and universities accountable for creating hostile environments for Jewish students, we are shocked and dismayed by the agreement Northwestern University President Michael Schill reached on behalf of Northwestern University with encampment protesters yesterday.

"For the last 7 months, and longer, Jewish Northwestern students have been harassed and intimidated by blatant anti-Semitism on campus, worsening since October 7."

Yesterday, at the time this was written, "President Schill signed an agreement with the perpetrators of that harassment and intimidation, rewarding them for their hate.

"For days, protesters openly mocked and violated Northwestern's codes of conduct and policies by erecting an encampment in which they fanned the flames of anti-Semitism and wreaked havoc on the entire university community. Their goal was not to find peace but to make Jewish students feel unsafe on campus. Rather than hold them

accountable, as he pledged he would, President Schill gave them a seat at the table and normalized their hatred against Jewish students.

"It is clear from President Schill's actions that he is unfit to lead Northwestern and must resign. President Schill capitulated to hatred and bigotry and empowered and emboldened those who have used intimidation, harassment, and violence to achieve their ends. Instead of issuing fines and suspensions in accordance with university policies, he awarded protest groups with scholarships, professorships, and a renovated community home. Instead of permanently shutting down the encampment and making the campus safe for all, he told protesters they can stay until June 1. Instead of reaffirming a longstanding university policy rejecting the anti-Semitic boycott, divestment, and sanctions campaign, he created new pathways to its implementation. And instead of holding the perpetrators accountable, he committed Northwestern to actively defend, protect, and shield students from anyone else, such as potential future employers who may choose to hold the protesters accountable for their harassing and discriminatory conduct."

The statement concludes: "A prestigious institution that is supposed to be preparing our students for the future catastrophically failed to teach responsibility, respect for community values, and the fundamental principle that no one is above the law regardless of how deeply or passionately they believe in their own cause."

They reiterate: "We call on President Schill to resign immediately and trust that if he fails to resign, the Board of Trustees will step in as the leaders the university needs and remove him."

That statement was issued a couple of weeks ago—of course, before the testimony that we heard today. President Schill still has not resigned, and the board of regents still has not removed him. It can only be concluded that the board of regents is endorsing the institutionalization and normalization of anti-Semitism that President Schill is responsible for by appeasing these demands.

There is the substance of the demands, which are deeply rooted in anti-Semitism, and then there is also the means by which they were achieved, those means being force. This is what I found particularly upsetting about the agreement reached by this president, President Schill of Northwestern, as well as President Holloway of Rutgers: They congratulated themselves for it. They said this was the way to negotiate a peaceful resolution. As a matter of fact, the exact words of the president were that they negotiated with their students through dialogue rather than force, engaging our students with dialogue rather than force.

Every part of that statement is utterly preposterous. First of all, a lot of them weren't students. I believe he even admitted to that. Second of all,

this was not dialogue. The president, for one thing, did not even consult with his own anti-Semitism committee to ask if they were okay with this agreement. In fact, six members of that committee resigned after he reached the agreement with the encampment.

When he was asked at the hearing today if he had consulted with Jewish students, he said that was impractical. What an utterly preposterous statement. He decides to change university policy in response to the demands of an anti-Semitic encampment, and he says it is impractical to even consult with Jewish students.

Engaging our students with dialogue rather than force—it wasn't just students. It was not dialogue; it was one-sided. The entire negotiation, as it was, was predicated on force. The only reason he talked to them at all is because they set up an illegal encampment that was used to terrorize students, and they refused to leave when they were ordered to.

What precedent does that set? What incentive does that set for others who want to achieve their objectives, even if they are unobjectionable objectives, that the way to get what you want on this campus is to use force, defy the rules, defy the law, refuse to leave when you are told to, to try to be as disruptive as possible?

What is worse is that after Northwestern University's president did this, we have seen this chain reaction where other universities are doing the same thing, one of which is Rutgers, whose president, President Holloway, was with us today. He reached a similar agreement. He said something similar. He said: "We engaged students in a conversation that led to a peaceful resolution"—again, an utterly preposterous statement.

The entire negotiation was predicated on force. It was not a conversation. It was a one-sided agreement with only those who are willing to resort to the use of force in order to get their way.

I was glad to hear today, by the way—it was confirmed by President Holloway—that he is no longer under consideration to be the next president of Yale University, of which I am an alum. There are many of us who are deeply concerned about the message it would send if Yale, which has had many of its own problems when it comes to anti-Semitism on campus, accepted as its new president someone who was just responsible for institutionalizing anti-Semitism at his own university.

There have been others as well throughout the country, several of which are in my State of California. There has been one instance, at least, where there has been accountability.

The president of Sonoma State, after reaching an agreement with the encampment there with a number of deeply anti-Semitic provisions like cutting off study abroad to Israel and even scrubbing university materials of

any reference to Israel, and then even appointing the encampment as a permanent governing council to enforce that agreement, that university leader was placed on leave and has now resigned. That was the right thing for the leader of the California State University system to do.

However, there are other campuses in California, in the CSU and UC systems, that have reached similar capitulation agreements with the lawless encampments on their campuses and who have followed this same script of rewarding the use of force, of institutionalizing and normalizing anti-Semitism, of setting a precedent that the way to get your way on their campuses is to break the rules, break the law, refuse to do what you are asked to do. They all need to face discipline, as well.

There were a number of other remarkable statements at today's hearing with the three university presidents, though, of UCLA, Rutgers, and of course Northwestern. In particular, the president of Northwestern said that he will not be commenting on the speech of their students, faculty, or staff, a completely preposterous statement.

