



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2024

No. 114

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 10, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2024, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

RECOGNIZING FULBRIGHT PROGRAM RECIPIENTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 28 individuals from the Pennsylvania 15th Congressional District who have received prestigious Fulbright awards during the 2022–2023 school year and the 2023–2024 school year.

Congress established the Fulbright Program in 1946. It promotes friendly and peaceful relations between Ameri-

cans and people of other countries through international educational exchange. Each year, more than 3,000 U.S. students, scholars, artists, and professionals in more than 100 different fields of study are offered Fulbright Program grants to lecture, study, teach English, and conduct research.

We proudly have Fulbright participants from Bradford, Duboistown, Lewisburg, Port Matilda, Selinsgrove, and State College, Pennsylvania. These recipients have earned their national recognition with years of study, leadership, and service, and our community is proud.

Mr. Speaker, the Fulbright Program is one of the most sought-after exchange programs in the world. It encourages applications from individuals of academic and professional achievement who are current and future leaders in their respective fields. Selected through open, merit-based competition, Fulbrighters represent the excellence and diversity of their societies around the world and in the United States.

They make an impact in all areas, including the environment, public service, technology, public health, and the arts. They study and teach in high-priority areas such as mental health, opioid addiction, cybersecurity, and military preparedness.

Since 1946, more than 400,000 individuals from the United States and over 160 countries and territories have participated in the program, including 42 heads of state, 62 Nobel laureates, 89 Pulitzer Prize winners, 80 MacArthur Foundation fellows, and 16 Presidential Medal of Freedom recipients.

These relationships form a foundation of trust on which the United States may advance global peace and security. I know that the memorable learning experiences individuals encounter through the program will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of our Fulbrighters, especially the 28 from

Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District. We are grateful for their contributions and most proud of their achievements.

OFFERING BEST WISHES TO DR. KARRIE DIXON IN NEW ROLE

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Elizabeth City State University, located in northeastern North Carolina, holds a significant place among historically Black colleges and universities.

Despite its prestigious status, the institution faced grave concerns some years ago. Discussions arose within the North Carolina General Assembly regarding the potential closure of the university, which sparked a spirited response from dedicated alums and community leaders, who rallied to keep the institution open.

Their unwavering support and dedication played a crucial role in the survival of the university. As a result of their impassioned support, State leaders ultimately committed to ensuring the university's continued existence. However, this commitment came with the expectation of formulating a comprehensive plan to invigorate and fortify the institution.

It became evident that the university would need a committed and visionary education leader, a unifying figure, and a skilled team builder to orchestrate this revitalization. During this critical phase, Dr. Karrie Dixon emerged as that figure.

Assuming the role of chancellor, Dr. Dixon charted a new course for the university. Her transformative initiatives played a significant role in the university's resurgence. Notably, her leadership saw the establishment of a leading aviation sciences program at ECSU, the State's sole program.

□ 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.

H4531

Furthermore, Dr. Dixon's unwavering drive and commitment inspired students to enroll and remain at Elizabeth City State University, breathing new life into the institution. Her leadership saved the university and attracted a new generation of students, promising a brighter future in northeastern North Carolina.

The impact of Chancellor Dixon's leadership became evident as, over 6 years, she laid the foundation for a promising future for this esteemed institution. Her astute leadership and unwavering dedication solidified her as the right leader for the university during a critical season of change and growth.

As Chancellor Dixon has now assumed the reins at North Carolina Central University, bringing her closer to her family, she left a remarkable leadership and transformation legacy at Elizabeth City State University.

Viking pride. Viking pride. Viking pride.

Acknowledging her extraordinary contributions, I gladly join the community and offer my heartfelt best wishes to Dr. Dixon as she has transitioned from leading the Vikings into her new role at the helm of the Eagles.

I have every confidence she will live up to the motto: Truth and Service. The drumline helped provide an incredible welcome. Eagle pride, amplified.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RICHARD HENDRICKSON

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

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solemn recognition of an incredible community leader in northern Utah and a dear lifelong family friend, Mr. Richard Hendrickson.

Over the Fourth of July weekend, Richard and his daughter, Sally, passed away in a tragic vehicle accident close to home in Ogden Canyon.

Richard led a 36-year career in the outdoor products space. Starting as a welder at the age of 16 and rising to become the CEO and president of Lifetime Products, a uniquely American success story. "From Rags to Richard," his colleagues would quip.

Not only was Richard a good friend but also a trusted adviser and supporter of my efforts in Congress. I am most grateful he accepted a voluntary role as a member of my Debt and Deficit Task Force based in Ogden, Utah. He would go out of his way to provide context on trade policy that affected American businesses. It was abundantly clear that his main professional focus was the livelihood of his employees and sustaining a positive culture at a very significant Utah-based company. He will leave a void that simply cannot be filled.

Above all, Richard was a truly genuine and kind man, treating his neighbors and his employees as his peers. In addition to his career and community

involvement, Richard was a leader in his faith, serving the last 2 years as a stake president for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. His service reflected his commitment to his faith, family, and community.

His executive counterpart mentioned to me how busy Richard's schedule had become. They couldn't even find 2½ days to visit another facility, yet what was he doing on a Saturday afternoon? He was taking his kids boating.

On a more personal note, every time that my boys practice free throws going forward or we host a backyard barbecue, we will remember Richard and how his life's work was to build products meant to bring friends and families together.

I take comfort alongside his family—his wife, Julie, and his surviving children, Samuel, Lyssa, and Mollie—in knowing that Richard continues to look after and comfort Sally, and they will all be united again. I offer these words as a remembrance of his legacy.

CONGRATULATING DR. DANIELE STRUPPA ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the career of my very good friend, Chapman University President Dr. Daniele Struppa.

Managing a major university today is not easy. Some say it takes a mathematician, an Einstein type, so Chapman University set out on a quest to find the right person, and they got really lucky by hiring a Ph.D. in mathematics to do the job. He was not just an ordinary math whiz, but rather an Italian model, fast and slick, an import from Italy.

President Struppa has not disappointed us. Since 2016, he has overseen the tremendous growth at Chapman University and enhanced the university's reputation at a national level.

President Struppa's contributions go beyond the campus. He has created a partnership with the Nicholas Academy, which has increased local enrollment on campus by almost 20 percent and boosted the number of first-generation students on campus.

President Struppa also put Chapman University on the map nationally as a Hispanic-serving institution. Chapman University, because of his leadership, is now known nationally for its sciences and research, arts, social sciences, and school of law.

President Struppa is a man of intellect, and his drive will never be equaled. I wish him the best of luck in his retirement as he returns to his lifelong passion of teaching math to the next generation. I trust that he will continue to be my friend and close adviser, and I congratulate him on his well-earned retirement.

Go Panthers.

CELEBRATING NORMA LOPEZ

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate Ms. Norma Lopez and

her career fighting for southern California working men and women.

Ms. Lopez is organized labor. Her grandfather was a key figure in the efforts in California to organize farmworkers. Even as a child, Norma walked picket lines and demonstrated solidarity with workers in her community.

Later, she joined the Service Employees Union when she was in her twenties. She quickly rose through the ranks to eventually represent 800,000 members.

Thirty years later, Norma is leaving her role with the Teamsters but will continue to fight for working families in California.

In her new role as executive director at Labor Community Services, I know she will continue to fight to make life better for all families in southern California.

We are all proud of Ms. Lopez. I congratulate her on her new role and thank her very much for all she does and will do for our communities.

□ 1015

IMPOSSIBLE RULES FROM CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, last year, California's air regulator, known as the California Air Resources Board, finalized a new rule that would require freight railroads in the State to adopt zero-emissions locomotives for industrial use by the year 2030, only 6 years from now, and for normal hauling by 2035. It is now requesting a waiver from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to proceed with this rule.

This EPA CARB rule would effectively require all locomotives to operate in a zero-emissions configuration when operating in California. Sounds nice in theory, doesn't it?

This regulation would limit the useful life of thousands of locomotives currently in use across the rail network and require transition to zero-emissions technology. What is that going to do to the cost of moving goods with technology that is not yet even available widely?

Even by CARB's own admission, this rule will drive many short-line railroad operators out of business. Short-line railroads are very important for moving freight in the interim from manufacturers, from granaries, from wherever, out to the mainline. We are just going to eliminate them. What will we replace them with? More trucks. We love trucks, but there is a role for trucks, for short-line and for long-haul railroads.

CARB also admits this rule will be shifting the transport of goods to many more trucks with much more truck traffic. They admit to that, which is the opposite of their stated goal of reducing emissions.

Rail operators have not even been able to acquire full tier 4 locomotives yet due to the availability and stretch in technology, which isn't there yet. We can't acquire tier 4 locomotives, which is already being bypassed by new tiers that CARB wants to push, basically going to all-electric trains. This isn't the all-electric train we have in the basement. This is the real world here.

It would make more sense for the bureaucrats at CARB to just take a break a little bit from their carbon-neutral crusade and let rail operators come to the tier 4 standards for the locomotives that they are still trying to develop as being compliant.

These tier 4 locomotives are 85 percent cleaner than other older technology already. That sounds like a win to me. That is a bingo, as some might say, instead of pushing net-zero locomotives on such a ridiculous timeline. Because of their obsession with net zero and carbon reductions, CARB is actually working against their own goals they are stating here.

It is estimated the U.S. EPA approval would result in close to 65 percent of the Nation's class I railroad locomotive fleet being banned from operating in California just 6 years from now.

General Van Ovost, the head of the U.S. Transportation Command, expressed concerns that this regulation will negatively affect the economy as well as the military readiness posture—moving the tanks and heavy equipment that you see sometimes on the railway, these big long trains of items the military has to deploy to wherever. By reducing the ability to transport this military equipment in and out of California from different parts of the country, it could severely impact their ability for military readiness.

When I asked about this CARB regulation in committee yesterday, they said the military is going to be exempt. I guess that is good. The things that are really important, CARB is going to exempt. I guess goods movement, movement of agricultural products, and movement of food isn't as important. Instead, we are going to be forced this rule.

A large collection of national, State, and local agriculture groups have expressed great concern that this CARB rule poses a significant danger to U.S. agriculture's ability to transport products domestically or to our ports. We already have enough trouble getting stuff into our ports.

It needs to be stated that technology for these replacements does not yet exist on these new types of locomotives.

Freight railroads contribute only 0.5 percent total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, as defined by WHO, and 1.7 percent to total transportation-related greenhouse gas. All of this is to reduce the amount of CO₂, carbon dioxide, which is currently only 0.04 percent of

our atmosphere, practically a rounding error.

Again, EPA approval of this rule would result in close to 65 percent of the Nation's class I railroad locomotives being banned from operating—what will that do to our supply chain—by 2030, with tier 4 locomotives that are not even fully available yet, let alone the next set of technology they are trying to mandate.

This will slow our farmers' ability to get food to our tables and our ports. It will be rotting in the fields or sitting somewhere while waiting for an electric train to recharge and be able to go another 100 miles.

It will delay and raise prices of materials used to build and heat our homes.

It will raise prices for middle-income and lower-income families who are already struggling with inflation and so many policies from this administration.

Every stage of automobile production and sale, including EVs, will be pushed by the same people who are also pushing this rule. Bureaucrats are once again going after anything carbon related without considering the effects of this crusade against carbon.

We need not follow the California Air Resources Board as a whole country. They are not even elected. They are appointed by the Governor. They might be elected locally as a supervisor or something, but they are not elected by anybody to be on the CARB.

COMBATING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, how many times do we have to come to the floor to demand that our colleagues take action to end the gun violence crisis that is traumatizing our children and tearing families apart?

Since Republicans took power, the Speaker has called not one single vote, not one, to combat gun violence. It is shameful. It is shameful because since then, 934 mass shootings have occurred in our country.

Just this past weekend, Mr. Speaker, in the northeast side of our city, there was a mass shooting where 2 people were killed and 19 others severely injured. The victims were all between the ages of 17 and 27 years old.

I refuse to accept this as normal or the status quo. I refuse to accept that last month, there was a mass shooting at a Splash Pad with families in Rochester Hills, Michigan, where nine people were shot, including two children, that that is okay, that it is normal.

Behind these numbers are real people in our communities, families who are directly, forever being impacted and traumatized by these senseless shootings.

Firearms are now the leading cause of death for children and teens in our country. It is not just mass shootings. Mr. Speaker, 4.6 million children in our

country live in homes with loaded and unlocked firearms.

There is a Children's Hospital in Detroit that passes out lockboxes.

Recently, a 6-year-old boy in Detroit shot himself in the hand at his grandmother's home after he found an unsecured firearm. He was playing with it and accidentally pulled the trigger. He is just one of nearly 360 children who unintentionally shoot themselves or someone else every single year.

This cable lock right here, which prevents a gun from being loaded and fired, is \$10. I looked it up. That is why I introduced the Safe Storage Saves Lives Act to require gun locks like this one to be provided for every firearm sold in our country. This is a common-sense solution to save lives, to prevent these horrific accidental shootings, and even prevent suicides among our children.

It is time for Congress to act with urgency, Mr. Speaker, and pass legislation to save lives now.

ABORTION RIGHTS

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 years since the corrupt, far-right Supreme Court gutted *Roe v. Wade* and stripped us of our reproductive freedom.

There are now 21 States with an abortion ban in effect. Currently, one in three women are living without access to abortion care.

I want you to think about this: Our bodies are now being regulated more than guns in our country. It is disgusting. They have not only targeted abortion but also undermined access to IVF, birth control, and family planning.

Thankfully, I know in our State, Michiganders have soundly rejected the Supreme Court's decision to overturn *Roe* and voted to enshrine abortion rights and abortion care into our State constitution.

MAGA extremists are not going to stop. They won't stop. They are pushing for a national abortion ban at the Federal level.

Abortion care is healthcare, and we must fight back and pass legislation that restores access.

People, Mr. Speaker, not politicians, should have the freedom to make decisions about their own bodies. We won't stop until we make reproductive freedom for all the law of the land and accessible to all our residents across our country.

LIVONIA TORNADO

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, last month, a tornado swept through my district with little to no warning. It tragically took the life of a 3-year-old child named Cooper Drake and left his mother in critical condition after a tree fell on their Livonia home during the storm.

It is absolutely devastating that a family should experience this heartbreak. Our community is heartbroken.

That is why my Michigan colleagues, Congresswoman HALBY STEVENS, and really led by Congresswoman DEBBIE

DINGELL, sent a letter—we did it together—to the National Weather Service seeking answers, asking them to provide insight into why no tornado warning was issued for our residents.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot normalize these severe weather patterns and the devastating impacts they have on our families. It is clear that these extreme weather events, including tornadoes and flooding in southeast Michigan, are becoming more frequent due to climate change. We also need to understand the root cause of these extreme weather patterns.

That is why I am hoping we can all work together to hold corporate polluters accountable and protect our planet from the impact of the fossil fuel industry for generations to come.

BIDEN FITNESS COMPLICITY

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, as much as the White House would like to move on from the terrible debate performance we saw less than 2 weeks ago, it is still on the minds of many Americans, including my own. Like many, I am not only concerned about who is in the Oval Office in 2025, but I am concerned about the weeks and months between now and Inauguration Day.

The American people deserve to know their Commander in Chief can do the job. They deserve to know why he requires pictures of stages and podiums before he attends events. They deserve to have their many, many questions answered.

Unfortunately, President Biden has decided that one recorded, in-person interview and a politically charged letter will suffice.

We would be well served not to forget Special Counsel Robert Hur's report from February describing the President's memory as significantly limited. More importantly, we must not forget his conclusion that a potential trial over the President's apparently intentional illegal possession of classified documents would result in a jury essentially feeling bad for a forgetful old man.

Following that frank and damning report, the President's chief of staff responded by saying: No one works harder and asks tougher questions than the President.

In hindsight, it appears he was willing to surrender his personal credibility in an attempt to keep the President's cognitive maladies hidden. Mitch Landrieu, national co-chair of the Biden campaign, said of the President: "He's on his game."

Again, in hindsight, perhaps the game he was referring to might have been shuffleboard.

Weeks before the debate, we saw the headline "Biden Appears to Freeze," detailing an event from the White House. We have endured 3½ years of similar stories.

Just days into his Presidency, The New York Times published a story titled: "The Many Ways That Joe Biden Trips Over His Own Tongue."

In May of 2022, The Washington Post published an article titled: "Three theories on Biden's repeated Taiwan gaffes."

The one I remember most is from Reuters 2 years ago which reads: "Gaffe or insight? Deciphering Biden's unguarded answers."

The American people should not have to decipher anything, Mr. Speaker. I, along with many of the Tennesseans I represent, believe we are still the shining city on a hill that Ronald Reagan referenced.

In this country, the First Amendment enables us to ask frank questions. In this country, we hold our elected officials to account.

Many of us remember 2 months before the debate when the President literally read the words: "Four more years. Pause" at an event.

We also recall this year when President Biden mistakenly claimed he was Vice President during the pandemic.

I, along with many other Members of the House of Representatives on our side of the aisle, have expressed our serious concerns with what strongly appears to be a debilitating, cognitive decline for quite a while now. Yet, those concerns were dismissed by the mainstream media as rightwing propaganda for all these years, and Congressional Democrats made similar allegations or remained silent altogether. They all knew these concerns with the President's cognitive limitations were credible.

Now, since the debate, the American people share these concerns, too. They are used to worrying about the consequences of the open-border policies of this administration and the crippling inflation that the administration's policies have produced, but now they are also concerned about whether he can even withstand the job itself.

Since the debate, we have heard nothing but weak excuses: a cold, a lack of sleep, jet lag from travel that took place 15 days before. The list continues to grow.

Those who have spread the notion that President Biden is as sharp as a tack and at the top of his game will have to answer for this big coverup. Indeed, they are complicit in the credible anxiety that the American people feel.

If we suffer a major national security incident which our impaired President fails to handle properly, they will be complicit in something much worse.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, it is past time for our President to pass the baton on to another and for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have helped to perpetuate this coverup to switch course and do the right thing.