This individual has commented on all manner of political issues. I was able to find a number of examples just googling on my phone as he said it. The idea that he wouldn't call out, fire, or condemn a high-ranking university official who makes overtly racist statements absolutely defies belief.

Incredibly, when asked by my colleague BURGESS OWENS if he would have dealt with a KKK demonstration in the same manner, he said he would not engage in a hypothetical, refusing to even condemn this most offensive of speech—or more than speech, of course, when we are dealing with the conduct that we have seen play out on these campuses.

The president also said—and the president I am referring to is President Schill of Northwestern—that a police option on that campus was not possible. This is how he justifies appeasing the demands of the encampment rather than enforcing the law.

I find it quite difficult to believe that there couldn't have been a sufficient police response coordinating with local law enforcement to ensure that those who were in the encampment left.

□ 1500

It is absolutely hypocritical when you look at the record of this president, President Schill, who actually reduced police and defunded police when he was the president of the University of Oregon.

The committee, I know, is committed to continuing this investigation of anti-Semitism across American higher education, but it is also important to understand the need for broad reform in higher education based upon what we have learned.

There have been some encouraging signs lately. We saw, for example, MIT

just recently said it is no longer going to require so-called diversity statements in the faculty hiring process. Even the Washington Post came out with an op-ed opposing the use of these diversity statements in hiring.

I think our work is only just beginning. The hearings that we have seen so far have been deeply disturbing.

It is highly important that we continue them and that we continue to keep an eye on every university that is failing to adequately address anti-Semitism in order to protect the students, to protect their safety, and to protect their right to an education.

We also need to think about fundamental reform when it comes to academic freedom, when it comes to free speech, when it comes to faculty hiring, and when it comes to so many of the other issues related to even the value of a higher education degree in America today.

I truly believe this can be a turning point. America's universities have long been national assets that have helped us to become the greatest country in the world, the greatest economy in the world, the leader in innovation on all fronts, and that is now in danger.

I look forward to continuing to work with the committee and colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We had a number of colleagues across the aisle who asked very good questions and expressed appropriate concerns today, as well.

I look forward to working together to reclaim our universities as national assets rather than the liabilities that they have increasingly become.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a concerning situation in the world of artificial intelligence that has developed over the last couple of weeks following the release of OpenAI's newest ChatGPT model, which has demonstrated some truly breathtaking, amazing features and capabilities that are going to have wide-ranging applications that I think we are only just beginning to understand.

After that release, there has been an exodus from the company of employees who are there to focus on issues related to safety. The reason for this was stated by Jan Leike, who is the leader of the team at OpenAI responsible for safety and alignment issues.

This is what Jan Leike said: "I joined because I thought OpenAI would be the best place in the world to do this research. However, I have been disagreeing with OpenAI leadership about the company's core priorities for quite some time, until we finally reached a breaking point."

I believe much more of our bandwidth should be spent getting ready for the next generation of models on security, monitoring, preparedness, safety, adversarial robustness, superalignment, confidentiality, societal impact, and related topics. These problems are quite hard to get right, and I am concerned we aren't on a trajectory to get there.

Jan writes: "Over the past few months, my team has been sailing against the wind. Sometimes we were struggling for compute, and it was getting harder and harder to get this crucial research done. Building smarter-than-human machines is an inherently dangerous endeavor. OpenAI is shouldering an enormous responsibility on behalf of all humanity. But over the past few years, safety culture and processes have taken a back seat to shiny products. We are long overdue in getting incredibly serious about the implications of AGI," meaning artificial general intelligence. "We must prioritize preparing for them as best we can."

This is what the outgoing leader of safety and alignment issues at OpenAI recently said on Twitter, on X.

I am not intending to criticize OpenAI. I have no basis to assess the veracity of the claims that were just read. I, like everyone else, have been truly dazzled by what the company has been able to accomplish.

I think that this exodus of safety employees and this particular testimonial for the person leading the alignment team should be a wake-up call for many of us who have perhaps not been giving this issue of safety and alignment in the development of artificial intelligence the attention that it deserves.

In fact, I don't know if there has ever been a time where the consequences, the stakes, of a particular issue are so wildly disproportionate to the small level of attention that is being paid to it.

The basic issue here is that as AI systems become more advanced, as their capabilities become more sophisticated, the risks are heightened as well when it comes to many things—when it comes to privacy, when it comes to confidentiality, when it comes to potential misuses, which are limitless, and when it comes to the alignment of those capabilities with the well-being of the machine's creator, with the well-being of humanity.

This is an issue that the company has been focusing on at OpenAI. They have, of course, this whole team there.

There has been some discussion about what percentage of their overall compute has been dedicated to it. If you believe the testimony here, it is less and less, but the company itself, as well as perhaps to a greater degree other leading AI companies, understand this to be an extremely important issue, especially as these models scale up and become more sophisticated and new capabilities emerge, sometimes perhaps in an unsophisticated way.

The important thing that has been understood by many is that we need to make sure our ability, our sophistication in aligning those systems with our own objectives, proceeds in a way that is commensurate to the sophistication of their capabilities.

I am concerned that that is no longer the case, that perhaps things are developing more quickly on the capabilities end than on the safety end.

I think the wake-up call that we need to take from what has happened at OpenAI is that we simply can't rely on any particular company, or even all of them collectively, to prioritize safety to the extent that is needed.

I do think there is some role for us here in Congress to catalyze safety research and to try to ensure the proper incentives for companies to invest in safety as much as they are investing in product development and other things.

There are some States, and perhaps even some folks here, who are already hamstringing this new technology, that would stand in the way of developing more advanced models. Personally, I think that is the wrong approach for a number of reasons.

First of all, it is not at all clear that it is going to actually be successful in limiting the development of these technologies, and if it is, it would only apply to us here in the U.S. in our jurisdiction whereas our potential adversaries in other countries could continue to develop this technology unabated and in a way that poses a risk to the United States, our competitiveness, and our national security.

Moreover, to try to block the further development of AI will limit the manifold benefits that are now appearing before us, which are limitless.

As these models become more and more advanced, so, too, do their applications in the fields of medicine, in the fields of transportation, and, basically, in any field that you can think of.

We have seen applications already, and these applications are only going to become greater and greater and have enormous potential to save lives, to extend lives, and to enhance the quality of life.

The position, from a humanist point of view, should be one of not trying to hold the development of that potential back but, rather, trying to ensure that it proceeds in a manner that unlocks the benefits while mitigating the risks.

Those risks will, perhaps, become most pronounced as we work toward what is commonly called AGI, which was referenced in that series of tweets, artificial general intelligence.

There is a lot of debate on this topic among people who know a lot more about it than I do, but there are many who believe that it is not that far away, that it is much closer than we might have thought even a few years ago—that is, the creation of an AI system that has the capacity to outperform human intelligence across multiple domains or across all domains.

What is more, once AGI is achieved, if, indeed, it is achieved, then the capabilities could well accelerate in a very rapid manner from there on out.

That is why many who focus on issues related to AI safety have ur-

gently emphasized the need to get the safety question right before that threshold is crossed.

Indeed, when Sam Altman, the CEO of OpenAI, was here last year, I asked him straight up how close they were to developing AGI. He basically said they were one big breakthrough away. That was a while ago.

I don't think anyone really knows how close we are or what that will look like, but I think there is an urgent need to prepare for that day by doing everything we possibly can to ensure that as capabilities develop in an unpredictable way, we have done the groundwork to make sure that those capabilities are aligned to our objectives, serve human purposes, and don't have the potential to serve other purposes or to misinterpret their commands in a way that has grave consequences.

I have introduced a bill, a bipartisan bill, that I think is a modest proposal that will help us get there. It will have the National Institutes of Health create a grant program that will fund basic research into AI safety. I think that is something that would be helpful, that would be a start.

In fact, I ran the idea by the CEO of OpenAI itself, Sam Altman. He thought it was a good idea. I think that it would help us get moving in the right direction, but I think it is also important at the same time that we make sure that the companies themselves have the right incentives to prioritize safety and alignment in the way that is needed.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We also have an AI task force being led by my colleague from California JAY OBERNOLTE, who has done some tremendous work in this area.

I think it is urgently important that we begin to think about our role in ensuring that artificial intelligence ushers in the best possible future while mitigating the risks that are in front of us.

□ 1515

RECOGNIZING FOLSOM POLICE DEPARTMENT'S
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to recognize some truly outstanding individuals from my district.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to include the members of the Folsom Police Department's Special Investigations Unit for the Police Honor Roll. The SIU team consists of one sergeant, Sergeant Brandon Monsoor, and three detectives, Detective William Maslak, Detective Justin Cain, and Detective Andrew Graham, whose responsibilities include narcotics prevention and weapons enforcement along with fugitive apprehension. I believe that their work surrounding fentanyl poisonings throughout the last year is truly worthy of recognition.

Along with several other areas of this country, the city of Folsom has seen an

increase in fentanyl-related deaths. These tragedies are the direct result of individuals who carelessly furnish this product to often unsuspecting customers on the illicit drug market.

In early 2023, the SIU team decided to address this issue by developing criminal homicide cases against drug dealers that knowingly sold this dangerous product. This was no small task, as these types of cases had never been attempted or prosecuted in Sacramento County. They began by coordinating with the Sacramento district attorney's office to determine the type of evidence that would be required to bring this type of case to conclusion. These cases are inherently difficult to prosecute. They require swift and relentless action by detectives upon notification of an overdose, a significant amount of digital evidence, and out-of-the-box investigation techniques.

In July 2023, SIU detectives were notified of a potential fentanyl poisoning within the city of Folsom. The victim was a 24-year-old female who recently moved to the area to begin work as a preschool teacher. The detectives worked all night to eventually identify her supplier, develop probable cause to arrest him for homicide, and coordinate with the district attorney's office. Approximately 48 hours later, her supplier was arrested for murder, the first case of its kind within Sacramento County.

Since that first case, the SIU team has successfully arrested three other individuals for manslaughter or homicide after knowingly supplying this dangerous drug to their customers. They remain the only investigative unit in our region to bring this type of case to the Sacramento district attorney.

The Special Investigations Unit has truly distinguished itself and had an incredible impact on the community we serve. I believe they have very much earned the right to be recognized on the Third District Police Honor Roll.

RECOGNIZING REBEKAH PEREZ

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Rebekah Perez, an English teacher at Loyalton High School in Loyalton, California. Rebekah is a remarkable and gifted educator who enriches the lives of her students and her community alike.

Before accepting her position at her hometown high school 8 years ago, Rebekah taught in title I schools in southern California for 5 years. Rebekah is one of those teachers who changes lives for the better. Her advanced placement students have scored in record-passing rates at Loyalton High School.