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

TAXING BILLIONAIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I want you to take a look at this graph. There are two lines. The dark blue line is the effective tax rate paid by the 400 highest income earners in America, and the light blue line is the effective tax rate paid by the bottom half of income earners in our country.

In the 1960s, the people at the very top, the richest 400 Americans, paid about twice the tax rate that the average middle-class family did, but in 2018 during the Donald Trump Presidency and for the first time in our history, the billionaires started paying a lower tax rate than nurses, teachers, firefighters, and most other middle-class Americans who put in an honest day's work and make our economy run.

It is unfair, it is absurd, and it is wrong.

How did we get here? For years, corrupt rightwing politicians gave tax break after tax break to the billionaires and big corporations who funded their campaigns. When the billionaires and big corporations don't pay their fair share in taxes, you know who has to carry the load? Working people carry the load—working people who can't afford to pay thousands of dollars to go to Mar-a-Lago or Trump Hotel, working people who don't get to move their money overseas or hire an Army of accountants to find them tax loopholes or hire an Army of lobbyists to create new loopholes for them, working people who have their healthcare cut and their veterans benefits cut, working people who have to send their kids to crumbling schools all because the politicians tell them there isn't enough money left.

But there is always money when those billionaires come asking for more tax cuts, isn't there?

When Donald Trump and the Republicans were in charge, they passed a \$2 trillion tax cut that went almost entirely to the wealthy, and then they turned around and tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act and kick 16 million Americans off their health insurance. We know what their priorities are, and we know what they will do if they return to power in this election.

Already, Donald Trump and House Republicans are meeting with industry lobbyists and billionaire donors to scheme how they can give away even more tax breaks to the people at the very top and cut the programs that working people depend on to get by.

Look at Project 2025, their policy plan for what they will do if they take control. That plan calls for cutting Social Security by raising the retirement age. It calls for repealing the Affordable Care Act, eliminating Head Start programs that provide preschool for 1 million children, eliminating the Department of Education, eliminating the National Weather Service. Republicans

propose cuts, cuts, cuts to programs that help working people, and at the same time they propose giving even more tax cuts to the people at the top who don't need it.

It doesn't have to be this way.

We can go back to a system where the tax code is fair, and working people aren't asked to pay an unfair burden. By asking the people at the top to pay their fair share again like they used to, we can do incredible things in this country.

We can ensure that Social Security benefits keep up with the cost of living and that the program's life is extended indefinitely. We can cut the cost of healthcare. We can ensure that every child receives a world-class education. We can provide tax relief to working people who actually need it.

The possibilities are right there in front of us, but we need to reverse this dangerous trend. We need to stop the corruption. We need to start working for working people, not the big donors and the lobbyists, and we need to put people over politics.

IN MEMORY OF MATTHEW WYATT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FULCHER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a fallen hero: Corporal Matthew Wyatt of Millstadt, Illinois.

Matthew was a marine serving in Iraq's Al Anbar Province when a suicide bomber approached his base in a truck loaded with explosives.

Matt and another marine took quick action to stop the attempted breach. An explosion killed both servicemembers instantly. Matt was just 1 week from his 22nd birthday.

Matt's commitment to our military service came from his father, Marine Gunnery Sergeant Alan Wyatt, and his two grandfathers—one Army, and one Navy.

Matt enlisted during his senior year at Belleville West High School. When his mother, Verlene, asked if he was willing to go to war, without hesitation Matt instantly answered: Yes.

Matt cared deeply for those he served with—so much so that he gave his life protecting them.

For his bravery, Matt was awarded the Purple Heart and Bronze Star. His commanding officer personally traveled to Millstadt, Illinois, to present the family with his medals.

To honor his sacrifice today, I am introducing legislation to rename the United States Post Office in Millstadt in his name.

I thank all Members of our Illinois delegation—Republicans and Democrats—for cosponsoring the bill. I thank my colleagues from North Carolina for their support and Representative MANNING for cosponsoring, as well.

This is a small but meaningful tribute to a small-town southern Illinoisan

who made a big difference for his country.

It has been 20 years since we lost Matt, but his legacy burns bright.

In a local news interview years after the loss, Matt's father, Alan, the marine gunnery sergeant said: "I do think of him every day. I still love and miss you, son."

It is a love that also carries on in the hearts of his mother, Verlene; stepmother, Lauren; grandmother, Millie; aunts; uncles; numerous cousins; and dear friends.

It has been said that one of life's greatest gifts is to be remembered. Corporal Matthew Wyatt will be remembered, and that is never going to change.

Semper fi, marine.

HONORING IAN BASTEK

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Captain Ian Bastek who recently retired as the commanding officer in the Air Station Sacramento Command.

Captain Bastek's career began in 1997 in the U.S. Coast Guard Academy and has been marked by exemplary dedication and leadership in the 27 years since.

From training pilots at the Coast Guard Aviation Training Center in Alabama to serving as Senior U.S. Coast Guard Joint Task Force East adviser to NORAD and U.S. NORTHCOM, Captain Bastek has made immense contributions to our Nation's security throughout his decorated career.

His contributions have earned him multiple prestigious military awards, including three Meritorious Service Medals, the Coast Guard Commendation Medal, and four Coast Guard Achievement Medals.

Captain Bastek's leadership at Air Station Sacramento was particularly notable. Under his leadership, the air station solved a critical fuselage issue that grounded the world's C-27J fleet.

While serving at Air Station Sacramento, Captain Bastek worked closely with my congressional office. His insights and advocacy were instrumental in ensuring that our Coast Guard units received the necessary funding to continue their essential missions.

As he transitions to his new role as the deputy director of response in California Governor's Office of Emergency Services, I am confident that his leadership skills and expertise will continue to benefit our State.

Please join me in congratulating Captain Ian Bastek on his remarkable career and new position.

RECOGNIZING JAREK NECZYPOR

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Jarek Neczypor for his perseverance and participation in the Department of Defense's 2024 Warrior Games.

A native of Sacramento, Lieutenant Neczypor joined the Navy with a desire

to serve his country and see the world. His service took him across Asia, where he proudly represented our Nation.

Following his injuries, Lieutenant Neczypor's involvement with the Navy Wounded Warrior connected him with fellow servicemembers fostering a supportive community crucial to his healing journey.

In this network, Lieutenant Neczypor and his shipmates have shared valuable resources related to education, employment, and veteran support organizations. These experiences inspired him to attend law school where he continues in his commitment to serve others through his involvement in Yale's Veterans Legal Services Clinic and Medical-Legal Partnership.

This year in the Warrior Games, Lieutenant Neczypor competed in cycling, precision air sports, track, wheelchair basketball, and wheelchair rugby.

Please join me in celebrating Lieutenant Jarek Neczypor's outstanding achievements and continued dedication to his fellow veterans.

CALIFORNIA CAPITAL AIRSHOW

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the upcoming California Capital Airshow set to take place this weekend at Mather Airport in Sacramento County. Established in 2004, this annual event not only honors our region's rich aviation heritage and our brave veterans, but it also inspires the next generation with the power and magic of flight.

This year's airshow promises to be a spectacular celebration, featuring the U.S. Air Force Thunderbirds and Italy's Frecce Tricolori. As we mark the 75th anniversary of NATO this week in Washington, this event underscores the strength of our alliances and the collaborative spirit that underpins our international partnerships.

The California Capital Airshow offers exhilarating aerial performances, interactive exhibits, and educational programs that engage and inspire our community.

It is time for families to come together, for us to celebrate our shared history and to look forward to the future of aviation and aerospace innovation.

As a proud Representative of Sacramento County, I am thrilled to support an event that brings such pride to our community. Let us celebrate this dedication of our servicemen and -women and the enduring power of international cooperation. It keeps our skies safe.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TRIXIE AVERILL

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life and service of my constituent and friend, Trixie Averill, who passed away on May 25, 2024.

Trixie was a beloved wife to Dan; a devoted mother to Marcus and Amy; a cherished grandmother to Noah, Aurora, and Gabriel; and a dear friend to so many.

Originally from New Orleans, Louisiana, Trixie moved to the Roanoke Valley in 1979. She served with enthusiasm as a member of the Virginia Tourism Board. As an activist and tireless organizer, she was always sincere, warm, dedicated, and an absolute delight to work with.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues join me in honoring the life of Trixie Averill. She diligently and effectively served her God, community, family, and Virginia's Sixth Congressional District.

CONGRATULATING GLENVAR HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS
SOCCER TEAM

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Glenvar High School girls' soccer team on winning the 2024, VHSL, Class 2 State championship, their second State title in the last 3 years.

After working hard all season, the team left it all on the field and beat Clarke County High School after four periods of overtime. Finishing the season with an impressive record of 21-0-1, there is no doubt that these girls earned this season and their championship.

I would like to recognize each of the outstanding players of this team, including Giuliana Stanley, who won the VHSL Class 2 Player of the Year, I recognize Chloe Childers, Sophie Childers, Lauren Claud, Madelaine Frackelton, Annie George, Campbell Hardin, Adalee Harvey, Logann Meadows, Megan Pomerleau, Brooke Smyth, Avery Steger, Davin Tate, Caitlin Underwood, Anna Vecellio, and Sawyer Wilson. As the head coach for 3 years, Coach Kyleigh Drew won the VHSL Coach of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, again, I congratulate the 2024 Glenvar High School girls' soccer team. Virginia's Sixth Congressional District is incredibly proud of their accomplishment, and I wish them continued success in the seasons ahead.

□ 1045

CONGRATULATING ISRAEL HAIRSTON

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the outstanding achievements of Israel Hairston from Vinton.

A standout graduate of William Byrd High School, Israel's leadership on the football field and in academics is truly commendable. He not only brought home the school's first regional football title but also earned the prestigious title of Class 3 Virginia High School League Foundation Achievement Award Scholar Athlete of the Year for his exemplary high school career.

Israel's commitment to excellence and dedication is further exemplified by his upcoming enrollment in Virginia Tech to play football for the Hokies.

I congratulate Israel on a job well done and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

PROTECTING ELECTION INTEGRITY

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a pressing issue that poses a direct threat to the integrity of American elections.

While the left has made baseless claims of a stolen 2016 election due to alleged foreign interference, they neglect the real peril of foreign meddling through noncitizen voting in our elections.

Under the Biden administration's leadership for the past 3 years, we have witnessed an alarming surge of over 9.6 million illegal immigrant encounters, with certain States even granting driver's licenses to illegal immigrants.

To safeguard the integrity of American elections, we must pass the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, or SAVE Act. This vital legislation requires States to verify proof of citizenship during voter registration for Federal elections.

It is simply common sense that only U.S. citizens should vote in Federal elections. However, the left seems to care more about noncitizens' ability to vote over upholding the rights of American citizens. While they prioritize their agendas, we are committed to safeguarding election integrity.

Let us uphold the bedrock principles of our democracy and protect the voices of the American people.

CONGRATULATING GLENVAR HIGH SCHOOL BOYS'
SOCCER TEAM STATE CHAMPIONS

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Glenvar High School boys' soccer team on their remarkable victory in the 2024 Virginia High School League Class 2 State championship, their second State title in a row.

They had a flawless 22-0 record this year and an outstanding 18 shutouts, including a streak of 10 consecutive shutouts.

These talented student athletes include Jake Williams, who was named VHSL Class 2 Player of the Year, Grayson Shepherd, Jackson Jones, Alan Vu, Kees Van Gerven, Gavin Miller, Tyler Curfiss, Zach Curfiss, Levi King, Seth Nichols, Heath Russell, Kian Fisher, Luke Farmer, Jax Boling, Avery McClanahan, Cooper Mullins, Bryce King, Dylan Ludlow, Griffin Geddes, Adam Saunders, Alex Rotkamp, Aidan Hylton, Zach Adams, Evan Harris, Ryder Francisco, Wesley Feliciano, Connor Magruder, and Tyler Shannon.

Their continued success is a testament to a winning culture led by Head Coach Josh Jones, head coach for 4 years and VHSL Class 2 Coach of the Year.

I congratulate the 2024 Glenvar Highlanders boys' soccer team on this incredible achievement. It is an honor to have such a program in Virginia's Sixth Congressional District. I wish them the best for many seasons to come.

HONORING CORPORAL MATTHEW
A. WYATT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. MANNING) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the late Corporal Matthew A. Wyatt.

After graduating from high school in June 2001, Corporal Wyatt made the courageous decision to serve his country. He joined the Marine Corps, where he was based at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina before deploying to Iraq.

On December 3, 2004, Corporal Wyatt gave his life to stop an enemy attack on his base. He was only 21 years old.

Corporal Wyatt bravely acted without hesitation to save the lives of his fellow servicemembers. I know the impact the loss of a loved one can have on a bereaved family, the Gold Star family that continues to mourn the loss of their fallen hero: his father, Marine Gunnery Sergeant Alan Wyatt; his mother, Verlene; and his entire family and their proud three-generation history of military service.

Corporal Wyatt's stepmother, Lauren, works in my district office, helping ensure that veterans and military families in my district get the care they need. In her work, she honors Corporal Wyatt's service and sacrifice for our country.

To pay tribute to Corporal Wyatt's sacrifice, I am proud to cosponsor Representative BOST's legislation to rename the United States post office in his hometown of Millstadt, Illinois, in Corporal Wyatt's honor.

I thank Representative BOST for his efforts and for the beautiful remarks he made about Matt on the House floor this morning.

While no act of gratitude will ever be enough to fill the void left by Corporal Wyatt's absence, I hope this small but meaningful gesture will comfort his loved ones and remind them that his sacrifice will not be forgotten.

HONORING DONALD N. LORENZ

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my late father, Donald N. Lorenz.

My dad was such a positive influence in my life. He worked hard, was honest, and helped other people. My dad left early every morning to go to work. He worked hard. He really cared about his work, was loyal to the Kohler Company, where he worked, and really cared about the men who worked under his leadership.

My dad was a skilled woodworker. He not only carved the patterns for engines and plumbing fixtures but also carved the intricate design for the entry sign into the Kohler Company itself. He made and carved furniture that our family still uses today and

built buildings and things almost to the day he died. My husband still uses the woodworking skills he learned from my dad.

My dad passed away in 2006. It was before I ran for the Arizona House of Representatives in 2008, and it was before I was sworn into Congress in 2018.

I wish my dad was alive, not only because I love him but because I wish he would have seen what I have accomplished. I know that he and my mom gave me the skills I needed to accomplish what I did.

I thank my dad for being a great father to me and for being a great grandfather to my kids. I love him and always will.

HONORING ROGER F. LORENZ

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my brother, Roger F. Lorenz.

Roger is my older brother. He set a good example for me while I was growing up. He studied hard in school, worked during the summer, and got really good grades in school.

While he was going to college, he would work nights—I mean, all night long into the wee morning—to pay the bills and went to college during the day. It was tough. He did well for himself and for his family. He was a manager for major companies selling huge mining equipment and machines.

Roger is a good husband, father, and grandfather. He is also a good brother to me. I can't believe it has been over 6 years since I was sworn into Congress in this very place. My brother Roger made sure he was here to show me his support.

I thank Roger for all the positive things he has done for me throughout my life. He has played a positive role in my success.

HONORING DONNA M. LORENZ

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my sister, Donna M. Lorenz. Donna is my younger sister, and she has always been there for me. I was often her babysitter when she was young.

One time, we were watching scary movies on a Friday night when our parents were gone, and we heard a sound in the basement. We went down the basement stairs, and we were scared out of our minds. If somebody was actually recording it, they would have had a good laugh.

We did lots of homework together. I helped her memorize things for tests at school, and I didn't think she thought it was very fun at all.

When I left my abusive ex-husband about 31 years ago, I was really having a difficult time. Donna dropped everything. She flew out to live with me and support me. Donna has always been there for me through the ups and downs. I love my sister.

As I near the end of my term as a Congresswoman, I thank my sister, Donna, for all she has done for my life.

HONORING PORT CHICAGO 50

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

California (Mr. DESAULNIER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to recognize the upcoming 80th anniversary of the Port Chicago explosion and to honor and seek justice for the Port Chicago 50, an incident that led President Harry Truman at the time to desegregate the United States Navy.

On Monday, July 17, 1944, at 10:18 p.m., disaster struck. Crewmembers were working in shifts around the clock to load munitions onto newly built ships so they could be sent off to fight in the Pacific in World War II. This explosion ripped through the shipyard at the Port Chicago Naval Magazine, about 18 miles northeast of San Francisco.

The explosion killed or wounded 710 people, 435 of whom were African-American sailors. This was the deadliest homefront disaster of World War II. This explosion was felt in downtown San Francisco as windows shook, and people thought there was an earthquake.

In another blow to the survivors, 50 of the brave enlisted men, all of whom were African American, refused to return to the unsafe working conditions that led to the explosion. They were discriminately convicted of mutiny.

Those men are now known as the Port Chicago 50. They were heroes, not traitors, who deserve to be fully exonerated 80 years later.

Indicative of the discriminatory practices and segregation policies at the time, all the enlisted men loading ammunition at the site were African Americans while all the officers were White. None of the African-American ammunition loaders were formally trained in the safe handling of munitions, as opposed to the Teamsters on the West Coast, who were White and properly trained.

After the explosion, the survivors were in a state of shock, troubled by the vivid memory of the horrible explosion in which so many of their friends had died. The day after the explosion, about 200 of the Black enlisted men helped with the cleanup operation.

One survivor recalled: "I was there the next morning. We went back to the dock. Man, it was awful. That was a sight. You would see a shoe with a foot in it. . . . You would see a head floating across the water, just the head, or an arm, bodies. Just awful."

"Everybody was scared," another survivor recalled. "If someone dropped a box or slammed a door, people began jumping around like crazy."

Many of the Black survivors expected to be granted survivors' leave before being reassigned to regular duty. Those leaves were never granted for the African-American sailors, not even for the men who had been hospitalized.

All the African-American sailors were sent back to work, loading ammunition under the same officers as before, but White officers were allowed to go home for 30-day leaves.

As the men marched to go back to work 3 weeks after the incident at another dock, they knew that, at a certain junction in the road, if they were ordered to turn right, they were going to the parade ground, but if they were ordered to turn left, they were going to continue to load ammunition, just like they were 3 weeks earlier.

□ 1100

At the moment the sailors were ordered to go left, and they all stopped, one of the officers asked the sailor, Joseph Small, the lead African American, why they stopped. He responded to the White officer: We are scared, sir.

Mr. Speaker, 328 of the sailors followed him and refused to return to work, 258 were imprisoned as a result, and 50 were later charged with conspiring to make mutiny. This was not mutiny. There was no active rebellion, revolt, or coordinated effort to overthrow a command as required by law. It was men who, after having to witness and even clean up the bloody aftermath of this explosion, feared for their lives and were being forced to return to the same unfair conditions and to worry every day whether they would be next.

Thurgood Marshall, who ultimately became involved in their trial on Treasure Island in San Francisco Bay for the Port Chicago 50, once said: "What's at stake here is more than the rights of my clients; it's the moral commitment stated in our Nation's creed."

This quote rings even more true today, 80 years later. By not taking action to exonerate these brave men, we are reaffirming the discriminatory action taken against them 80 years ago. By refusing to stand up for their innocence, we are sanctioning the discrimination they faced 80 years ago. It is long past time that we right this historical injustice and officially clear the record.

COMMEMORATING THE ISLAND PARK VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to commemorate the longstanding and storied traditions of the Island Park Volunteer Fire Department.

The Island Park Fire Department was started 100 years ago when a group of young men in Island Park gathered together at a local pub and decided that they needed a fire department as they planned to incorporate 2 years later what would become the village of Island Park. At that meeting they elected their first chief, Hubert Miele.

Over the last 100 years, the Island Park Fire Department has seen its fair share of ups and downs. We lost one of our members on the battlefields in World War II, Charles Talbot, Jr.

We had two line-of-duty deaths: honorary Chief Michael Fischer and ex-Chief Ronald Nurnberger to 9/11-related illness.

In 1976 we saw an explosion along our waterfront that caused death and closed 63 area beaches for weeks after.

We saw the devastation of the COVID-19 pandemic and, of course, the devastation of Hurricane Sandy as the village of Island Park was one of the hardest hit communities on the East Coast.

However, some of our worst times gave us the opportunity to show some of our best, and the Island Park Fire Department has forever been a beacon in the Island Park community. It is that go-to place where people could find safety and where they could get help. During the devastation of Hurricane Sandy, they found food, they found a place to utilize bathrooms, and they talked to their government officials.

From 1924 to 2024, the Island Park Fire Department has been that beacon in our community, and it is a place and an institution that I am proud to be part of.

In 1978 we swore in our first female firefighter, Phyllis Berotti.

We have seen, I would argue, probably the only fire department perhaps in the United States that actually sent two members to this House. In 1980 the Island Park Fire Department sent Senator Alfonse D'Amato to the United States Senate, and in 2022, they sent me to this great House.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to recognize one of my true loves, the Island Park Fire Department, in its 100th year of service.

RECOGNIZING THE FAITHFUL SERVICE OF PAUL DIGIACOMO

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize NYPD Detective Paul DiGiacomo who just took his final walk from 26 Thomas Street in lower Manhattan as the president of the Detectives' Endowment Association.

Paul DiGiacomo started his career in the NYPD in 1983, serving over 40 years and earned his beloved gold shield in 1993. He was elected a delegate to the DEA in 1994. He has served as president of the DEA since 2020 and has been one of the leading voices in New York protecting law enforcement. He has stood with those who wear the uniform and has called out the disastrous effects of Democrat policies that have made our country and our city less safe and have put law enforcement in danger.

Paul DiGiacomo is not only a friend and not only a fellow detective, but he has been regarded as a cop's cop. As those of us who have worn the uniform know, there sometimes is no greater attribute than that reference, and that was Paul DiGiacomo.

His lasting impact on the DEA will be felt for generations of law enforcement professionals in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Paul DiGiacomo a healthy and safe retirement, and I thank him for his dedication to the New York City Police Department.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty program for our children. That program, Mr. Speaker, as you know, is Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, and for the members in the gallery, I think it is important to understand the statistics that we are dealing with, most importantly, that there are now close to 70 million Americans who rely on Social Security, 40 percent of whom rely on a pension which is the only benefit that they have.

It is a testament to the genius of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. What is required in an entrepreneurial capitalist system is that there be a safety net for people.

Even more so, imagine that 10,000 baby boomers a day become eligible for Social Security. It is disheartening that Congress, the institution primarily responsible for Social Security's enhancement and protection, has not done anything in 53 years. Richard Nixon was the President of the United States the last time Social Security was enhanced.

Five million of our fellow citizens get below poverty-level checks from Social Security, the greatest insurance program in the Nation's history, but Congress has not attended to the program. That is why this is so vitally important that we do so.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, in Idaho in the First District there are 219,000-plus Social Security recipients, 170,000-plus who are retirees, and 21,000 who get disability. There are 10,000-plus widows, 5,600 spouses, and 11,000 children in Idaho who rely on Social Security. It brings in \$388 million monthly to the First District and has not been adjusted in more than 50 years. This is an outrage.

When Members learn of this and when the public is aware of this, they say: Why hasn't Congress acted?

President Biden has suggested, and it makes sense, that in this great Nation of ours, why shouldn't everybody pay the same?

So he said: Let's just simply lift the cap on people making over \$400,000 who don't pay nearly the same that a person making \$30,000, \$50,000, \$75,000, or \$100,000 does who pay into the program.

In doing so, we would be able to enhance Social Security not only in Idaho but across the entire United States.

Even former President Trump now is apparently changing the Republican platform to say that we are going to protect Social Security.

It is not enough to protect Social Security. Congress hasn't done anything in more than 53 years. So that means whether you are in Idaho or whether

you are in Connecticut, those very citizens, those 10,000-a-day baby boomers who expect their Congress to take action on their behalf, need to enhance a program that provides them with the benefits. That money goes directly into every congressional district and every congressional community.

Where do the citizens spend that money?

They spend it at the grocery store, at the pharmacy, and at the gas station. It goes to the essential needs that Americans require. That is why Social Security is the number one antipoverty program for the elderly and also the number one antipoverty program for children.

What Congress needs to do is not talk about it. It needs to vote. Citizens in the gallery and across this Nation should demand that the United States Congress vote on Social Security and correct something that has gone in disrepair for more than 50 years.

BORDER SOLUTIONS

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss President Biden's open border.

Since President Biden was sworn in, his open-border policies have created a national security and humanitarian crisis. House Republicans continue to urge the White House and our Democrat colleagues in Congress to work with us to identify solutions. Again and again, we are met with silence.

I understand border security may not be politically convenient for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but at some point, they must stop pretending that this crisis does not exist.

I found it telling that over the Fourth of July weekend, the White House touted that illegal crossings along the U.S. southern border decreased following President Biden's recent executive order. What they conveniently left out is that even with this executive order, May was still the 39th straight month where illegal immigrant encounters have been higher than even the highest month under President Trump's administration.

I understand that the White House is in desperate need of good press, but with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, the facts are the facts. Our borders are far from secure, and no feel-good story or graphic from the White House communications team is going to change that.

I spent last week with Kansans in 11 counties across the Big First District, and they were clear: Addressing the Nation's border crisis matters to them.

Under President Biden's policies, cartels have been winners, and innocent children and those who are trying to enter the country legally have been the losers. It doesn't have to be this way. Let's do something to fix this chaos.

First, we need to immediately finish the border wall. Time and time again,

Border Patrol agents have shared that a physical barrier along our Nation's borders, coupled with advanced technology, is extremely helpful in stopping the cartels. We also need to designate the Mexican cartels as exactly what they are, terrorists. These human smugglers get rich by putting lives at risk and pouring fentanyl into our country. It is unacceptable.

We need to implement policies that are actually effective. On his first day in office, President Biden immediately began rolling back the Trump administration's immigration policies for no other reason than they were associated with President Trump's name. President Biden never asked if the policies were helping curb illegal immigration or slow illegal immigrants from entering the country or whether it was good for the United States of America.

It was simply: If President Trump did it, then it is gone. That has backfired on President Biden, and the polls show that. There is a reason President Trump is more trusted on the border than President Biden. We need to reinstate remain in Mexico and end President Biden's disastrous catch-and-release policy.

□ 1115

Finally, we must change our tone to send a clear message: Do not come to the U.S. illegally.

At the start of his Presidency, President Biden promised outright citizenship to more than 11 million illegal immigrants. America is a Nation of legal immigrants, and the President's false promise was a slap in the face to the 2 million people who legally migrate to the U.S. each year the right way. We should make legal immigration easier and illegal immigration harder. Mr. President, this is not rocket science. It is simple.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues again today: What will it take for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come to the table to secure the border? We can't keep pretending the current situation is normal. It is the minority's move.

FAILED POLICIES AND RECKLESS SPENDING

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the Biden-Harris administration's failed policies and reckless spending that have led to runaway inflation and have bled American workers dry.

Since the beginning of the Biden-Harris administration, the essentials Americans rely on daily have become unaffordable and inaccessible for most Americans. Before President Biden took office, inflation sat at 1.4 percent. It went up to 9 percent.

Since then, inflation and prices have increased by a mind-boggling 20.11 per-

cent. At the gas pump, regular gasoline has increased a whopping 55.3 percent, and groceries are up 21.2 percent. Interest rates are at record-high levels, the highest they have been in two decades, impacting every family.

With the average American spending \$12,800 more a year to buy basic needs, Bidenomics has hurt millions of everyday Americans and Iowans living paycheck to paycheck. Biden-Harris inflation is a Biden-Harris tax on all Americans, especially seniors on a fixed income and those working families.

House Republicans remain committed to reining in Biden-Harris reckless spending and taming inflation.

BORDER CRISIS

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the national security crisis that is the Biden-Harris border crisis.

Since the start of the Biden-Harris administration, there have been over 9.7 million illegal immigrant encounters nationwide and 1.8 million known got-aways who have evaded the U.S. Border Patrol. A record 350 individuals whose names appear on the terrorist watch list have also been encountered at the southern border.

Let us not forget it was the Biden-Harris administration that ended the effective remain in Mexico program and allowed for 40 percent of catch-and-release migrants to disappear, and we have lost over 85,000 children.

Across the country, we have seen the impact of a porous border. Fentanyl and crime coming across the border has ravaged communities in Iowa and across America, making drug overdoses the number one cause of death in 18- to 45-year-olds. This is devastating the lives of millions of Americans.

Democrat-led cities, such as New York and Chicago, have become unrecognizable due to the influx of migrants and violent crime.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to push the Senate to support H.R. 2, the Secure the Border Act, to protect our American homeland and stop the madness and crisis at our southern border.

EVERY LEGAL VOTE MATTERS

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8281, the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, or SAVE Act.

The SAVE Act protects and preserves the right of American citizens to vote by requiring States to obtain proof of citizenship, in person, when registering an individual to vote in a Federal election. It also provides States with access to existing Federal databases to clean up their voter registration rolls and remove noncitizens.

Under the outdated National Voter Registration Act, or NVRA, States are not required to ask for proof and are prohibited from asking for proof of citizenship when registering an individual to vote in Federal elections.

While Democrats and their media allies claim their elections are secure, there are a multitude of cases with in-

contestable evidence of noncitizens registering and voting in Federal elections. If you think one vote doesn't matter or one person voting fraudulent doesn't matter, I won my race in 2020 by six votes, and we had a mayoral race in my district that was decided after two ties by drawing a name out of a hat. Every vote matters. Every legal vote matters.

Americans should decide American elections, not illegal immigrants. The SAVE Act is a commonsense measure to safeguard this cherished American right and privilege, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Heavenly Father, we pray Your intervention on behalf of the children of Ukraine, Israel, Gaza, and all other places around the world who find themselves caught in the snares of war, trapped in conflict zones, the innocent casualties of our warfare.

God, how is it that the most vulnerable among us have become the targets of indiscriminate yet deliberate bombing? Holy Lord, how has humanity let its sense of justice erode to the point where even children's hospitals become targets? When did it become commonplace that babies and toddlers are made victims of vengeful kidnapping?

It is clear that Your kingdom alone is the place of safety and spiritual sanctuary for our children. Lord, let Your kingdom come, Your will be done here in this broken world.

Silence our guns and still the weapons which threaten the heritage our children long to receive from our hands.

See that we do not despise any of these little ones but reveal to us the road to peace, that once again we would provide a future for these children that is free from fear, danger, and sadness.

Into the protection of Your everlasting arms we place our children this day. May the strength of Your name be their hope and salvation.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

BIDEN TELLS LIE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL correctly condemned Biden for a lie that no American servicemembers were killed on his watch, ignoring the 13 murdered at the Abbey Gate.

The lie cited by Mr. MCCAUL was underscored by three American reservists murdered by the Iranian puppet Hezbollah on January 28.

As a grateful father of four sons who served overseas, it is sad Biden ignores the three murdered and conceals the others injured, even though I asked about their injuries on March 13.

Corrupt Judge Merchan, orchestrated by the corrupt Biden Department of Justice, is backfiring—The Wall Street Journal today—reelecting Donald Trump, as Merchan earns my invitation to the Trump inauguration.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. We do not need new border laws. We need to enforce existing laws. Biden shamefully opens borders for dictators as more 9/11 attacks across America are imminent as repeatedly warned by the FBI.

Our sympathies to those killed Monday at the Kyiv, Ukraine, children's hospital by war criminal Putin.

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

NATIONAL MINORITY MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge National Minority Mental Health Awareness Month.

More than one in five adults in the United States live with mental illness. We must ensure that community practitioners, from mental health workers, social workers, crisis managers, and law enforcement are educated on implicit biases that they may have and the social determinants of health that negatively impact patients of color.

While people of all ages and backgrounds experience mental disorders, minorities face significant treatment disparities. Cultural humility training has advanced healthcare equity, but we must do better.

In my area in the Caribbean, communities affected by hurricanes, most recently Grenada, St. Vincent, the Grenadines, and Jamaica, experience a different level of mental strain, leading to mental health crises in families among adults and children.

I urge my colleagues to better address the tremendous mental health disparities and barriers to treatment for minority communities.

LEGISLATION THAT DEMANDS THE ATTENTION OF EVERY AMERICAN

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we will be voting on legislation that demands the attention of every single American. This will be one of the most important votes that Members of this Chamber will ever take in their entire careers. It is an issue that we never thought we would actually have to address, but that moment has come to us now.

Should Americans and Americans alone determine the outcome of American elections, or should we allow foreigners and illegal aliens to decide who sits in the White House and here in the people's House and in the Senate?

As the progressive wing of Washington has slowly crept in and marched through our institutions and has infected every level of government, they have brought us to a generation-defining moment. That is the moment that we have upon us now.

Because the Democratic Party has shown time and time again that they want our borders wide open to every country on the planet and they want illegal aliens voting in our elections, we now have reached a fateful decision point.

Here is the critical question: Should only American citizens, citizens of this country, be allowed to determine who controls the people's House, the Senate, and the White House?

Every Republican, every one of our colleagues, emphatically says yes. The answer to that question is yes, and every Republican will vote for the bill that we have on the floor today.

This is a question that almost every American agrees with us upon. Here is

the number: 89 percent of Americans believe that only Americans should decide our elections, and that includes, by the way, 82 percent of Democrats, 80 percent of Black and African-American voters, and 76 percent of Hispanic and Latino voters. Everybody who looks at this question answers it the right way, just about everybody.

We are about to find out here very shortly if all of the Members of this Chamber agree.

Americans all over the country understand what is at stake here. They refuse to hand over our country to illegal aliens, cartels, traffickers, violent criminals, and murderers. That is what is at stake.

Now, I hate to say it, but we have so many noncitizens in the country right now that if only 1 out of 100 of those illegal aliens voted, you are talking about hundreds of thousands of votes being cast.

Remember, these aren't huddled masses of frightened families yearning to be free.

In January of this year, we took the largest delegation of Members of Congress to the border. January 3, we went to Eagle Pass, Texas. It was the epicenter of the open-border crisis at the time. We met with Border Patrol agents and high officers in U.S. Customs and Border Patrol. They told us the truth.

They said, down there at Eagle Pass, of all the many, many countless people who come across that border illegally, because Joe Biden and Secretary Mayorkas opened the border wide, they said: You should know this, Members of Congress, 70 percent of the people who crossed illegally at Eagle Pass, down there in the Del Rio sector, are single adult males between the ages of 18 and 49. These are not huddled masses of people seeking refuge from persecution and seeking asylum here for just causes. These are people who do not have our best designs in mind.

Because of Joe Biden's open-border policies, we have ISIS smuggling rings operating in our country. We have cartels who have operational control of the border. We have Chinese and Russian spies here in our midst roaming freely in our country. We have murderers and rapists offending again and again across the country, and they are never deported.

These are people who Joe Biden and his administration are releasing into the country every day. The Director of the FBI has testified multiple times now before Congress, before our committees, and he has said: All the red lights are flashing. What is he referring to? The unprecedented dangerous situation.

The enemy is here. The enemy is in our country now and is endangering American citizens, law-abiding citizens.

You see the headlines on the news now almost every day: another violent act committed by an illegal.

Joe Biden did that to the country. His administration did that because

they opened the border. They engineered the open border. It is absurd and outrageous, and people know it. That is one of the things that is going to be a big factor in November.

I will tell you this, too. Since our elections are so razor thin, it is not just the physical safety of our communities that are in jeopardy. It is also the integrity of the ballot box.

With just a few precincts and a few States often now deciding the makeup of the Congress and the White House, we aren't just facing dangerous individuals; we are facing a dangerously high number of dangerous individuals who could actually change the outcome of our elections and thus determine the future of this great Republic.

Just as our dear friend Congresswoman MILLER-MEEKS will tell you, she won her elections in 2020 by 6 votes. Some of these elections, some of your elections, are very, very close. We have to keep that in mind.

Here is the solution. Today is this fateful moment. Again, I think it may be the most important vote you will make as a Member of this body because you are going to determine the course of this country today. You are going to determine whether you want the elections to be safe and fair.