As a former educator, I understand the essential role that a teacher plays in the lives of their students, and Rebekah has high expectations for her students. She provides excellent support to ensure they can meet those expectations.

Knowing that reading literature and participating in thoughtful discussions

are essential for rural students to get a glimpse and understanding of the bigger world, its diverse cultures and complexity drives Rebekah's work.

Active in her community, she serves on the board of her church and as a 4-H project leader. Her big laugh and huge smile makes students, colleagues, and parents alike feel like they have come home and are deeply cared for. Rebekah's positive leadership at Loyaltan is reflected in a sign she has made for her classroom. I love this. It says: "Get excited, people."

Whether teaching English, providing academic advisement, leading the accreditation process, serving as a senior class adviser, or coaching young people, Rebekah brings infectious, joy-filled excitement to all those around her.

Loyaltan High School shines so bright because of her great work, and we are forever grateful that she has chosen to teach at Loyaltan High School.

Therefore, in honor of her passion, dedication, and her commitment to her students' success, it is my privilege to recognize Rebekah Perez as the truly outstanding teacher that she is.

RECOGNIZING ELAINA STOLL

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a moment to recognize the outstanding and prominent educators of California's Third Congressional District.

I will briefly highlight a teacher from the Bishop Unified School District, Elaina Stoll, who has dedicated 34 years of her career to educating the students of her community.

Ms. Stoll graduated from Bishop Union High School in 1983 and then returned in 1990 to serve and spend two decades as a primary teacher. She later became a reading specialist for Bishop Unified and continued to further her education by obtaining her master's degree in education administration with an emphasis in reading.

Ms. Stoll has worked tirelessly on strengthening Bishop's Reading Intervention Program, implementing phonics-based small group instructional strategies, and creating systemic improvements across the grade spans.

She approaches her work pertaining to students with high levels of enthusiasm and love and strives to meet best practice standards. She is known for her unique ability to motivate others to meet the high standards set by her performance.

I commend Ms. Stoll for her exceptional dedication to education and to promoting student success and academic achievement.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am pleased to recognize Ms. Elaina Stoll for her significant contributions to the Bishop Unified School District and to the students of the Bishop community.

RECOGNIZING ELIZABETH ISAACS

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I will take a moment to recognize Ms. Elizabeth

Isaacs, a kindergarten teacher in the Folsom Cordova Unified School District at Oak Chan Elementary School.

Ms. Isaacs teaches kindergarten at Oak Chan and has been employed there since 2015. However, her experience goes back 19 years.

Ms. Isaacs' mission is to make the world a better place, and she finds herself continuously motivated by the positive impact she has on her students' lives.

Ms. Isaacs teaches in innovative ways to keep her students motivated and engaged and is passionate about instilling her students with the knowledge and tenacity that is needed to help each child reach their full potential.

Just the idea that she is contributing toward this development of her students brings her great joy and satisfaction.

Ms. Isaacs' students and the opportunity to teach kindergarten have contributed to her unwavering commitment to education. Every day, she comes to class feeling cherished, challenged, and fulfilled.

Growing up, Ms. Isaacs learned how education has the power to affect meaningful change in the world. Even as a child, she enjoyed playing school with her siblings, where she took on the role, of course, as the teacher.

Both of her parents were educators, and she grew up helping set up bulletin boards in her mother's classroom at White Rock Elementary in the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. Additionally, she appreciated being able to observe her father's lectures as a professor at the McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento.

It is a true honor to represent exemplary teachers such as Ms. Elizabeth Isaacs in the United States Congress. Therefore, in honor of her passion, dedication, and belief in the transformative power of education, in honor of her commitment to her students' success, it is my privilege to recognize Ms. Elizabeth Isaacs as the outstanding teacher that she is.

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

RECOGNIZING LEE GREENWOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. STRONG) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. STRONG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his Special Order. The gentleman I am soon to recognize was raised in his district in California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true American patriot, Grammy Award winner Lee Greenwood.

May 21 marked the 40th anniversary of his song "God Bless the USA." This song has withstood the test of time and remains an anthem for Americans to proudly express their love of God and country.

"God Bless the USA" is one of the most recognizable, patriotic songs in America, uniting people both in times of celebration, like the Fourth of July, and during some of our Nation's darkest hours, like 9/11.

Lee wrote "God Bless the USA" in 1983 and published it in 1984. Lee Greenwood has performed "God Bless the USA" for 10 American Presidents and traveled on 20 USO tours.

Not only is he a tireless entertainer, doing more than 160 concerts this year, but he also cares deeply about his family. He cares about America, our military, and our veterans. He is a supporter of Helping a Hero and has been a part of hundreds of welcome-home ceremonies for our brave and courageous wounded warriors.

I thank Grammy Award winner Lee Greenwood for his contribution to this great Nation.

I end by saying: God bless the USA.

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

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2024 AT PAGE H3413

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Furnaces".

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of S. Con. Res. 34 (118th Congress), the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

The Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER).

The Senator from Minnesota (Mrs. KLOBUCHAR).

The Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 115-123, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader of the Senate, reappoints the following individual as member of the Commission on Social Impact Partnership:

Carol B. Kellermann of New York (For a two year term beginning June 6, 2024).

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(z) of House Resolution 5, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 24, 2024, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

EC-4302. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Discrimination Financial Assistance Program Application; to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-4303. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazard Communication Standard [Docket No.: OSHA-2019-0001] (RIN: 1218-AC93) received May 21, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-4304. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Annual Report to Congress: Qualifying Payment Amount Audits, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 300gg-111(a)(2)(A)(iii); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title XXVII, Sec. 2799A-1(a)(2)(A)(iii) (as added by Public Law 116-260, div. BB, title I, Sec. 102(a)(1)); (134 Stat. 2761); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4305. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Federal Energy Management Program, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Clean Energy for New Federal Buildings and Major Renovations of Federal Buildings [EERE-2010-BT-STD-0031] (RIN: 1904-AB96) 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-4306. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 23-071; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4307. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Appellate Jurisdiction Update received May 22, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4308. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0029; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-01182-T; Amendment 39-22741; AD 2024-08-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 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-4309. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1817; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00664-T; Amendment 39-22732; AD 2024-07-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 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-4310. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes

[Docket No.: FAA-2024-0222; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-01072-T; Amendment 39-22735; AD 2024-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 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-4311. A letter from the Attorney-Adviser, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Certification of Dispatchers (RIN: 2130-AC91) received May 21, 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 7630. A bill to require a plan to improve the cybersecurity and telecommunications of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-521. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 7685. A bill to strengthen and enhance the competitiveness of American industry through the research and development of advanced technologies to improve the efficiency of cement, concrete, and asphalt production, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services, H.R. 555. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to ensure the supply of certain medical materials essential to national defense, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services, H.R. 1166. A bill to enhance authorities under the Defense Production Act of 1950 to respond to the public health emergencies, to provide additional oversight of such authorities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H.R. 8516. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 840 Front Street in Casselton, North Dakota, as the "Commander Delbert Austin Olson Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 8517. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land in Arizona to La Paz County, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SELF, Mr. PALMER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 8518. A bill to require that the prevailing wage utilized for purposes of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United

States Code (commonly referred to as the Davis-Bacon Act), be determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. FINSTAD, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. OGLES, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROY, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 8519. A bill to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of Federal funds for disinformation research grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 8520. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to implement the Climate Ready Tribes Initiative; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 8521. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Joan Trumpauer Mulholland in recognition of her unique and substantial contributions to American life through her life-long commitment to social justice and equality for all citizens, exhibited both through direct action, at great personal risk, and through ongoing educational activities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BICE (for herself and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 8522. A bill to improve connections between the Department of Agriculture and national and homeland security agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 8523. A bill to require Transmission Organizations to allow bids from aggregators of certain retail customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LIEU, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 8524. A bill to effectively staff the high-need public elementary schools and secondary schools of the United States with school-based mental health services providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LIEU, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CORREA, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCANLON, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ROSS, Mr. IVEY, Ms. BALINT, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. AMO, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASAR, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-

MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELUZZIO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MANNING, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 8525. A bill to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. SALINAS):

H.R. 8526. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide criteria for use of Federal funds to support trauma-informed practices in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York):

H.R. 8527. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Climate Justice Working Group to help guide the Nation's just and equitable transition towards a clean, climate-resilient, zero-emission economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. D'ESPOSITO:

H.R. 8528. A bill to increase the criminal penalties for assaulting a Bureau of Prisons correctional officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 8529. A bill to authorize assistance to train and retain obstetrician-gynecologists and sub-specialists in urogynecology and to help improve the quality of care to meet the health care needs of women in least developed countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EZELL:

H.R. 8530. A bill to require Facility Security Committees to respond to security recommendations issued by the Federal Protective Service relating to facility security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 8531. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to promulgate regulations relating to the disclosure of certain commercial data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. LETLOW):

H.R. 8532. A bill to identify and address barriers to coverage of remote physiologic devices under State Medicaid programs to improve maternal and child health outcomes for pregnant and postpartum women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FROST (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. DELUZZIO, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 8533. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall update the regulations to issue regulations to phase out the use of bleed air systems in certain aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BURLINSON, Mr. OGLES, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 8534. A bill to prohibit a student athlete from being considered an employee of an institution, a conference, or an association based on participation in certain intercollegiate athletics; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. HOUCHIN:

H.R. 8535. A bill to establish the Benjamin Harrison National Recreation Area and Wilderness in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JACKSON LEE,

Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BALINT, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. TLAB):

H.R. 8536. A bill to establish the Office of the Ombudsperson for Immigrant Children in Immigration Custody, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 8537. A bill to require a study on public health impacts as a consequence of the February 3, 2023, train derailment in East Palestine, Ohio; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself and Mrs. BICE):

H.R. 8538. A bill to establish an inter-agency committee to coordinate activities of the Federal Government relating to biotechnology oversight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself and Mrs. BICE):

H.R. 8539. A bill to establish the Office of Biotechnology Policy in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KUSTOFF (for himself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. TENNEY, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 8540. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the employer-provided child care credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LUNA:

H.R. 8541. A bill to amend the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act to provide for criminal penalties for acquiring a wild free-roaming horse or burro with the intention of transferring such animal for processing into commercial products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 8542. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Joseph B. Kirsner, in recognition of his service to the United States during World War II and his contributions to the medical field, particularly gastroenterology; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. BUCHSON, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. MOLINARO, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 8543. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Public Health Service Act to permanently authorize certified community behavioral health clinics, and for other purposes; 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. MORELLE (for himself and Ms. PEREZ):

H.R. 8544. A bill to require original equipment manufacturers of digital electronic equipment to make available certain documentation, diagnostic, and repair information to independent repair providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. ROSS, Ms. MANNING, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. HUNT):