The SAVE Act is the bill before us. It is not complicated. It is written in very plain language so everyone can read it and understand it. We are merely suggesting that because so many illegal aliens are in the country—and there is no disputing that there are millions upon millions of them. I think the actual count is probably somewhere close to 16 million illegals who have come across the border in the last 3½ years since Joe Biden opened it wide beginning on his first day in office—because there are so many of them here, I ask our guests in the gallery this question: Is it worth adding a layer of protection to ensure all of those illegals cannot register to vote? Everybody would answer yes, if we asked for an audible response, because that is obvious to us.

Everybody understands the SAVE Act will do several important things, and all of them are obvious, commonsense measures.

Here is the list:

Number 1: It requires State election officials to ask about citizenship before providing voter registration forms. What a concept.

Number 2: It requires an individual to provide proof of citizenship if indeed he or she wants to register to vote in our Federal elections.

Number 3: It provides States with access to our Federal agency databases. Why is that so important? So they can remove noncitizens from voter rolls and confirm citizenship for individuals who lack that all-important proof of citizenship.

Number 4: It directs the Department of Homeland Security to determine whether to conduct removal proceedings if an illegal alien, a noncitizen, has been identified as having registered to vote in Federal elections.

American citizens will be protected and in no way harmed by this bill. There is not a conceivable argument that the Democrats can make to oppose the commonsense measures that we are putting before them today. Nothing changes the voter registration process in the States.

The only people who will face hurdles here are those who are trying to break our Federal laws. That is why it is patently absurd that the White House issued a veto threat. President Biden says he is going to veto the bill, and Democrat leadership right now is engaging in a very robust whipping operation to stop this bill from being passed. It is absolutely outrageous, and the American people need to know what is happening here.

It is dangerous. It is dangerous for the future of our country. It is dangerous for the future of your family, if you are watching at home.

Joseph Story was a great American legal scholar and Supreme Court Justice, the author of the seminal "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States" that we used to have to read in law school. He said it this way on this subject. This is very important. Listen to what he said.

He said: "If aliens might be admitted indiscriminately to enjoy all the rights of citizens at the will of a single State, the Union itself might be endangered by an influx of foreigners, hostile to its institutions, ignorant of its powers, and incapable of a due estimate of its privileges."

He said that so well. I wholeheartedly agree. I know everyone on our side of the aisle does.

If we are going to maintain this great American experiment, this grand experiment in self-governance that we have now kept for 248 years, if we are going to keep it for more, then we have to ensure that the outcomes of our elections remain in the hands of Americans alone.

□ 1215

Now, some of our colleagues are arguing and some of the outside interest groups who want those open borders, the open borders crowd, they are pointing out that it is already illegal to vote, and you don't really need to do this. That is true, it is illegal to vote under Federal law. Only a U.S. citizen is supposed to vote in a U.S. election.

But here is the problem: The law is not being followed. Even though it is already illegal, this is happening.

Let me give you a couple examples.

In Georgia, State election officials are catching thousands of noncitizens who are trying to register to vote, but they are one of only a few States that is making that effort right now to check the voter rolls on the front end before the disaster occurs.

In May, the State of Ohio, they had to remove 137 noncitizen voters from the rolls when they did a quick check.

In May of last year, Virginia removed almost 1,500 noncitizens from their

voter rolls. Here is the catch: It was only after more than 800 of those noncitizen ballots had been cast in 2019. They already participated in an election illegally.

It shouldn't surprise us that criminals who break our border laws are also going to break our election laws. These are not paragons of virtue in all these cases, as the 70 percent of people who come across the border who are military-aged males come into our country without any deterrence at all. They are not law-abiding citizens. They are illegal aliens, and they should not be participating in the election.

Remember, if just a small percentage, a fraction of a fraction of all those illegals that Joe Biden has brought in here to vote, if they do vote, it wouldn't just change one race, it might potentially change all of our races.

Now, despite the claims of our opponents, it is also true there are no current preventative mechanisms to ensure that only those registering or voting are actually citizens.

Perhaps the Democratic Party would prefer that we only identify fraudulent voters after the fact, after an election is already decided and the new Members are sworn in. That is not acceptable. That doesn't instill trust. It doesn't ensure the integrity of the system.

Of course, that is nonsense. It is good and right to take preventative action now. We can look out on the horizon. We know the storm is coming. We know we have an unprecedented number of illegal aliens. We know many of them are being encouraged to register to vote, and they are doing so. We know we have a problem.

We have a duty here under the Constitution to ensure it doesn't happen. We have an instrument before us, a piece of legislation, that will do just that, and there is no excuse—no excuse—to oppose it.

Of course, preventative action is desperately needed because of all this, and the stakes are so high, and the loopholes are so wide that we have to do it.

Regardless of what the detractors say, the voter laws are really that lax. If a citizen wants to vote for President, they just have to go to their local DMV, they go to the local welfare office or some other government agency, and they are given a very simple form that says while you are here signing up for taxpayer benefits, Mr. Noncitizen who just came across the border and was sent here by plane, train, or automobile by an NGO who, by the way, is sending the receipt for that to the U.S. taxpayer that we are all funding, hey, since you are here and signing up for benefits, do you also want to register to vote? On the form that was passed by Congress back in the early nineties, the motor voter registration law, it just has one little box that asks: Are you a U.S. citizen? How many people are checking that box who are not supposed to?

Well, the problem is, whoever is working there is not allowed under current law to ask for proof of that citizenship. If somebody checks the box, they can't stop them and say, hey, do you have any paperwork to prove that? Where are you from? You have a funny accent. Oh, you don't speak English? Are you a citizen? They don't have any way to prove it.

I believe I stand with the American public when I say our elections are just too important to simply rely on the honor system by people who have already proven they have no regard or respect for our laws.

Would we be so foolish as to think every one of the 500 got-aways sneaking through our southern border every single day have good intentions? Come on. We have got to apply reason and common sense.

Would we prefer to wait for fraud to happen and only do something after elections are finalized? No. We have to catch the fraud on the front end so there is no question about the integrity of our votes. Again, this is our duty to do so.

If we don't catch any unlawful voters, great, that is wonderful. It means our systems are secure. If we do catch unlawful voters, then good, we stop them from voting. We did what was right by the Constitution, right by our Federal law, and right by the people that we represent.

There should be no objection to this legislation at all.

I will conclude with this: I have been here 8 years. Every so often in this Chamber, we take a vote that clearly reveals what we think about the world. There are important votes every day, but there are some votes that define who we are. It defines our world, and it defines what we believe about the Constitution and about the rule of law. It defines our careers, and it defines our character. It is a signal to the voters fundamentally about what we believe about our country.

Republicans want 100 percent participation by citizens in our elections, eligible citizens who can vote. We want everybody to vote. We want 100 percent participation, but we want zero percent fraud. We want American citizens to be the lone people who decide our elections.

Here is the question that is about to be answered on this floor: Do Democrats want that same thing, or do they want to hand over our country to the worst impulses and nefarious plans of foreign spies and criminals who will exploit the system for their own gain?

Republicans are anxious to get this done. We are anxious to take the necessary steps to protect the integrity of every single vote, and we will ensure that we have free and fair elections, and we will ensure that only Americans decide American elections.

The question that will be answered—and it is not a rhetorical question; this is a real live exercise—can Democrats say the same thing? Is there any meas-

ure that they will take to reduce the opportunity for fraud? Today is their chance, and, unfortunately, I am not that hopeful that they are going to do the right thing, but you are about to find out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members not to refer to persons in the gallery.

COMMENDING THE DEDICATION AND HARD WORK OF STELLA JIMENEZ

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the dedication and hard work of Stella Jimenez, my outstanding district director, as I bid her farewell as she moves on to the next step of her career.

Stella Jimenez brought a wealth of experience and an unwavering commitment to community service and a dedication to enact positive change.

Stella had a pivotal role in leading diverse initiatives aimed at enhancing the well-being of residents in Imperial and Riverside Counties.

Stella demonstrated a profound understanding of the community's needs and challenges. Her leadership, characterized by a unique combination of grace and effectiveness, garnered admiration and respect from colleagues and constituents alike.

Stella's dedication to community engagement was unparalleled. Whether it was championing the proposed Chuckwalla National Monument or ensuring full stakeholder engagement in Imperial County, she approached each initiative with unwavering determination.

Under her guidance, these events not only achieved success but also carried a deeply personal touch reflecting Stella's commitment to meaningful connection.

I am profoundly grateful for the privilege of working with Stella Jimenez, and I wish her the best in her next life adventure.

RECOGNIZING SOLDIERS REUNION

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, next month we celebrate the 134th annual Soldiers Reunion celebration in Newton, North Carolina, which I am proud to represent. It is believed to be the longest running patriotic celebration in the country that is not based on a holiday.

Thousands of people will gather for various events including concerts, a car show, a bike ride, and a 5K. The sidewalks will be packed with families from August 10 through 15 for the annual parade and the festival surrounding Newton's 1924 courthouse. It is a special celebration.

Our veterans and active servicemembers will be honored and recognized throughout the week, as they have been recognized since this tradition began in 1889.

I thank and congratulate the citizens of Newton and the local organizations who spend many months each year planning for the Soldiers Reunion. They deserve our recognition for this annual reminder of the debt and gratitude we owe those who serve our Nation.

NASH COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRE-APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the exceptional apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship programs Nash Community College offers.

The STEPS4GROWTH Pre-Apprenticeship is an incredible opportunity for individuals interested in advanced manufacturing or clean energy vehicles.

Imagine not just learning but actively engaging with industry-experienced instructors, gaining hands-on experience, and working on real projects that can kickstart a career.

These programs don't just benefit students. Local organizations can also boost their productivity and profitability by participating.

It is an exciting chance for students to dive into their passions and for local communities to nurture the next generation of talented workforce-ready individuals. We have seen the benefits and the results across the region at places like OIC.

I commend Nash Community College for its commitment to keeping the American Dream within reach for eastern North Carolinians.

INFLATION

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, month after month, the American people endure higher utility bills and rising costs at the grocery store and the gas pump.

Inflation has risen by more than 20 percent since President Biden took office. That is just an average. Every day, folks are actually paying 35 percent more for flour, 40 percent more for eggs, and 27 percent more for butter. That is on top of paying 29 percent more for electricity, about 55 percent more for a gallon of gas, and 21 percent more in monthly rent.

It adds up to more than \$1,000 a month for the same goods and services that American families were buying before these historic price increases. This is a direct result of the Biden administration's overspending and overregulation.

While we hear White House officials continue to dismiss the sticker shock that Americans face every day, House Republicans are committed to reining in the reckless spending in Washington and restoring fiscal sanity.

DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, 8 months ago, the President put forth a supplemental disaster recovery funding request, and while Congress has failed to act, wildfires, hurricanes, and extreme weather conditions have continued to strike.

On June 28, the President submitted to Congress an updated request for \$700 million for the Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery program. These funds play an essential role in communities across the country in towns like Lahaina that have been devastated by fire and help to rebuild housing, infrastructure, and other facilities.

The need for this request is urgent. As we look ahead to a hyperactive hurricane and wildfire season, working families and communities across the country are still struggling to rebuild homes and businesses ravaged by the impacts of the last storm cycle.

Mr. Speaker, disaster does not discriminate, and it does not wait. I urge this House to immediately bring the disaster supplemental request up for a vote before we depart for the August recess. Doing so ensures we get the work of the people done and deliver much-needed relief to our communities across the country.

BUREAUCRATIC WASTE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, so far Congress has provided \$7.5 billion for electric vehicle charging stations via the so-called infrastructure bill.

Mr. Speaker, \$5 billion of that money is allocated to individual States to build a network of fast chargers along major highways in the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure program.

This outpouring of funds, the intense focus of the Department of Transportation and the Biden administration has only managed to finish seven of these stations in only four States.

Investment seems to be the term used on this topic to get around the fact that nothing is getting done and an incredible amount of taxpayer money is being spent.

There is a consistent pattern of electric vehicle charging stations being exempted also from the Buy America provisions that were expanded in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

We are buying these components from China because most are not sourced from U.S. manufacturing because we are in a big hurry, it seems, to not actually build them.

This is a pathetic and embarrassing show of bureaucratic waste and a slap in the face to American workers.

The whole Biden administration at every level, be it funding or regulation, have forced electric vehicles and have forced the demand that the infrastructure isn't even close to being in place for.

Mr. Speaker, 7 in 10 Americans said they don't want to buy an EV and are already trying to give back what they have.

□ 1230

BELTED GALLOWAY JUNIOR NATIONALS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three outstanding young people from Venango County, Pennsylvania, who competed in the first-ever Belted Galloway Junior Nationals event at the Medina County Fairgrounds in Medina, Ohio.

The Belted Galloway is a traditional Scottish breed of beef cattle. The Buckeye Battle of the Belts took place June 26 through June 30. I proudly recognize these livestock enthusiasts from Venango County:

Mark Snyder, 18, of Titusville, won the grand champion overall pure breed Belted Galloway bull, fourth overall intermediate sales talk, third intermediate team fitting, reserve grand champion overall purebred Belted Galloway heifer, and two class winners Belted Galloway heifer.

Coltin Cross, 16, of Rockland, won Belted Galloway class winner heifer, third intermediate overall cattlemen's quiz, third intermediate team fitting, and 10th overall intermediate points.

Marie Schwab, 13, of Oil City, won third junior public speaking, fifth junior sales talk, reserve team fitting, fourth junior judging contest, seventh overall junior points, champion Belted Galloway immediate heifer, champion Belted Galloway prospect steer, champion overall purebred Belted Galloway steer.

Mr. Speaker, I am so impressed with these young people. The Belted Galloway Junior Nationals provide a platform for youths aged 18 to 21 to showcase their skills, dedication, and passion for agriculture. I congratulate them all.

HONORING BOONE COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT ASSISTANT CHIEF MATTHEW TOBBEN

(Mr. ALFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart today that I rise to honor the life and service of Boone County Fire Protection District Assistant Chief Matthew Tobben, who lost his life in the line of duty this week during a high-water rescue.

Prior to joining the Boone County team this year, Matt spent 19 years with the Union Fire Department and was part of Missouri Task Force One for 12 years.

Today, we honor and remember Matt, especially his selfless dedication to others and his courage to always answer the call. He never turned down an opportunity to make a rescue or help his community.

Our sincere condolences are with his family, friends, and loved ones. The Fourth District of Missouri will forever be grateful to Matt for his service and heroism.

PROTECTING HOME APPLIANCE CHOICE

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

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to state my support for H.R. 7700, the Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act, and H.R. 7637, the Refrigerator Freedom Act, which passed the House this week.

Since his first day in office, President Biden has repeatedly advanced burdensome rules, regulations, and mandates that have made Americans' lives more difficult and caused prices to skyrocket. Across the board, prices are up 20 percent because of President Biden's failed and inflationary policies.

Families in Florida cannot afford Bidenomics. House Republicans are fighting to protect families from burdensome mandates, safeguard consumer choice, and defend cost-effective energy solutions.

That is what these important bills will do. President Biden's war on everyday household appliances only hurts hardworking Americans and small businesses. People in Florida, not bureaucrats in Washington, should be able to decide what appliances they want in their homes.

These bills will protect affordability and choice, allowing all Americans the ability to make the right decision for themselves and their families.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION RELATING TO "STAFF ACCOUNTING BULLETIN NO. 121"—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 3, 2024, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message

of the President on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121".

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of June 3, 2024, at page H3548.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member on the Committee on Financial Services, pending which I will yield myself such time as I may consume.

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 veto message of H.J. Res. 109.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding President Biden's veto of H.J. Res. 109.

It didn't have to be this way. It did not have to be this way on digital assets, on the regulation of digital assets, on the functioning of a new asset class that a substantial number of Americans, and those around the world, are using, a new set of technology.

The Biden administration has been given every opportunity to work with this Congress on digital asset policy and to come to a reasonable conclusion on digital asset policy.

In May, Congress passed a resolution to overturn the Securities and Exchange Commission's SAB 121 with broad bipartisan support in both the House and Senate. A lot has changed since that time.

Following that vote, the House passed historic digital asset market structure legislation, called FIT21, with an overwhelming two-thirds support of this Chamber. In divided times, a vote like that in this Chamber is a substantial statement of the validity of a policy. That means that 71 members of the President's own party voted for that bill.

Today's vote should mirror the support of FIT21, given that this policy change was also in that legislation they voted for.

SAB 121 is one of the most glaring examples of the regulatory overreach that has defined Chair Gary Gensler's tenure at the Securities and Exchange

Commission. It limits consumers' options to safely custody their digital assets, upending decades of bank custody practices and increasing concentration risk.

This is real consumer harm that is now in the marketplace because of these rules that Gensler has put in place.

Congress used the mechanism available to us, the Congressional Review Act, to overturn this harmful so-called guidance. To be clear, a bipartisan CRA sends a strong message. A bipartisan Congressional Review Act vote that passes both Chambers, well, that is a mandate from the Americans we represent.

Despite all the recent progress and bipartisan agreement, President Biden vetoed the first digital asset-specific legislation that ever passed the House and Senate. It has never been clearer that this administration would rather play politics and side with power-hungry bureaucrats over the American people and over new technology and the safe use of new technology.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support today's resolution, overturn the veto, and take a small step to bring sanity to the American digital asset policy landscape.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 109, which if passed would undermine the Securities and Exchange Commission's ability to protect people who buy cryptocurrency.

Today, Republicans want to override President Biden's veto and block the SEC from setting accounting standards for companies that hold digital assets, like crypto, on behalf of their customers. This resolution is part of a long list of efforts by industry and its allies to attack the good work of the SEC, which has made significant progress in protecting investors; maintaining fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and facilitating capital formation.

Preserving the power of the SEC to protect investors and our markets is now more important than ever, especially in light of the recent Supreme Court ruling in *Loper v. Raimondo*, which, by overturning *Chevron* deference, has now undermined the authority of the SEC and other Federal agencies.