H.R. 8545. A bill to amend the Camp Lejeune Justice Act of 2022 to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 8546. A bill to require the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration to take certain actions to improve the processing of claims and appeals for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 8547. A bill to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a universal design standards certification system and to establish a refundable tax credit for individuals and groups that construct or renovate buildings and residences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. NEHLS:

H.R. 8548. A bill to remove aliens who fail to comply with a release order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 8549. A bill to prohibit any person convicted of an unlawful activity on or after October 7, 2023, on a college campus from being eligible for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 8550. A bill to provide for the prohibition on the use of United States passports for travel to, in, or through the Turks and Caicos Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BURLISON, and Mr. MCCORMICK):

H.R. 8551. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to prepare and make available a report on the wealth and corrupt activities of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 8552. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit criminal corporations from making disbursements of funds in connection with a campaign for election for Federal, State, or local office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 8553. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to establish a separate unit within the Department of Justice for the investigation and enforcement of such Act, to provide the Attorney General with the authority to impose civil money penalties for violations of such Act, and to require agents of foreign principals who are registered under such Act to disclose transactions involving things of financial value conferred on officeholders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FROST, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois,

Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 8554. A bill to eliminate certain subsidies for fossil-fuel production; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Science, Space, and Technology, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCANLON (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 8555. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to provide for better protections for children raised in kinship families outside of the foster care system; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. STANSBURY):

H.R. 8556. A bill to amend section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure that certain telecommunications assistance available to assist school buses is preserved consistent with the Declaratory Ruling in the matter of Modernizing the E-Rate Program for Schools and Libraries adopted by the Federal Communications Commission on October 19, 2023 (FCC 23-84; WC Docket No. 13-184), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHRIER (for herself and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 8557. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and expand the use of prescribed fire on land managed by the Department of the Interior or the Forest Service, with an emphasis on units of the National Forest System in the western United States, to acknowledge and support the long-standing use of cultural burning by Tribes and Indigenous practitioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Oversight and Accountability, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SELF:

H.R. 8558. A bill to give Presidential Proclamation 9645 the full force and effect of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. STEEL (for herself and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 8559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect small businesses from unemployment insurance premium increases by reason of unrepaid State advances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 8560. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, and the United States Housing Act of 1937, to make certain improvements to the supported housing program for veterans commonly known as "HUD-VASH"; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. LANGWORTHY, and Mr. MOLINARO):

H.R. 8561. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to address significant under projection of MA local area growth due to wage index reclassification; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TOKUDA (for herself and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 8562. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of direct housing loans and medical care from the Department of Veterans Affairs for Native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TOKUDA (for herself and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 8563. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a floor on the work geographic index for physicians' services furnished in Hawaii; 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. WENSTRUP (for himself and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 8564. A bill to require certain elements of the intelligence community to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report with respect to biotechnology threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Ms. ADAMS, and Mrs. SYKES):

H.R. 8565. A bill to advance research, promote awareness, and provide patient support with respect to endometriosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 8566. A bill to require reports and certain actions with respect to the Republic of Georgia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Ways and Means, 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. LATTA:

H.J. Res. 153. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Safeguarding and Securing the Open Internet; Restoring Internet Freedom"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BOEBERT (for herself, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. OGLES, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. ROSENDALE):

H.J. Res. 154. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to "Fluid Mineral Leases and Leasing Process"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DUARTE (for himself and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.J. Res. 155. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Marine Fisheries Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Regulations for Interagency Cooperation”; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DUARTE (for himself and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.J. Res. 156. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Regulations for Interagency Cooperation”; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAGEMAN (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. MALOY, Ms. BOEBERT, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.J. Res. 157. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Marine Fisheries Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Species and Designating Critical Habitat”; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAGEMAN (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. MALOY, Ms. BOEBERT, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.J. Res. 158. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing Endangered and Threatened Species and Designating Critical Habitat”; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. ZINKE, and Ms. HAGEMAN):

H.J. Res. 159. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Regulations Pertaining to Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants”; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. OGLES, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. SELF, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.J. Res. 160. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Health and Human Services relating to “Nondiscrimination in Health Programs and Activities”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the designation of the Gila Wilderness; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that assisted suicide (sometimes referred to using other terms) puts everyone, including those most vulnerable, at risk of deadly harm; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H. Res. 1253. A resolution reaffirming that the United States is not a party to the Rome

Statute and does not recognize the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK (for herself, Mr. JAMES, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. KIM of California):

H. Res. 1254. A resolution recognizing the strategic importance of Kenya to the United States and celebrating the 60-year anniversary of United States-Kenya relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. CARSON, Mr. EZELL, Mrs. BICE, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DE REMER, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. TRONE, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MILLS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. MCCORMICK, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MANN, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Ms. MACE, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. LESKO, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. BACON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CLYDE, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. MEUSER):

H. Res. 1255. A resolution calling upon all Americans on this Memorial Day, 2024, to honor the men and women of the Armed Forces who have died in the pursuit of freedom and peace; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia (for herself, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BURCHETT, and Ms. TENNEY):

H. Res. 1256. A resolution condemning the United Nations moment of silence for Ebrahim Raisolsadati as a blatant disregard of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 1257. A resolution expressing the need for enhanced public awareness of Huntington's Disease and support for the designation of a “National Huntington's Disease Awareness Month”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H. Res. 1258. A resolution recognizing and Honoring the Unwavering Journey of our Armed Forces from Enlistment to Their Lasting Contributions as Veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Mr. BACON):

H. Res. 1259. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2024 as “Na-

tional Physical Fitness and Sports Month”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WEXTON (for herself, Ms. WILD, Ms. TOKUDA, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. PORTER, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. CARAVEO, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. ROSS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BALINT, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HIMES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. MANNING, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. STANTON, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BACON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. SYKES, Mrs. BICE, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. SCHOLTEN):

H. Res. 1260. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the month of May 2024 as “Progressive Supranuclear Palsy Awareness Month”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:
H.R. 8516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 840 Front Street in Casselton, North Dakota, as the “Commander Delbert Austin Olson Post Office”

By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 8517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 which provides Congress with the power to “dispose of

and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory and other Property belonging to the United States.” in this case the sale of federal land for economic development.