The SEC staff accounting bulletin, SAB 121, is an informal guidance intended to clarify confusion raised by market participants. One prong of SAB 121 that would be repealed by today's resolution is about giving the public disclosures to increase transparency about these cryptoassets.

This kind of transparency helps prevent the kind of fraud and mishandling of crypto that led to the collapse of companies like FTX and a dozen other crypto firms that were handling and safeguarding customers' assets.

The second part of SAB 121's guidance advises companies to record cryptoassets as liabilities on their balance sheets and to ensure those liabilities correspond to the fair value of the cryptoassets they are obligated to safeguard.

This ensures that the company providing custody has sufficient resources to secure these assets for the users against any loss or misuse. The SEC has explained that this guidance is prudent due to the unique risk and uncertainties associated with cryptoassets. These risks include hacks, theft, and technical failures.

SEC's guidance simply says a firm that safeguards cryptoassets on behalf of customers should account for these unique crypto risks by recording these assets on its balance sheet as a liability. These safeguards would be completely undermined by passing H.J. Res. 109.

The crypto industry and its allies have long chided the SEC for not providing enough clarity over how cryptoassets should be regulated. However, SAB 121 directly addressed industry uncertainty. It is just that the industry didn't like the answer they got.

□ 1245

Should H.J. Res. 109 come into law, it would not only eliminate SAB 121's helpful guidance, but it would also permanently block the agency's ability to do anything substantially similar in this area in the future.

One special interest group representing large custody banks has provided the SEC with targeted modifications to SAB 121, which would avoid the sledgehammer effect of this legislation. I understand that the SEC may be close to reaching an agreement on these modifications, which would ensure that well-regulated entities, like custody banks, can offer crypto custody services consistent with SAB 121. Nevertheless, despite the fact that this issue will soon be moot, Republicans are pushing ahead anyway with this blunt and overly broad approach.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the ranking member to yield. There is this rumor that has been going about that there is this resolution at the SEC with a group of banks, and they are going to let certain banks custody digital assets in some deal that is being made. I have no details of it. The first public pronouncement of this I heard from the ranking member.

I was just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire of the ranking member if there is paper on this or any published accounts of what the ranking member said.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the ranking member.

I am interested in this deal that she has talked about that certain banks

can custody digital assets and there is a deal made with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The first I heard of this was the pronouncement that the ranking member just made. I am just wondering if there is any published account of this or anything in writing we have from the SEC?

Ms. WATERS. If I may respond to the gentleman.

Mr. MCHENRY. I am happy to yield.

Ms. WATERS. As I said when I made the presentation, they are close to working out the deal with SAB and the custody bank.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just say that the idea that Congress is going to wait because you have banks trying to get a special carve-out for themselves from Gary Gensler and the SEC, that is not sound public policy. The idea that Congress is going to wait and pause on overriding the President's veto is really bad policy that harms consumers. Just because we have a rumor that two people are talking or 10 people are talking, that is not the way a great state should do business. A great nation-state with the best capital markets on the globe should not be doing business this way.

We should have clarity under the law that peoples' financial assets are going to be protected, and they are going to be protected in a resilient regime, which we have. We have it for securities. We have it for commodities. We should have it for digital assets, the same protections we have for these other financial assets, and we don't because of the actions of Gary Gensler and the Biden administration that have said that you can't hold these assets in custody. It has made it more risky for consumers to own digital assets.

So let's reject this idea that we just wait for a couple of people to strike some private deal for a group of banks. Let's make this correct. Let's make it right for the American people. Let's vote to override this veto.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD), who is the author of the original bill that the President vetoed that we are now voting on again.

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel like we should start with a definition of "custody." It is that basic, Mr. Speaker. Banks hold others' assets in custody, and they don't put them on their balance sheet.

This is an example of Mr. Gensler at the SEC using a staff accounting bulletin to keep banks out of digital asset custody. The first time this resolution went through Congress, it received, as the chairman said, bipartisan support from both the House and the Senate, including Majority Leader SCHUMER. Think about that, Mr. Speaker: Majority Leader SCHUMER broke with his own party and with his own party's President on this issue.

The reason for that support, and it is really simple, the SEC got its hand caught in the cookie jar. They overstepped in a blatant way that runs contrary to its obligation to protect investors.

What is the SEC doing in banking policy?

Somebody, ask the Federal Reserve. Ask the OCC. Ask the Treasury Department.

Do they think this is right?

Look at the testimony in front of the Financial Services Committee.

SAB 121 is not a political issue. It is simply a bad regulation. No matter what your feelings are about cryptocurrency, the SEC shouldn't be writing bank custody rules, and they definitely shouldn't be overstepping their authority to do it.

Moreover, now on this floor today we hear from the ranking member that there is some private deal with a couple of banks. To the chairman's point, that is not good public policy. That is amateur hour. That is trying to avoid the embarrassment of having the House of Representatives vote like it did on FIT21 where a better than two-thirds majority were in support of this very policy.

Finally, let's be clear. SAB 121 is bad policy that affects the entire banking system, not just one bank or one small group of banks. If the SEC wants to fix this problem themselves, then they shouldn't rescind the bulletin for every bank in America that is publicly traded. One-off agreements do not fix underlying problems with this fatally flawed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me address the Democrats in this Chamber and say: Sustain President Biden's veto.

This is the worst possible week for Democrats to do anything else but to stand behind President Biden's veto. If you vote the other way, then you can explain to the press that you repudiated the President's decision and that you voted to override a Presidential veto—something I don't think we have done in a long time—because you had extensive conversations with Paul Munter, the chief accountant of the SEC, and he was unable to convince you that Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 properly lays out for generally accepted accounting principle purposes which asset should be on the balance sheet.

You can then discuss with them how you also commented on a host of other accounting principles that put assets on the balance sheet that are not actually owned but might be leased or held by the company on whose balance sheet they are listed.

You can then discuss with them your personal views on accounting theory

and try to convince them that you repudiated the President because of deeply held concerns on what assets should and should not be on the balance sheet. However, they will not listen. They will tell you that you voted to override a Presidential veto this very week.

Now, we are told that somehow this is going to prevent banks from acting as custodians. It does not because we have three accounting systems in this country.

We have tax accounting, which is separate from GAAP, or generally accepted accounting principles, which are for disclosures to investors; and we have a third accounting system for regulated companies, particularly banks, called regulatory accounting principles, or RAP.

This pronouncement doesn't deal with RAP. Banks are free to do what they want. They must inform their investors what they did, and then the investors can decide whether that bank is one they want to invest in.

Now we are told that we should override SAB 121.

What effect does that have?

Not only does it take crypto off the balance sheet, it prevents the chief accountant from writing another regulation or staff accounting bulletin requiring footnote disclosure. So then you would be voting for no disclosure to investors of the very significant risk of holding these crypto assets.

You can argue for balance sheet disclosure. You can argue instead for footnote disclosure. However, if you vote today for no disclosure in the financial statements, then that is a repudiation of all modern accounting theory.

I did want to point out, as the ranking member has, that there is a substantial risk to banks in holding crypto assets, and Sam Bankman-Fried's fraud is just one of many in the crypto world. So this disclosure is necessary for investors to decide what risks they are taking when they invest in the stock of a bank.

So, in summary, if you believe that crypto assets that the bank is holding as a custodian should be on the balance sheet, then vote "no." If you believe that crypto asset risks, the risks that the bank has by acting as a custodian for crypto, should only be disclosed in the footnotes, then vote "no."

If you have no deeply felt opinion on whether generally accepted accounting principles should cause assets that are being held by a custodian or a lessee should be on the balance sheet, should be in the footnotes, or should not be in the financial statements at all, if you do not have a deeply held personal belief on this technical matter of accounting, then vote "no" and sustain President Biden's veto.

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

I have to address this, Mr. Speaker, because there is a lot of gibberish that I just heard about this vote being an endorsement of President Biden or something like that, and I don't want to get into that debate. I don't.

The question of whether or not the President cares about the veto or is going to look through the vote count on this day or whatever else or the politics of what is happening in the hallways here with all my Democratic colleagues being asked about the President, I am trying to withhold from opining about those things.

I see in press reports that the President is really dialed in between 10 and 4 and this vote being at 1 p.m., perhaps he is going to look at the vote total. Perhaps. However, that is all conjecture, and I don't want to get into the conjecture of this stuff. It is not part of the decorum of the House here.

The substance here is about digital assets. What we have shown in this Chamber with a two-thirds vote, 71 Democrats joining with just about every Republican, saying that we want a market structure so that we can develop the next generation of internet technology here in the United States. We want to have consumer protection, safety and soundness ensured so that we can have the best capital markets on the globe, with capital attracted from around the globe here in the United States so it can be deployed safely, and then cutting-edge technologies and digital assets. Just as we had this debate on artificial intelligence, we voted with a two-thirds vote to have a regulatory regime that looks like our capital markets for crypto, and my colleagues, after 21 voted to repeal this stupid accounting—I am sorry—this ill-fitting, ill-designed, poorly thought-out accounting standard that says that crypto is not a real asset and we are going to treat it as this other thing so it can't be in regulated finance. We had 21 Democrats vote with us to repeal this rule. Then we had 71 Democrats vote for a full market structure for crypto.

I would say to those 50 Democrats who voted on the large regulation, the larger regulation package on crypto, look at this anew, and if you want to send a message that you are pro-crypto, if you want to send the message to your voters that you are pro-crypto and you want to protect their assets, those 50 who voted for the market structure but didn't vote for this should vote with us. We should have a two-thirds vote of this House to repeal this ill-designed accounting standard.

This is not a marker of Presidential leadership. What we have heard from this administration is all over the map on what they want to do with crypto, and now they are contorting themselves as the election gets closer.

So let's just do the right thing. Let's support sound policy. Let's override this veto and send a message that America will remain the best place in the world to deploy capital with the best cutting-edge technology with consumer protection and law-abiding rights connected with those digital assets.

Madam Speaker, I would say to my colleague that I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

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

Madam Speaker, no matter what is said, this is about overriding the President's veto. My colleagues argue that SAB 121 undermines the investor protection by discouraging crypto firms and other entities from providing custody services.

However, the numbers show this couldn't be further from the truth. According to figures provided by SEC staff, at least 10 U.S. firms are already offering SAB 121-compliant crypto safeguarding services. As of the end of last year, they were safeguarding close to \$210 billion worth of crypto assets in a SAB 121-compliant way.

This just goes to show, despite all of the talk, that SAB 121 will lead to less companies wanting to safeguard crypto assets. There are, indeed, plenty of firms out there that are doing so in compliance with this staff accounting bulletin.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, this resolution is terrible accounting policy. It has nothing to do with whether banks are allowed to act as custodians since it has no effect on bank regulation, no effect on the calculation of their capital, and no effect on regulatory accounting.

This resolution deprives investors of the knowledge of what risks the bank they are investing in is running. It says you can't put it on the balance sheet on the theory that nothing should be on the balance sheet unless it is owned by the entity whose balance sheet is being filed.

Anyone familiar with lease accounting knows that that is not the basic principle that is carried out with an awful lot of assets that are listed on the balance sheet.

It goes further. It says not only can't the chief accountant and the staff accounting bulletin require disclosure on the balance sheet, but they are prohibited from doing another regulation and disclose it in the footnotes. This is terrible accounting policy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this effort to override the President's veto of H.J. Res. 109. If passed, Congress would block the SEC from providing much-needed and timely clarity to our markets.

We would also be preventing the SEC from ensuring companies that hold crypto on behalf of Americans take the necessary care to ensure those holdings are transparent and accounted for.

For all of the handwringing about the lack of regulatory clarity in the crypto space, it is baffling to me how

the industry wants to make it harder for the SEC to use one of the primary mechanisms it has to provide clarity around crypto: Staff guidance and accounting bulletins.

H.J. Res. 109 is a sledgehammer when what may be needed to address concerns is a scalpel. CRA resolutions, as these are referred to, not only overturn the agency guidance that is the subject of the resolution, but also prevents the SEC from issuing any substantially similar guidance in the future. In essence, even if the SEC wanted to offer clarity around crypto custody in the future, they would no longer be able to do so.

If Republicans want to address the issue previously raised by custody banks, Members could have done that, but now my colleagues have put forth a bill that causes broad harm not only to the SEC, but all the people and companies that rely on the agency to maintain safety and stability.

Madam Speaker, I call on all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the bank trades, the American Bankers Association, the Bank Policy Institute, the Financial Services Forum, and SIFMA, which represents the securities industry in banking, in support of the vote to override the veto.

JULY 10, 2024.

Re Providing for Congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121" (H.J. Res. 109)

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

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

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: The American Bankers Association, Bank Policy Institute, Financial Services Forum, and Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (Associations) write to express our support for H.J. Res. 109, the Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval for the Securities and Exchange Commission's "Staff Accounting Bulletin 121." H.J. Res. 109 is being led by Reps. Mike Flood (R-NE) and Wiley Nickel (D-NC) and Sen. Cynthia Lummis (R-WY). Both the House and Senate passed the measure with a strong bipartisan vote on May 8 and May 16, respectively. Pres. Biden vetoed the measure on May 31, and we write today to voice our support for the House's vote later today to overturn the veto of H.J. Res. 109.

In March 2022, the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Office of the Chief Accountant released Staff Accounting Bulletin (SAB) 121, without consulting the prudential regulators or soliciting public comment, to address perceived risks to publicly traded companies that safeguard digital assets for their customers. Under SAB 121, an entity responsible for safeguarding digital assets

for platform users must measure safeguarding assets and obligations on its balance sheet at the fair value of the related assets, which is a departure from accounting standards and the historical practice of treating custodial assets as off-balance sheet. As this effectively treats the custodial assets as those owned by a bank, SAB 121 effectively precludes banks from offering digital asset custody at scale since placing the value of client assets on their balance sheets will impact certain capital, liquidity, and other prudential requirements. Furthermore, SAB 121 undercuts the ability of banks to develop responsible use cases for distributed ledger technology (DLT) and encumbers regulated broker-dealers from custody services as a result of the net capital rule (Rule 15c3-1), which treats the on-balance sheet items as non-allowable assets.

On February 14, 2024, the Associations sent a joint letter to the SEC noting that over the past two years SAB 121 has curbed the ability of our member banks to develop and bring to market at scale certain digital asset products and services. This includes spot bitcoin exchange traded products (recently approved by the Commission for investors) and the use of DLT to record traditional financial assets (i.e. tokenization).

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, a lot has happened since the original vote in the House in May. A lot has happened. This is an asset class that more Americans own than ever before. This is a new technology being deployed that is going to be the backbone of the next generation of internet technology.

Europeans are establishing a standard and clear rules of the road for crypto and a regulatory regime there. There are clear standards in Japan. There are clear standards in Singapore, the Middle East, and even Hong Kong. There is clarity and rules of the road for crypto.

We had a two-thirds vote in support of clarity for crypto and a full regulatory regime for digital assets, like we have for securities, like we have for commodities, like we have for banking in the United States. These are clear rules of the road, a best-in-class set of regulations for consumers, for those who are creating the technology, who are deploying capital, and for the users of this technology.

Madam Speaker, I know my two colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have spoken in opposition to this

veto override voted against that regulatory regime, along with part of their party. I would say we need to look to the wider vote.

Two-thirds of the House voted for a regulatory regime for crypto and clarity for crypto. There were 21 of my Democratic colleagues who voted for this original bill coming out of the House.

Then it went to the Senate, and an interesting thing happened in the Senate. There were 12 Democratic Senators, Senator WYDEN, Senator LUJÁN, Senator BOOKER, Senator KELLY, Senator CASEY, Senator HICKENLOOPER, Senator ROSEN, Senator TESTER, Senator PETERS, Senator SINEMA, and Senator GILLIBRAND, who represents the capital markets in the United States in New York, and her colleague, New York Senator SCHUMER, who also happens to be the Democratic majority leader in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, I say to my Democratic colleagues: This is not an unsafe vote to override this President's veto. It is a very safe vote for the minority to say to their constituents: I am pro-crypto, and I will stand up and do the right thing for clarity for crypto.

Madam Speaker, we should have a wide bipartisan vote. We should override this veto. We should provide clarity under law. We should do this for consumer protection, and we should do this to be best in class in the world for digital assets.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this veto override and vote "yes."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "NONDISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES RECEIVING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE"

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the joint resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1341, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 165

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance" (89 Fed. Reg. 33474; published April 29, 2024), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

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

The gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the single most important issue for the next generation of daughters soon to enter the world of women's sports.

President Biden issued a final Title IX rule that would effectively end a woman's right to female-only organized athletics. The resolution up for debate today sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) would put a stop to it.

A woman's athletic journey starts at a young age. At the outset, it serves as a vital source of empowerment for young girls. Every young woman remembers gym class and the experience of getting hit with a rogue football or being caught in the middle of a boy-dominated dodge ball dispute. Even from a young age, the inherent value of female-only sports is readily apparent. Young girls grow together, learn from each other, and earn a unique sense of female camaraderie.

Then some women get the chance to carry their talent on to college. Post-

secondary athletic opportunities were slim prior to Title IX when I was growing up. However, Title IX came around in 1972 and swung open the doors to college athletics for women who had historically been excluded from such opportunities.

As the first in my family even to graduate high school, I understood the importance of Title IX to women's fight for access to post-secondary education. I immediately saw the law as a means for women to pursue their passion and further their education, just like the boys did. It was a watershed moment.

Title IX ushered in a golden era for women's competition in education. There is sanctity in the community and tradition of these memories and these spaces and these opportunities for young girls. That is why I want to preserve Title IX and ensure the same opportunities for the next generation of daughters.

This is the task today. Congress has the choice before it to either stand with Title IX and the protection of women, or don't. By adding gender identity to Title IX's protected classes, the radical left and the Biden administration will tear down women's sports and eliminate safe and private spaces for girls.

The rule puts a man's perceived feelings of femininity on par with actual womanhood rooted in biological sex. Effectively, it ensures that anyone who says he is a woman can compete in women's sports, shower with women, and go to the bathroom with women.

□ 1315

My womanhood is not a costume, nor is my daughter's or my granddaughter's. I find it offensive that the Biden administration would treat it that way.

By equating perceived sex with biological sex, this rule is at odds with reality. I, along with my Republican colleagues, stand firmly on the side of reality against this onslaught of gender madness. Biological sex exists. It existed when Title IX was first drafted. It still exists today.

Moreover, this isn't just an issue of fiction versus reality. This is an issue of fairness and safety. Men and women are not physiological equals and treating them so is inherently unfair and dangerous.

The Biden administration's rule will strip women and girls of athletic opportunities and put them in danger.

Finally, this rule prohibits female-only spaces, such as locker rooms, bathrooms, and other sex-separated areas. I will stop at nothing to ensure that America's daughters are not put in that situation.

Today, Congress is called upon to vote for young women across America who would have opportunity, safety, and innocence ripped from them by the Biden administration.

We cannot allow that. Therefore, I urge a "yes" vote on Representative

MILLER's resolution, H.J. Res. 165, to stop Biden's Title IX rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 165, a Congressional Review Act resolution to repeal the Biden-Harris administration's Title IX rule.

The administration's final Title IX rule does three things. First, it safeguards against all forms of sex-based harassment and discrimination by making several improvements to the 2020 Trump administration's Title IX rule. These include requiring schools to take prompt and effective acts to address sexual harassment as opposed to the lax Trump standard that a school's response just not be deliberately indifferent.

The new rule places the duty to report possible discrimination on more employees, in contrast to the old rule, which only required some employees to report when they had actual, not possible, knowledge of sexual discrimination or assault, and it recognizes that discrimination based on sex includes discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity following Supreme Court precedent.

Second, the Title IX rule promotes accountability and fairness in how schools respond to and discipline sex-based discrimination by mandating that schools handle complaints in a timely manner and implement a fair and transparent process.

Finally, this rule empowers students and families to exercise their rights under Title IX. The administration's Title IX rule explicitly protects sexual assault survivors and people affected by discrimination from retaliation for seeking to have their Title IX rights enforced.

Further, the rule guarantees access to supportive services for survivors of sexual assault and accused individuals and, despite what my colleagues repeatedly claim—I thought I was in the wrong debate for a minute—this rule does not address students' participation in sports.

This false narrative follows the many attacks against the LGBTQI+ community in this House and State legislatures across the country. We have had more than 60 anti-LGBTQI+ votes on the House floor this Congress, and it is a distraction to claim that this rule harms women in sports.

For example, the Department has not issued a separate proposed rule to address athletics. They are working on it, but it has not been finalized. That is not the debate we are having today.

Let me be clear: Trans girls like all girls deserve the opportunity to participate on school sports teams, but my colleagues across the aisle keep talking about athletics because they don't want to admit the truth behind this resolution. The resolution is an at-

tempt to undermine nondiscrimination protections for LGBTQI+ students. LGBTQI students, including trans students, deserve to go to school free from discrimination, and that is what this rule is about.

It is not about bathrooms. In fact, the real risk of violence occurs when transgender people are barred from using the appropriate facility. Transgender people experience shockingly high rates of sexual and physical violence and are much more likely to be a victim than a perpetrator.

I am also extremely concerned about the false narrative that my colleagues have invented to portray trans individuals as criminals attempting to enter restrooms to harm others. That is not supported by evidence or data.

Transgender people want the same thing everyone else wants: safety, comfort, and privacy. We must work to protect the transgender community from discrimination and stop the false narratives that exacerbate and encourage prejudice against innocent people.

This bill is particularly extreme because passing it would prevent any substantially similar rule from being enacted on these issues in the future. Voting for this bill would prohibit protections for sexual assault survivors and protections against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity in schools that receive Federal funding.

If Republicans truly cared about protecting women and children, they would stop this prejudiced rhetoric and take action on bills that would actually protect women from discrimination and harassment and defend women's reproductive healthcare, make childcare more affordable, and preserve opportunities in workplaces for all parents, especially women.

Instead, this joint resolution is another attempt to undercut this administration's efforts to empower survivors and protect all Americans from discrimination.

I do want to note that this is another plank in the extremist Project 2025 takeover of government that will sanction discrimination and strip Americans of their rights and freedoms. That is on page 333 if you are looking for it.

I also note that yesterday my Republican colleagues were supporting dignity for dishwashers. I implore all of you to show some dignity to the LGBTQI students who just want to go to school and learn free from discrimination. Show some dignity to the girls and women who survive sexual assault and deserve justice.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons and others, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), the vice chairman of the committee and sponsor of this resolution.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman FOXX for

making the restoration of Title IX such an important priority for this committee.

Madam Speaker, we recently celebrated the 52nd anniversary of this body passing Title IX.

Fifty-two years ago, everyone saw the need for equal opportunities in education, scholarships, and athletics for our girls.

Title IX was enacted to do just that, but Joe Biden's new rule will erase those protections and opportunities for our girls. Unfortunately, the Democrats and the radical left don't know the difference between a man and a woman.

I am proud to be leading this effort today to overturn Joe Biden's unlawful and radical destruction of Title IX.

We keep hearing the Democrats parrot that they are just following the Supreme Court's decision in *Bostock*. That is a lie.

The Supreme Court specifically said in that ruling that *Bostock* should not be applied to Title IX. This is from the majority opinion in *Bostock*: "... we do not purport to address bathrooms, locker rooms, or anything else of the kind," but Joe Biden does not care about courts or the rule of law.

He will do anything to appease the radical left. Biden wants to force biological men into our girls' showers and bathrooms, and the Biden Title IX rule will be the end of girls' sports.

The prospect of this is sickening, and parents across this country are horrified.

We must pray for a return to the Trump administration policies that protected our girls from the vile left-wing agenda to force biological men into our girls' safe spaces and sports.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and stand up to Joe Biden.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I will note that the *Bostock* case did not expressly rule, but they did not say it does not apply. The issue is not before them, and that is why several courts have actually extended the ruling from *Bostock* to other civil rights laws.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA).

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT and my Democratic colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee for your leadership during this important debate.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.J. Res. 165, which would reverse the Biden administration's Title IX rule.

Republicans want the American people to believe that this Title IX rule endangers women and girls.

Republicans want the American people to believe that this Title IX rule strips the due process rights of students accused of sexual misconduct.

Republicans want the American people to believe that this Title IX rule stifles students' free speech and under-

mines parental rights, but they are lying.

The truth is, President Biden's historic Title IX rule strengthens protections for women and girls, pregnant students, survivors of sexual assault, and our LGBTQ+ students, plain and simple.

For 52 years, Title IX has paved the way to allow all of our children to fully participate and engage in their education, in sports, and all other forms of learning as their true authentic selves.

As the mother of Title IX, Patsy Takemoto Mink had a vision and a dream for her daughter, and for all of our children: to live a life free from the kind of discrimination she suffered as a woman of color.

Throughout her pursuit of higher education, she faced racial discrimination, segregation, and limited opportunities all because she was a woman.

Thanks to her groundbreaking advocacy and reforms, today millions more Americans have equal access to opportunities in our Nation's schools. I am humbled to serve in the seat that Patsy once held with grit and grace. I cannot speak for her, but I know in my heart that she would not stand for this kind of politicization of our children that we are seeing here in this very Chamber.

House Republicans' efforts today will seriously gut Title IX and undoubtedly restrict the Department of Education's ability to protect our Nation's most marginalized and most vulnerable students.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Speaker, every student deserves an education free from harassment, discrimination, and violence, and as Americans, we should not stand for this kind of intolerance. That is why I am voting "no" on H.J. Res. 165, and I encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, first of all, I thank Representative MILLER for introducing this Congressional Review Act.

I am old enough to remember when Title IX was passed back in 1972. I will guarantee you, there was not one Congressman in this Chamber who voted for that thing 50 years ago who believed that they were voting to require men be allowed in women's sports or requiring men to be allowed in the women's restroom. Nobody would have dreamed of that.

It is maybe a good example of why we should never give the Federal Government more power around here. The question is: Why are we doing it?

I think President Biden and the Democrats are doing it because he

wants to sympathize with the most radical of LGBT agendas.

□ 1330

The best studies of gender dysphoria show that between 80 and 95 percent of the children who expressed discordant gender identity will eventually come to identify with their bodily sex.

When we try to normalize this, when we try to say it is okay for guys to participate in women's sports or okay for guys to use the women's restroom, what we are doing is lessening the chances that people will kind of come out of it and go back to their natural gender. I believe that is the goal of President Biden's order.

In any event, I am glad we have this resolution. I think we should pass this resolution so that local school districts are not required to agree with somebody's feelings and are not forced to go into a situation in which a person with these feelings is encouraged down this path and, in some ways, made to feel like someone who is somewhat of a hero for going down this path.

We must stand firm in protecting the rights and safety of women and girls, preserving due process, and ensuring fairness in our educational institutions.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, in making these important decisions, it is important to rely on experts like child psychiatrists and pediatricians.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), my colleague from the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I am proud to support the Biden administration's new Title IX rule that recognizes every student deserves to feel safe and explicitly prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex characteristics in schools.

Protecting kids should not be controversial. Allowing parents to parent their kids without interference from the Federal Government should not be controversial.

This cruel attack on LGBTQIA youth from congressional Republicans is just the precursor to the Republicans' Project 2025, a horrific roadmap for a Trump Presidency that would reverse foundational freedoms and destroy our democracy. This 1,000-page manifesto would gut protections for the LGBTQIA+ community and attacks marriage equality, offensively claiming that same-sex marriages are less "stable" than so-called "traditional families."

According to a 2024 survey from the Trevor Project, in the last year, almost half of the LGBTQIA+ youth experienced bullying, and over a third have seriously considered attempting suicide.

The Biden administration's rule is a critical step to supporting our LGBTQIA+ students and ensuring that they have the rights and protections to be who they are without fear of retaliation, bullying, or discrimination.

I am proud to represent Seattle in Congress. I am proud to be the mom of a transgender daughter. I know the importance of protecting the LGBTQIA+ community from discrimination and harassment. Washington State has had these exact protections for LGBTQIA+ youth for 18 years. That is right, 18 years. Our State is a clear example that protecting all kids, no matter how they identify, is good policy that makes our schools safer for everyone.

Republicans' cruel attempt to repeal President Biden's new Title IX rule, fueled by fear tactics and misinformation, tells already vulnerable children in schools that they do not belong. No one, no child, should have to hide who they are to be accepted.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" against this hateful resolution.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a strong sense of compassion but stronger support for H.J. Res. 165, which would overturn the administration's radical rewrite of Title IX.

The Biden administration's failure to honor the vital protection granted to women and girls, not to mention its disregard of existing due process rights, is incredibly dangerous. Just read the rule. By attempting to work toward what the rule calls educational equity, the Biden administration has put women and girls in danger and sacrificed their equal access in educational opportunities.

Their privacy has been invaded, making them vulnerable to many threats, from physical harm in contact sports to sexual harassment in unsupervised areas like bathrooms or locker rooms.

All it takes is to think about the safety of your own daughters or granddaughters to realize that the Biden administration's Title IX rewrite must be stopped.

For decades, women have courageously fought for and successfully earned their equal protection under the law. The Title IX rule not only forces a nonscientific and nonsensical gender ideology onto every American but also undermines the progress of women's rights in our country. It is an enormous step backward.

I have met with female athletes who have lost out on opportunities because of a male taking their place. We have also seen the footage of female athletes being physically hurt by male athletes. Courageous voices, such as Riley Gaines, have had the courage to stand up and speak for millions of young girls across our country who are at risk because of the Biden administration's dangerous policy.

This resolution stands up for those young women and girls who have found their voice and the courage to speak up for truth, fairness, and science. I encourage support of this resolution.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, before yielding to Mr. TAKANO, I reiterate that this rule is not about athletics. There is a separate rule being drafted about addressing athletics. This is not it.

Also, I am concerned about the scare tactics that are being used. Studies show that allowing trans people to use facilities consistent with their gender identity does not result in increased safety risks. Nondiscrimination laws do not allow men to go into women's bathrooms, period. The claim that allowing transgender people to use facilities that match the gender they live every day allows men into women's bathrooms or women into men's bathrooms is based on a flawed understanding of what it means to be a transgender person or a misrepresentation of the law. The real risk occurs when transgender people are barred from using the appropriate facilities.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), my colleague from the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution.

The Biden administration's rule strengthens and clarifies protections against sex-based harassment and discrimination for LGBTQIA+ students, pregnant students, and parenting students. Consistent with the Bostock decision, the final rule clarifies that Title IX's protections extend to cover discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, sex characteristics, and sex stereotypes.

This is gravely needed for LGBTQIA+ students. Currently, 83 percent of LGBTQIA+ students face victimization at school. In States with laws that specifically target gay and transgender youth, the rate of hate crimes in schools has quadrupled.

For these students, the explicit protections the Biden administration has finalized will make a life-changing difference. This rule will decrease absenteeism, improve mental health, and allow students recourse when they are targets of harassment and violence.

Republicans, however, are seeking to overturn a rule precisely because of the protections it extends to queer students and, with the passage of this resolution, tear down all protections that this essential rule clarifies.

This resolution will have drastic consequences. The protections that the administration offers for pregnant and parenting students would also be overturned. Survivors of sexual harassment and assault will continue to face significant barriers to completing their education.

While Republicans claim this resolution is in the interest of women's rights, their proposed solution will make the situation worse for female students.

What overturning this rule does is exacerbates existing inequalities, prevents any future administration from enacting a similar rule, and then places

the blame solely on the LGBTQIA+ community. It is shortsighted, petty, and cruel.

Madam Speaker, I will vote against overturning this rule, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. It is not we who are misleading the American people or scaring the American people. Just read the regulation, which says that schools are not allowed to prevent a person from participating in an education program or activity consistent with the person's gender identity. There are exceptions to the general policy included in the regulations, but athletics are not included among the exceptions.

We are not misleading or lying. The other side is misleading.

It is true the Biden administration has proposed a separate rule on athletics, but it is also true the Biden administration is using that proposed rule to mislead the American people and Congress into thinking athletics aren't affected by the rule this resolution would stop.

Thankfully, the American people can see through the Biden administration's attempts to mislead. We have an opportunity to pass this resolution and protect women's sports.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS), chair of the Higher Education and Workforce Development Subcommittee.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today, as the father of 5 daughters and the grandfather of 12 girls, with a simple truth: Women's sports are for women; girls' sports are for girls; female bathrooms and locker rooms are for females.

When Title IX became law in 1972, it was a watershed moment for the hopes and dreams of every female in America. It was a game changer for women and girls in sports to showcase their talents without discrimination or prejudice.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration wants biological men to compete with women so badly that they are willing to erase decades of progress, placing women and girls in vulnerable, unfair, and dangerous situations, undermining the very protections Title IX was designed to uphold.

President Biden and the Democrats think they can redefine women's sports by redefining fairness. They believe that by replacing the word "equality" with "equity," Americans will come to embrace their Marxist view. They believe that we will learn to reject science, God's wisdom, and good old common sense. They are wrong because they simply do not understand the American way.

The American way does not deny biological reality, and because of its instinctive respect for womanhood, the American way would never deny women and girls the protections they deserve from men.

Our resolution under the Congressional Review Act isn't just about pushing back against administration overreach. It is about standing up for fairness, safety, and equal opportunity. We cannot allow ideological extremism to dictate policy, especially when it disregards scientific facts and threatens the safety of women and girls.

House Republicans are taking a stand to protect women and girls from President Biden's misguided attempts to redefine biological reality. We refuse to allow our daughters to compete in unsafe environments or compromise their dignity in locker rooms and bathrooms.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 165 to stop the Biden administration's attacks on women and girls.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 165, the Congressional Review Act resolution aimed at repealing the Biden-Harris administration's Title IX rule.

This rule is crucial for three reasons.

First, it ensures protections against all forms of sex-based harassment and discrimination. It overturns problematic provisions from the previous administration's rule that allowed educational institutions to ignore harassment and discrimination that happens off-campus, even if it is at an event sponsored by a college organization. It extends this protection to LGBTQIA+ youth, aligning with recent Supreme Court precedent.

Second, it enhances accountability in how schools handle discrimination complaints, including expanding the number of employees required to report problems. It mandates timely responses and fair processes, unlike the previous rule that allowed unreasonable delays, and ensures equitable treatment for all involved.

Third, it empowers students and families to exercise their Title IX rights without fear of retaliation. It supports survivors and provides necessary services while maintaining due process for the accused.

By the way, this rule does not address participation in sports. As has been said, that is the subject of another rule that has not been finalized. The rule does not change anything about sports participation that is already happening.

□ 1345

Unfortunately, this resolution has been clouded by misinformation, unfounded fears, and with some just hatred of transgender individuals. We must reject these narratives and focus on real issues of safety and equity.

This resolution, if passed, would prevent future administrations from enacting similar protections, undermining progress and safeguarding

women, LGBTQ individuals, and survivors of sexual assault.

Let us prioritize issues like reproductive healthcare, affordable childcare, and closing the gender pay gap instead of perpetuating harmful stereotypes.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to nullify the Biden administration's harmful Title IX rule that for the first time includes sexual orientation and gender identity in the definition of sex.

With the stroke of a pen, the Biden administration is making law apart from congressional action, destroying Title IX's promises of equal opportunity for women and eliminating single-sex spaces like bathrooms, locker rooms, and campus housing for female students from kindergarten through grad school.

This forces schools to adopt progressive Democrats' radical worldview that sex is something that can change on a whim and is not a God-created, scientifically immutable design embedded in our DNA.

Democrats would rather perpetuate the harm of gender confusion than stand up for women and girls. Thankfully, the courts have intervened, and this rule is temporarily blocked from going into effect in 14 States, including my home State of Virginia, but if this resolution isn't successful today, a majority of American schoolchildren and teachers will suffer under this policy when they return to school next month.

This school year, we can expect to see more boys joining girls' sports teams in middle school and high school, thanks to Democrats' radical progressive policies.

You can thank our radical Democrat friends when your daughter finds out her freshman roommate is actually a man.