The single subject of this legislation is:
Land Conveyance

By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 8518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

The single subject of this legislation is:
This legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts and is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 8519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8
First Amendment

The single subject of this legislation is:
Federal grants relating to First Amendment activity.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 8520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
To amend the Public Health Service Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to implement the Climate Ready Tribes Initiative.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 8521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

article 1 section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Congressional Gold Medal Honoree

By Mrs. BICE:

H.R. 8522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:
Agriculture

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 8523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
To require Electricity Transmission Organizations to allow bids from aggregators of certain retail electricity customers, and for other purposes.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8524.

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:
Mental health

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 8525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 8527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Environment

By Mr. D'ESPOSITO:

H.R. 8528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
To increase the criminal penalties for assaulting a Bureau of Prisons correctional officer.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 8529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize assistance to train and retain obstetrician-gynecologists and sub-specialists in urogynecology and to help improve the quality of care to meet the health care needs of women in least developed countries.

By Mr. EZELL:

H.R. 8530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
To require Facility Security Committees to respond to security recommendations issued by the Federal Protective Service relating to facility security, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 8531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill requires commercial data operators to disclose to users what types of user data are collected, and the usage and value of that data. Commercial data operators must also provide users with a way to delete this data. Commercial data operators that issue securities must report the value of their user data and the value of any third-party contracts made for the collection of user data.

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 8532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
maternal health

By Mr. FROST:

H.R. 8533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
To require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall update the regulations to issue regulations to phase out the use of bleed air systems in certain aircraft, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 8534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Prohibiting student athletes from being classified as employees under federal law.

By Mrs. HOUCHIN:

H.R. 8535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
To establish the Benjamin Harrison National Recreation Area and Wilderness in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 8536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a “uniform rule of Naturalization.”

The single subject of this legislation is:
Immigration

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 8537.

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 a study on public health impacts as a consequence of the February 3, 2023, train derailment in East Palestine, Ohio.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 8538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:
Biotechnology

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 8539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:
Biotechnology

By Mr. KUSTOFF:

H.R. 8540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:
This legislation expands the Employer-Provided Childcare Tax Credit (IRC Section 45F).

By Mrs. LUNA:

H.R. 8541.

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 shorten the adoption wait period from one year to six months and makes it a felony to knowingly transfer a wild horse or burro for slaughter.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 8542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The single subject of this legislation is:
This bill would award Dr. Joseph B. Kirsner with a Congressional Gold Medal in recognition of his service to the United States during World War II and his contributions to the medical field, particularly, gastroenterology.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 8543.

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:
health care

By Mr. MORELLE:
H.R. 8544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
Right to Repair.

By Mr. MURPHY:
H.R. 8545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states:

The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Camp Lejeune Justice Act of 2022 to make technical corrections.

By Mr. NEGUSE:
H.R. 8546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration to take certain actions to improve the processing of claims and appeals for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income, and for other purposes.

By Mr. NEGUSE:
H.R. 8547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a universal design standards certification system and to establish a refundable tax credit for individuals and groups that construct or renovate buildings and residences, and for other purposes.

By Mr. NEHLS:
H.R. 8548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To remove aliens who fail to comply with a release order, and for other purposes.

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 8549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit any person convicted of an unlawful activity on or after October 7, 2023, on a college campus from being eligible for public service loan forgiveness.

By Mr. OGLES:
H.R. 8550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for the prohibition on the use of United States passports for travel to, in, or through the Turks and Caicos Islands.

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 8551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Director of National Intelligence to prepare and make available a report on the wealth and corrupt activities of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 8552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Elections

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 8553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

strengthening existing laws to ensure that lobbyists who represent foreign governments operate in full transparency and are not able to unduly influence our elected officials

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 8554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Energy

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 8555.

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 better support kinship caregivers for children exposed to substance misuse or other trauma.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 8556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article V of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Clarifying E-Rate Act of 2024

By Ms. SCHRIER:

H.R. 8557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Forestry

By Mr. SELF:

H.R. 8558.

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:

Foreign Relations as it relates to the Middle East

By Mrs. STEEL:

H.R. 8559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Taxation

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 8560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill seeks to reform the HUD-VASH program by expanding eligibility.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 8561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill requires skilled nursing facilities, nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities for the intellectually disabled, and nearby inpatient rehabilitation facilities to establish an essential caregivers program during a public health emergency.

By Ms. TOKUDA:

H.R. 8562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of direct housing loans and medical care from the Department of Veterans Affairs for Native Hawaiians.

By Ms. TOKUDA:

H.R. 8563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a floor on the work geographic index for physicians' services furnished in Hawaii.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 8564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require certain elements of the intelligence community to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report with respect to biotechnology threats, and for other purposes.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.R. 8565.