Brace yourself for the onslaught of investigations at the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights when teachers and students who refuse to use nonbiological pronouns are reported to the authorities.

I appreciate Representative MILLER's effort to protect women and girls. I am proud to support this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to nullify the Biden administration rule by supporting H.J. Res. 165.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to point out that it is definitely not the first time that the definition of discrimination based on sex included sexual orientation and gender identity, because Trump-appointed Justice Neil Gorsuch did exactly that in the *Bostock v. Clayton County* case.

I also note that in this resolution, they are saying it is going to hurt girls and women. It absolutely will not. It is going to strengthen protections for girls and women because it ensures colleges and universities properly address sexual violence, violence that disproportionately impacts girls and women. The rule clarifies protections for pregnant and parenting students, and the rule explicitly clarifies protections for the LGBTQI community, including lesbian, bisexual, and transgender girls and women.

As Representative JAYAPAL said, these rules and protections have been in effect in many States, and the sky is not falling. People are free from discrimination in those places.

Republicans are just repeating the lie that they are standing up for women to hide from the radical antiwomen agenda. You don't have to take our word for it. Leading gender justice organizations, like the National Women's Law Center, the American Association of University Women, and Girls Inc., all oppose this resolution to repeal the Title IX rule. That is why these groups, and more than 100 organizations working to advance gender justice, LGBTQI rights, civil rights, and student rights have written to Congress urging us to oppose this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Coalition of Gender Justice, LGBTQI+ rights, civil rights, and student rights groups, opposing H.J. Res. 165.

JUNE 13, 2024.

Re Coalition of Gender Justice, LGBTQI+ Rights, Civil Rights, and Student Rights Groups Urges Members to Oppose H.J. Res. 165

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The undersigned organizations who work to advance gender justice, LGBTQI+ rights, civil rights, and student rights urge you to oppose H.J. Res. 165, and its companion legislation in the Senate, which would undo the U.S. Department of Education's recently published final rule that strengthens Title IX's protections against sex-based discrimination in federally funded schools. Not only would H.J. Res. 165 overturn the entirety of the protections set out in the rule, it would prevent any future effort to reinstate any of these protections. This effort must be rejected, as the U.S. Department of Education's recently finalized rule reinforces and restores Title IX's protections, ensuring that every student has the right to a safe and welcoming learning environment, free from sex discrimination, including LGBTQI+ students, survivors of sexual assault and other sex-based harassment, and pregnant and parenting students.

The updates clarify that Title IX protects against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. With a staggering 83% of LGBTQI+ youth reporting in school victimization—and 62% of those who have faced victimization never reporting an incident to school staff—the Title IX updates will clarify remedies for students facing all types of sex-based harassment and hold school officials accountable for fostering safer school environments. This regulatory clarification ensures that LGBTQI+ youth will be able to equally participate in educational opportunities, from being able to attend prom with a date of their choice and wearing clothes that reflect their gender expression to using a restroom that corresponds with their gender identity.

We collectively reject the false narrative that equal educational opportunity for transgender and non-binary students undermines protections for cisgender girls and women. Transgender women are women and transgender girls are girls who deserve the full protection of federal civil rights law. Policies that seek to undermine protections for transgender women and girls—whether in accessing school restrooms or playing sports—harm all women and girls by allowing them to be subjected to unwarranted and inappropriate scrutiny. This scrutiny also falls particularly hard on women and girls of color who do not follow white standards of womanhood, and any cisgender woman or girl who fails to conform to sex-based stereotypes of femininity because of how they look or act. Further, schools across the country have had gender identity nondiscrimination policies in place for years without any issue, and comprehensive nondiscrimination policies that explicitly enumerate gender identity are associated with safer school environments that result in lower rates of discrimination. Such policies are especially critical for sex-separated spaces such as bathrooms and locker rooms. Transgender and non-binary students avoid sex-separated spaces at higher rates than their LGBQ+ peers, and delayed use of bathrooms can result in adverse impacts on a youth's physical and physiological state, mental health, and academic success and attention at school. Forcing transgender and nonbinary students into sex-separated spaces that are inconsistent with their gender identity may result in increased risk of bullying and physical harassment. In fact, survivor-led organizations and anti-sexual assault and domestic violence organizations support full and equal access for transgender people to use restrooms and locker rooms that align with their gender identity.

Additionally, the Title IX rule reverses the Trump administration's 2020 Title IX rule that significantly weakened protections for student survivors seeking help in the wake of their victimization and incentivize schools to further sweep sexual harassment and assault under the rug. Undoing the 2020 Title IX rule brings justice to survivors by ensuring they are not denied their right to educational opportunities in the wake of sexual assault or harassment. The updates to the Title IX rule no longer allow schools to ignore many reports of sexual assault and remove unfair hurdles uniquely faced by student survivors in their schools' investigations—hurdles that students and employees complaining about any other type of misconduct do not have to experience.

Lastly, the updates to the Title IX rule provide greater clarity on pregnant and parenting students' rights, including affirmative steps schools must take to ensure those students are aware of their rights. Schools must provide reasonable accommodations, such as the ability to take breaks and access to a sanitary and private lactation room. According to the CDC, roughly 50% of teenagers who become pregnant and give birth withdraw from school and do not receive their high school diplomas by age 22. Research indicates that discrimination plays a major role in students having to withdraw early from school, despite pregnant and parenting students earning higher GPAs than their non-parenting peers. These Title IX rule clarifications are much-needed to ensure pregnant and parenting students have a right to equal education opportunities.

Every student deserves to have an education free from discrimination and harassment, including on the basis of sex. We urge you to oppose H. Res. 165, and any efforts to undermine this milestone rule that ensures equal educational opportunity for LGBTQI+

students, survivors of sexual assault and harassment, and pregnant and parenting students.

Sincerely,

A Better Balance, AFT, All* Above All, Alliance for Girls, American Association of University Women, American Atheists, American Humanist Association, American Psychological Association, Arab American Institute (AAI), Ascend, Athlete Ally, Autistic Self Advocacy Network, CA LGBTQ Health and Human Services Network, Center for WorkLife Law, CenterLink: The Community of LGBTQ Centers, Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation (CAASE), Clearinghouse on Women's Issues, Clery Center, Colorado Teen Parent Collaborative, Doctors for America.

EdTrust, Education Law Center, Education Law Center Pennsylvania, End Rape On Campus, Equal Rights Advocates, Equality California, ERA Coalition, Esperanza United, Family Equality, Feminist Majority Foundation, Generation Hope, Girls Inc., GLAAD, GLSEN, Guttmacher Institute, Healthy Teen Network, Human Rights Campaign, Human Rights First, Immigration Equality, Institute for Women's Policy Research.

interACT: Advocates for Intersex Youth, Ipas, It's On Us, Japanese American Citizens League, Jewish Women International, Just Solutions, Justice and Joy National Collaborative (formerly National Crittenton), Know Your IX, Advocates for Youth, Legal Momentum, The Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund, Los Angeles LGBT Center, MomsRising, Monsoon Asians & Pacific Islanders in Solidarity, Movement Advancement Project, Mujeres Latinas en Accion, National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum, National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities, National Association of Social Workers, National Center for Lesbian Rights, National Center for Parent Leadership, Advocacy, and Community Empowerment (National PLACE), National Council of Jewish Women.

National Education Association, National Latina Institute for Reproductive Justice, National LGBTQI+ Cancer Network, National Organization for Women, National Women's Law Center, National Women's Political Caucus, Network for Victim Recovery of DC (NVRDC), Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence, PFLAG National, Population Institute, Public Justice, Reproductive Freedom for All (formerly NARAL Pro-Choice America), Rocky Mountain Victim Law Center, Sexual Violence Prevention Association (SVPA), Silver State Equality-Nevada, Stop Sexual Assault in Schools, Supermajority, Tahirih Justice Center, The Trevor Project, Trans Empowerment Project.

Trans Formations Project, Transgender Law Center, Ujima, The National Center on Violence Against Women in the Black Community, UltraViolet, Victim Rights Law Center, VOICEINSPORT Foundation, Women's March, Women's Sports Foundation, YWCA USA.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. McCLAIN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Madam Speaker, today, our girls are under attack. Our daughters are under attack.

I ask this: What about their freedoms? What about their rights? Do they not have any rights? Do they not have any freedoms?

I say they do. I am here to protect women's and girls' rights and freedoms.

For more than 50 years, Title IX has ensured our daughters have access to quality education and athletic programs. Now, President Biden and his bureaucrats at the Department of Education, are hell-bent on erasing those vital protections for our girls.

This rule to redefine sex discrimination on the basis of gender identity will force schools to provide biological men, who claim to be women, access to women's locker rooms. Yes, that is the truth. That is not fear. That is the truth.

They will also be allowed to go to their same bathrooms. What about our daughters' rights? What about our daughters' freedoms? What about their rights? What about girls' rights and women's rights to have safety and feel secure? Do they not have any rights anymore?

They should not be an expense at all. This is absolutely ridiculous.

You want to talk about us fearmongering? If these allegations that we are talking about right now wouldn't be true, he wouldn't have had to redefine the law without congressional consent. He did it with a stroke of his pen.

The rule to redefine sex discrimination on the basis of gender identity will force schools to provide biological men, who claim to be women, access to women's locker rooms.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Madam Speaker, that is why this CRA is so important, and that is why I am proud to cosponsor it. Why? Because I will stand up for women and girls.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Madam Speaker, do you remember the 1970s? It was the decade of bell-bottom pants, lava lamps, and disco, but the seventies went beyond fads. Profound changes to societal norms took root, particularly for women, in 1972.

In 1972, women were paid 60 percent less than men. Single women couldn't buy a home without a cosigner. Even more jarring, only 1 in 27 girls participated in high school sports.

The tide began to turn that year with the passage of Title IX, the monumental legislation that leveled the playing field to ensure women and girls have an equal opportunity in education and sports.

More than just throwing a ball, playing a sport means learning lifelong skills, leadership, teamwork, and discipline. Title IX paved the way for girls to compete and lead in athletics.

It has been 52 years since 1972, yet Democrats are trying to reverse many

decades of revolutionary change by allowing men to compete against women. It is what the woke progressive mob calls equality.

Every time a male takes a lane in a pool, a spot on the field, or on the starting line, a female athlete loses the opportunity to compete. Madam Speaker, that doesn't sound very equal to me.

There is a reason that men's sports and women's sports are separate. The inclusion of men into women's sports breaches the privacy of all athletes, compromises fairness and safety, and subverts opportunities for women.

Madam Speaker, today, I say "no" to men competing in women's sports. I say "no" to men in women's locker rooms. I say "no" to men in women's showers. I say "no" to the Biden administration's proposed changes that will allow all of this when they try to change Title IX.

That is why today, Madam Speaker, we are in a battle of survival for women's sports. We have to pass the resolution. I stand in support of the resolution and ask for your help. Let's go get it done.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to note that there are so many groups, domestic violence and sexual assault organizations, such as the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence, that have all signed onto a national consensus statement of anti-sexual assault and domestic violence in support of full and equal access for the transgender community.

They noted: Nondiscrimination laws do not allow men to go into women's restrooms or locker rooms, period. The claim that allowing transgender people to use the facilities that match the gender they live every day, that it allows men into women's bathrooms or women into men's, is based on a flawed understanding of what it means to be transgender.

I will note that out of approximately 110,000 collegiate athletes, there are approximately 35 who identify as transgender.

Nondiscrimination laws protecting transgender people have existed for a long time. In some cases, these protections have been in place for decades. The laws have protected people from discrimination without creating harm. None of those jurisdictions have seen a rise in sexual violence or other public safety issues due to nondiscrimination laws.

Assaulting another person in a restroom or a changing room or a locker room is against the law in every State, including under this rule.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women in opposition to this resolution and in support of full and equal access for the transgender community.

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN,

April 21, 2016.

NATIONAL CONSENSUS STATEMENT OF ANTI-SEXUAL ASSAULT AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF FULL AND EQUAL ACCESS FOR THE TRANSGENDER COMMUNITY

We, the undersigned sexual assault and domestic violence organizations, oppose anti-transgender initiatives. These initiatives utilize and perpetuate the myth that protecting transgender people's access to restrooms and locker rooms endangers the safety or privacy of others. As organizations that care about reducing assault and violence, we favor laws and policies that protect transgender people from discrimination, including in accessing facilities that match the gender they live every day.

States across the country have introduced harmful legislation or initiatives that seek to repeal non-discrimination protections or restrict transgender people's access to gender-specific facilities like restrooms. Those who are pushing these proposals have claimed that these proposals are necessary for public safety and to prevent sexual violence against women and children. As rape crisis centers, shelters, and other service providers who work each and every day to meet the needs of all survivors and reduce sexual assault and domestic violence throughout society, we speak from experience and expertise when we state that these claims are false.

Nondiscrimination laws protecting transgender people have existed for a long time. Over 200 municipalities and 18 states have nondiscrimination laws protecting transgender people's access to facilities consistent with the gender they live every day. In some cases, these protections have been in place for decades. These laws have protected people from discrimination without creating harm. None of those jurisdictions have seen a rise in sexual violence or other public safety issues due to nondiscrimination laws. Assaulting another person in a restroom or changing room remains against the law in every single state. We operate and advocate for rape crisis centers and shelters all over the country, including in cities and states with non-discrimination protections for transgender people. Those protections have not weakened public safety or criminal laws, nor have they compromised their enforcement.

Nondiscrimination laws do not allow men to go into women's restrooms—period. The claim that allowing transgender people to use the facilities that match the gender they live every day allows men into women's bathrooms or women into men's is based either on a flawed understanding of what it means to be transgender or a misrepresentation of the law.

It may be hard to understand the experiences of transgender people, especially if you have never met a transgender person. We believe in respecting the identities of transgender people. Transgender people live in a society that often discriminates against them and makes it much harder for them to participate in the routines of daily life.

The efforts to ban transgender people from using public restrooms obscures the fact that all of us, including transgender people, are deeply concerned about safety and privacy in restrooms. Transgender people already experience unconscionably high rates of sexual assault—and forcing them out of facilities consistent with the gender they live every day makes them vulnerable to assault. As advocates committed to ending sexual assault and domestic violence of every kind, we will never support any law or policy that

could put anyone at greater risk for assault or harassment. That is why we are able to strongly support transgender-inclusive non-discrimination protections—and why we oppose any law that would jeopardize the safety of transgender people by forcing them into restrooms that do not align with the gender they live every day.

It is natural to be concerned about safety and privacy. As advocates and survivors, we know the threat of sexual assault is real and pervasive. Every time we hear of someone who speaks of their assault or abuse, we feel their pain. The safety fears that many have, especially those who are survivors, are not baseless or irrational, nor should they be dismissed. However, discriminating against transgender people does nothing to decrease the risk of sexual assault.

Discriminating against transgender people does not give anyone more control over their body or security. Those who perpetuate falsehoods about transgender people and nondiscrimination laws are putting transgender people in harm's way and making no one safer. We cannot stand by while the needs of survivors, both those who are transgender and those who are not, are obscured in order to push a political agenda that does nothing to serve and protect victims and potential victims. We will only accomplish our goal of ending sexual violence by treating all people, including those who are transgender, with fairness and respect.

National Organizations:

9to5 National Association of Working Women, Alliance for HOPE International, Alliance for Strong Families and Communities, American Association of University Women, American Dance Therapy Association, American Psychological Association, Asian Pacific Institute on Gender Based Violence, Battered Women's Justice Project, Break the Cycle, Center for Women Policy Studies, End Violence Against Women International, Faith Trust Institute, Futures Without Violence, Hollaback!, Jewish Women International.

Just Detention International, Know Your IX, Legal Momentum, Men As Peacemakers, Men's Story Project, National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity (NAPE), National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, National Center for Victims of Crime, National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Clearinghouse for Defense of Battered Women, National Council of Jewish Women, National Domestic Violence Hotline, National Housing Law Project, National Indigenous Women's Resource Center, National Latina@ Network: Casa de Esperanza.

National Network to End Domestic Violence, National Organization for Men Against Sexism, National Organization for Women, National Organization of Asian Pacific Islanders Ending Sexual Violence, National Organization of Sisters of Color Ending Sexual Assault, National Organization for Victim Assistance, National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, National Women's Law Center, Praxis International, Resource Sharing Project, Stop it Now!, Support Network of Advocates for Protective Parents, UltraViolet, Women of Color Network, YWCA.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MORAN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 165 introduced by Congresswoman MILLER.

It is disheartening that there is even a need for this legislation, but it is needed because President Biden has led a crusade against biological reality and common sense.

This new Title IX rule erodes underlying protections for women and girls. As a father of two young ladies, I can tell you that I am devastated and appalled by the action of the Department of Education.

Title IX was written to protect women by ensuring equal opportunities for young women and girls in educational programs. However, this new rule, promoted by radical ideologies, shatters it by redefining “sex” to include sexual orientation and gender identity.

By redefining “sex” under Title IX, the administration will effectively allow biological males into female-only spaces, including locker rooms and bathrooms.

Additionally, this Biden rule will impact women's sports as the final rule does not create any carve-out for women's athletics. Under this rule, local school districts will be required to allow biological men to compete in women's sports or risk losing their funding.

Contrary to the administration's new rule, this resolution today guarantees a level playing field to uphold athletics' core principles of integrity and fairness, and it reaffirms that boys will be boys and girls will be girls.

Democrats are weaponizing the Department of Education by blurring the lines between men and women, and this new rule blatantly disregards common sense and the natural laws of this world and, frankly, of God, putting women and girls at a disadvantage and a risk. It is vital that we pass this Congressional Review Act to uphold the original intent of Title IX.

We must vote to protect our girls and our women in support of this resolution and dismantle the left's radical ideology and undo this nonsensical rule by the Department of Education. We must pass this resolution.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to respond to “the natural laws of this world.” It is not a new concept. There are two-spirit people in Native-American culture. There are hijra people in South Asia and many more in Judaism. For example, the Talmud, the sacred text, lists six genders. The sky is not falling.