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:

The Endometriosis CARE Act would invest \$50 million annually in endometriosis research through the National Institutes of Health and commission a nationwide study on disparities in endometriosis prevalence, detection, treatment and outcomes.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 8566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To support the democratic aspirations of the people of Georgia against malign Russian influence.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.J. Res. 153.

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:

Provide for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Safe-guarding and Securing the Open Internet; Restoring Internet Freedom".

By Ms. BOEBERT:

H.J. Res. 154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8: The Congress shall

have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and Excises, to pay debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

The single subject of this legislation is:

a CRA resolution of disapproval that would nullify Biden's rule entitled Fluid Mineral Leases and Leasing Process.

By Mr. DUARTE:

H.J. Res. 155.

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:

Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Marine Fisheries Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Regulations for Interagency Cooperation”.

By Mr. DUARTE:

H.J. Res. 156.

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:

Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Regulations for Interagency Cooperation”.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.J. Res. 157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation disapproves of of the rule submitted by the National Marine Fisheries Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing Endangered and Threatened Species and Designating Critical Habitat”, and states that such rule shall have no force or effect.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.J. Res. 158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation provides Congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife Plants; Listing Endangered and Threatened Species and Designating Critical Habitat”, and states that such rule shall have no force or effect.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.J. Res. 159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Repealing a regulation related to the Endangered Species Act of 1973

By Mr. ROY:

H.J. Res. 160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To disapprove of the “Nondiscrimination in Health Programs and Activities” rule.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 16: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 472: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 655: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 798: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 957: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 976: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 1015: Mr. CASTEN, Mr. STEIL, and Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 1088: Mr. CASAR, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.

H.R. 1179: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1385: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1406: Mr. KILMER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mrs. FOUSHEE.

H.R. 1447: Ms. STEVENS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BOWMAN, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1509: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1572: Ms. MENG, Ms. OMAR, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1692: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1701: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 1788: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1806: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1831: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 1834: Ms. PETTERSEN.

H.R. 2424: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2539: Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 2630: Mr. D’ESPOSITO.

H.R. 2713: Mr. VAN ORDEN.

H.R. 2827: Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.

H.R. 2891: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2923: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2933: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 2941: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2971: Mr. FINSTAD.

H.R. 3006: Mrs. PELTOLA and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3018: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3038: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 3124: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 3164: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 3228: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 3486: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 3491: Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 3576: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3887: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 3916: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3949: Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 3998: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 4070: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 4646: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4674: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 4818: Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 4858: Mrs. RAMIREZ and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 5003: Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 5040: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.

H.R. 5044: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 5113: Mrs. PELTOLA.

H.R. 5140: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 5159: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. PFLUGER.

H.R. 5397: Mr. CAREY.

H.R. 5526: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 5545: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 5547: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5614: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 5646: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 5995: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 6089: Mr. D’ESPOSITO.

H.R. 6161: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 6201: Mr. CURELLAR and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 6225: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6257: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6271: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 6293: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 6404: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 6612: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 6664: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 6727: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 6763: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Mr. YAKYM.

H.R. 6766: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 6860: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 6945: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 6982: Mr. DELUZZIO.

H.R. 7007: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 7012: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 7035: Mr. FALLON and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 7070: Ms. SEWELL and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 7133: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 7142: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 7162: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 7170: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 7191: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 7257: Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 7266: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 7297: Mr. LUCAS and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 7380: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 7384: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 7470: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 7478: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.

H.R. 7543: Ms. MCCLELLAN.

H.R. 7544: Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 7563: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 7629: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 7634: Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 7661: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 7770: Ms. SALINAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 7771: Ms. SALINAS and Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 7779: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 7866: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 7914: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 7940: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 8045: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 8060: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 8093: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 8117: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 8120: Mr. LALOTA.

H.R. 8249: Mrs. FOUSHEE.

H.R. 8281: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 8282: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 8290: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 8295: Mr. MCCORMICK.

H.R. 8331: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. PELTOLA, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 8343: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 8370: Mr. TONKO and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 8390: Mr. EVANS and Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 8404: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 8409: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 8419: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 8422: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 8425: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 8426: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 8434: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 8437: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 8458: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 8466: Mrs. STEEL and Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 8473: Mr. MOYLAN.

H.R. 8474: Mr. MOYLAN.

H.R. 8475: Mr. MOYLAN.

H.R. 8476: Mr. MOYLAN.

H.R. 8477: Mr. GARBARINO and Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 8478: Mr. GALLEGGO.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.J. Res. 82: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. THANEDAR.

H.J. Res. 133: Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.J. Res. 134: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.J. Res. 135: Mr. MILLS.

H.J. Res. 136: Mr. BIGGS.

H.J. Res. 138: Mr. BEAN of Florida.

H.J. Res. 144: Mr. MURPHY.

H.J. Res. 148: Mr. MILLS.

H.J. Res. 152: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. DELUZZIO.

H. Res. 376: Mr. D’ESPOSITO.

H. Res. 443: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. Res. 881: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H. Res. 1131: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 1188: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. MILLS.

H. Res. 1199: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 1206: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MRVAN.

H. Res. 1219: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H. Res. 1244: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. PETERS.

H. Res. 1246: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H. Res. 1248: Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE and Mr. TONKO.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

PT-12. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Kenneth Johnson, relative to formally request the Department of Justice and U.S. House of Representatives to conduct investigations of U.S. District District Court Judge Leigh Martin May; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.