I also note that the gentleman referred to redefining “sex” to include sexual orientation and gender identity as some sort of novel or woke concept. I suggest you take that up with the Trump-appointed Justice Neil Gorsuch because he wrote the opinion making clear that sex discrimination includes discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

I include in the RECORD letters from the American Library Association, the National Education Association, and

the Consortium for Constituents with Disabilities. These three letters are all in opposition to H.J. Res. 165.

ALA AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,

June 11, 2024.

Re H.J. Res. 165, Title IX rule disapproval—**OPPOSE**

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chairwoman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, US House of Representatives.

Hon. ROBERT C. “BOBBY” SCOTT,
Ranking Member, Committee on Education and the Workforce, US House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN FOXX AND RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: On behalf of the American Library Association (ALA), I write to respectfully oppose H.J. Res. 165, “Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to ‘Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance.’”

The Department of Education's Title IX rule, issued April 29, 2024, applies the Supreme Court's ruling in *Bostock v. Clayton County*, 590 U.S. 644 (2020), to codify that Title IX prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. By doing so, the rule clarifies that recipients of Education Department funding may not discriminate against LGBTQI+ library workers or students in employment opportunities or the delivery of library services (e.g., removal of library materials in a discriminatory manner).

All Americans deserve equal opportunity in education, employment, and the freedom to read. We urge Congress to defend the rights of students and library workers by rejecting H.J. Res. 165. If we can provide more information, please contact Gavin Baker (gbaker@alawash.org).

Sincerely,

Alan S. Inouye, Ph.D., Senior Director,
Public Policy & Government Relations and
Interim Associate Executive Director, American Library Association.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,

June 12, 2024.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Education Association's 3 million members and the 50 million students they teach and support in public schools and public colleges and universities, we appreciate the opportunity to offer comments for the Committee's markup of H.R. 7227, the Truth and Healing Commission on Indian Boarding School Policies Act, and H.J. Res. 165, pertaining to the Department of Education rule regarding nondiscrimination in education programs and activities receiving federal funding.

We urge you to vote YES on H.R. 7227 and NO on H.J. Res. 165. Votes related to these issues may be included in the NEA Report Card on the 118th Congress.

H.R. 7227, THE TRUTH AND HEALING COMMISSION ON INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOL POLICIES ACT

NEA members are grateful to the Committee for your leadership—especially significant when there is such division in our nation—in advancing H.R. 7227. The bill's bipartisan sponsorship signals that it is still possible for us to come together, regardless of political party, to illuminate historical wrongs.

The Truth and Healing Commission on Indian Board School Policies Act will shine a light on the impact of Indian boarding schools on the hundreds of thousands of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children who were taken from

their families and Tribes from at least 1860 until 1978. The schools were not places of education; they were tools for colonization, assimilation, and genocide. Many children died, went missing, or were murdered while in the custody of the boarding schools, and those who survived were often the victims of physical, sexual, psychological, and spiritual abuse. The schools caused the loss of connection to language, culture, families, and Tribes.

H.R. 7227 would provide for a full inquiry into the policies of the boarding schools through locating church and government records, compiling evidence of the ongoing effects of intergenerational trauma, and collecting testimony from survivors and Tribes. Information resulting from the inquiry would be shared with the public within five years.

H.J. RES. 165, PERTAINING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RULE REGARDING NON-DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES RECEIVING FEDERAL FUNDING

H.J. Res. 165 would undo the recent Title IX rule protecting LGBTQI+ students, survivors of sexual violence or harassment, and students who are pregnant or parents. It must be rejected because it would undercut the U.S. Department of Education's recently finalized rule reinforcing and restoring Title IX's protections, which are meant to ensure that every student has the right to a safe and welcoming learning environment, free from sex discrimination.

The Department of Education updates clarify Title IX's protections against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, at a time when 83% of LGBTQI+ youth report in-school victimization, yet 62% of those who have been victimized never inform school staff of the incident. The Title IX updates will clarify remedies for students facing sex-based harassment, hold school officials accountable for fostering safer school environments, and ensure that LGBTQI+ youth can participate equally in educational opportunities, ranging from attending the restroom that corresponds with their gender identity, to going to prom with the person of their choice.

H.R. 7227 moves our nation forward on the path to healing and reconciliation, while H.J. Res. 165 pushes us backward in our ongoing work to protect the civil rights and safety of us all. Please vote YES on H.R. 7227 and NO on H.J. Res. 165.

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,
*Director of Government Relations,
National Education Association.*

CONSORTIUM FOR CONSTITUENTS
WITH DISABILITIES,

JUNE 12, 2024.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chair, House Education and Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,
Ranking Member, House Education and Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN FOXX AND RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: The Consortium for Constituents with Disabilities (CCD) Education Task Force and Rights Task Force are writing to oppose House Joint Resolution (H.J. Res) 165 which intends to negate the rule submitted by the Department of Education (ED) relating to “Nondiscrimination based on Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance” (known as Title IX). As finalized by ED, the Title IX regulation includes important provisions that positively impact and support all K–16 students with disabilities, including those who identify as Black, Indigenous, or People of Color (BIPOC) and/or may also

identify as LGBTQI+. We therefore urge members of the Education and Workforce Committee to vote 'no' if H.J. Res. 165 is brought before the Committee.

CCD advocated for the much-needed updates to the Title IX regulations as it is well documented that students with disabilities, including those who identify as BIPOC and/or LGBTQI+ already face additional barriers to K-16 education. Specifically, updates to Title IX include changes that:

- ensure schools address broader Title IX complaints of sex-based harassment;
- ensure students are not forced into unfair and/or potentially traumatic procedures that favor harassers;

- require Title IX coordinators to consult with one or more members of a [eligible] student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) team or Section 504 team; and,

- allow college students to have access to someone in an advisory role during the process.

Importantly, the improvements clarify that federal due process rights of students with disabilities must not be ignored and that these students must be treated equitably during the Title IX process. This was not the case prior to the issuance of this rule.

We appreciate this opportunity to weigh in and hope you will reconsider the mark-up of H.J. Res 165.

Sincerely,

CCD Education Task Force co-chairs:

STEPHANIE FLYNT,
National Disability Rights Network (NDRN).

LAURA KALOI,
Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates and the Center for Learner Equity.

LINDSAY KUBATZKY,
National Center for Learning Disabilities.

ROBYN LINSOTT,
The Arc of the United States.

KIM MUSHENO,
Autism Society of America.

CCD Rights TF co-chairs:

CLAUDIA CENTER,
Disability Rights Education Fund.

MORGAN K. WHITLATCH,
Center for Public Representation.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FOXX for her leadership and friendship. You are a pretty cool lady.

Madam Speaker, Title IX of the Civil Rights Act was passed to protect women from being unfairly denied opportunities in education and sports.

Can you imagine drawing the short stick and having to defend allowing men to compete in women's sports and take trophies from young ladies or even careers away from hardworking female athletes?

Of course, the most famous time this happened was when my friend Riley

Gaines tied with a man in her swim meet—I say “man” in lower case letters but she didn't get a trophy because they wanted to give it to him instead. They also had to suffer the punishment of having to see this guy walk around without any clothes on and his lack of manhood, I guess.

I recently asked Riley about men competing in women's sports in a committee hearing. She said that some men started competing before they were taking hormones. She also said something we already knew: Hormone treatments don't alter a man's bone structure, lung capacity, or his height.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BURCHETT. Hormones don't alter many other attributes that give men physical advantages over women. She talked about how allowing men into women's sports endangers their physical safety. We see more instances of this than Democrats and the mainstream media would have you believe.

A high school volleyball player got a concussion. We also saw a boxer withdraw from a match to protect herself when she learned her opponent was a biological male. A high school field hockey player had her teeth knocked out.

I strongly support protecting female athletes and rejecting this rule by an administration that has completely abandoned them.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman FOXX for leading on this very important issue.

As a former athlete in high school, college, and beyond, I know the unparalleled opportunities that sports offer to women and girls.

Title IX and its mission to end discrimination against women in sports made so much of this possible for me and countless other women over the years.

Today, these opportunities for women and girls are under threat.

Joe Biden's Department of Education is requiring that schools allow biological males to participate in women's sports. This is fundamentally unfair. It deprives women and girls of what so many of us fought for decades to achieve: equal opportunity to train, compete, and excel in athletics.

Today, we take a stand in defense of women's sports and to stop this dangerous precedent.

This is why I am honored to be an original cosponsor of this Congressional Review Act to overturn the Biden administration's radical rule to allow biological men in women's sports.

The CRA will protect opportunities for women and girls to compete fairly

on the athletic field. Without interference, the woke Biden agenda will continue further.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 9¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to note in the big picture as we consider this conversation today, LGBTQ youth and trans youth are more likely to have experienced sexual violence than their straight counterparts.

Further, nearly 59 percent of LGBTQI+ students report experiencing discriminatory policies and practices at school, particularly those targeting students' gender and limiting their ability to participate in activities consistent with their gender identity.

Madam Speaker, 62 percent of LGBTQ students who were harassed or assaulted at school did not report the incident because they don't feel safe. This is creating hostile environments that are leading to adverse outcomes for LGBTQ students.

The report that I mentioned found that students who experienced discrimination and higher levels of victimization have higher dropout rates, lower academic performance, and increased mental health issues such as anxiety, depression, and suicidal ideation.

Madam Speaker, 68 percent of the students reported feeling unsafe at school because of their sexual orientation, gender identity, and/or gender expression.

We should not be creating this hostile school climate that is making students feel unsafe because of who they are.

I want to again encourage my colleagues to think about the message that this is sending to students, that they do not belong, that they are not safe in their schools. This is the Education and the Workforce Committee. We should be making students feel safe, not making them feel threatened.

Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LOPEZ), our newest Member in Congress.

Mr. LOPEZ. Madam Speaker, the Biden administration's newly proposed Title IX rule is yet another example of how we are losing our moral compass.

This new rule diminishes the undeniable respect that we must as a society extend to all women. It completely destroys the distinctions between men and women and forces schools to allow men into private women's spaces, including locker rooms and bathrooms.

Make no mistake about it, under this proposed rule, women will be compelled to change with and go to the bathroom next to naked men. That simply cannot stand. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

The Biden-Harris administration's Title IX rule is a necessary step in protecting all Americans from sex-based harassment and discrimination. It would uplift and empower survivors while holding schools accountable for their handling of these sensitive cases.

This Congressional Review Act that Republicans have put forward undermines the rights of survivors of sexual assault and advances a baseless, prejudiced narrative against LGBTQI+, especially transgender, individuals.

I am incredibly frustrated that Republicans are spending time obsessing over what bathroom is used instead of addressing the real problems faced by women and children.

I also include in the RECORD, Madam Speaker, a Statement of Administrative Policy providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5 of the United States Code. If this President were presented with H.J. Res. 165, he would veto it, and for good reason because this bill takes us back.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.J. RES. 165—PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "NONDISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES RECEIVING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE"

The Administration strongly opposes H.J. Res. 165, which would disapprove the Department of Education's rule, under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, to restore and strengthen vital nondiscrimination protections for students, employees, and applicants in federally funded education programs and activities.

Since Title IX was signed into law more than 50 years ago, it has opened doors for generations of women and girls and increased access to educational opportunities for millions of students. Despite this progress, rates of sexual harassment and assault in our nation's schools and colleges remain unacceptably high. Many women see their education derailed because of pregnancy discrimination. And many LGBTQI+ students face bullying and harassment just because of who they are.

The Department's rule is critical to ensuring that no person experiences sex discrimination at school. The rule provides protection from sex-based harassment, including sexual violence; promotes accountability and fundamental fairness through a fair, transparent, and reliable process; and ensures that students, employees, and families understand their rights and that institutions know their responsibilities. The rule also advances educational equity by requiring schools that have knowledge of possible sex discrimination in their education programs or activities to take prompt and effective action to end the sex discrimination, prevent its recurrence, and remedy its effects. Passage of H.J. Res. 165 would eliminate these critical protections that keep students safe and able to realize their full potential.

The promise of Title IX—an education free from sex discrimination—remains as vital now as it was when the law was enacted. The Administration will continue to fight tirelessly to realize this promise and achieve equal opportunity for all students and all Americans.

If the President were presented with H.J. Res. 165, he would veto it.

Ms. BONAMICI. We have made progress in making every student feel safe and be safe in schools.

I once again encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this harmful and extreme joint resolution for the sake of women, the LGBTQI community, and survivors across the Nation.

Again, Madam Speaker, yesterday we were talking about dignity for dishwashers. Please show some dignity for people who are being discriminated against because of who they are and who they love.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot of misleading comments today, as I said earlier—misleading verging on untruths.

The Department isn't following court precedent. In *Bostock*, the Supreme Court specifically warned against applying its decision in that case to Title IX or any other civil rights law preventing sex discrimination.

In addition, there is currently a split among Federal appeals courts on this issue. In January of last year, the Eleventh Circuit held that a school district's policy requiring people to use the bathroom that corresponds with the student's biological sex is allowed under Title IX.

As I said earlier, we are not misleading or scaring the American people. All people have to do is read this regulation to see that schools are not allowed to prevent a person from participating in an educational program or activity consistent with the person's gender identity. There are exceptions, but athletics are not included. A biological man can announce that he feels like a girl or a woman and go into the bathroom with women and girls if he chooses to do so based on this rule.

In addition, three separate Federal district court judges in three separate cases have already taken action to block the rule from going into effect in the States involved in those cases, which has been alluded to. One judge called the regulation "an abuse of power." The other judge called the regulation "an attempt by the executive branch to dramatically alter the purpose and meaning of Title IX."

Madam Speaker, this resolution to overturn President Biden's Title IX rule is a necessary step to keep the spirit of Title IX alive. My colleagues have eloquently talked about that.

H.J. Res. 165 is about fairness, safety, and ensuring that the playing field remains level for everyone. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. 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.

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1341, I call up the bill (H.R. 8281) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration, printed in this bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 8281

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 "Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act" or the "SAVE Act".

SEC. 2. ENSURING ONLY CITIZENS ARE REGISTERED TO VOTE IN ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE.

(a) *DEFINITION OF DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.*—Section 3 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502) is amended—

(1) *by striking "As used" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—As used"; and*

(2) *by adding at the end the following:*

"(b) DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—As used in this Act, the term 'documentary proof of United States citizenship' means, with respect to an applicant for voter registration, any of the following:

"(1) A form of identification issued consistent with the requirements of the REAL ID Act of 2005 that indicates the applicant is a citizen of the United States.

"(2) A valid United States passport.

"(3) The applicant's official United States military identification card, together with a United States military record of service showing that the applicant's place of birth was in the United States.

"(4) A valid government-issued photo identification card issued by a Federal, State or Tribal government showing that the applicant's place of birth was in the United States.

"(5) A valid government-issued photo identification card issued by a Federal, State or Tribal government other than an identification described in paragraphs (1) through (4), but only

if presented together with one or more of the following:

“(A) A certified birth certificate issued by a State, a unit of local government in a State, or a Tribal government which—

“(i) was issued by the State, unit of local government, or Tribal government in which the applicant was born;

“(ii) was filed with the office responsible for keeping vital records in the State;

“(iii) includes the full name, date of birth, and place of birth of the applicant;

“(iv) lists the full names of one or both of the parents of the applicant;

“(v) has the signature of an individual who is authorized to sign birth certificates on behalf of the State, unit of local government, or Tribal government in which the applicant was born;

“(vi) includes the date that the certificate was filed with the office responsible for keeping vital records in the State; and

“(vii) has the seal of the State, unit of local government, or Tribal government that issued the birth certificate.

“(B) An extract from a United States hospital Record of Birth created at the time of the applicant's birth which indicates that the applicant's place of birth was in the United States.

“(C) A final adoption decree showing the applicant's name and that the applicant's place of birth was in the United States.

“(D) A Consular Report of Birth Abroad of a citizen of the United States or a certification of the applicant's Report of Birth of a United States citizen issued by the Secretary of State.

“(E) A Naturalization Certificate or Certificate of Citizenship issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security or any other document or method of proof of United States citizenship issued by the Federal government pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

“(F) An American Indian Card issued by the Department of Homeland Security with the classification ‘KIC’.”

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20503) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) REQUIRING APPLICANTS TO PRESENT DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—Under any method of voter registration in a State, the State shall not accept and process an application to register to vote in an election for Federal office unless the applicant presents documentary proof of United States citizenship with the application.”

(c) REGISTRATION WITH APPLICATION FOR MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVER'S LICENSE.—Section 5 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20504) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “Each State motor vehicle driver's license application” and inserting “Subject to the requirements under section 8(j), each State motor vehicle driver's license application”;

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “Each State shall include” and inserting “Subject to the requirements under section 8(j), each State shall include”;

(3) in subsection (c)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by adding “and” at the end;

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) verify that the applicant is a citizen of the United States;”;

(4) in subsection (c)(2)(C)(i), by striking “(including citizenship)” and inserting “, including the requirement that the applicant provides documentary proof of United States citizenship”; and

(5) in subsection (c)(2)(D)(iii), by striking “; and” and inserting the following: “, other than

as evidence in a criminal proceeding or immigration proceeding brought against an applicant who knowingly attempts to register to vote and knowingly makes a false declaration under penalty of perjury that the applicant meets the eligibility requirements to register to vote in an election for Federal office; and”.

(d) REQUIRING DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP WITH NATIONAL MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.—Section 6 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20505) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking “Each State shall accept and use” and inserting “Subject to the requirements under section 8(j), each State shall accept and use”; and

(B) by striking “Federal Election Commission” and inserting “Election Assistance Commission”;

(2) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following: “The chief State election official of a State shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that residents of the State are aware of the requirement to provide documentary proof of United States citizenship to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) the person did not provide documentary proof of United States citizenship when registering to vote.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) ENSURING PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—

“(1) PRESENTING PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP TO ELECTION OFFICIAL.—An applicant who submits the mail voter registration application form prescribed by the Election Assistance Commission pursuant to section 9(a)(2) or a form described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall not be registered to vote in an election for Federal office unless—

“(A) the applicant presents documentary proof of United States citizenship in person to the office of the appropriate election official not later than the deadline provided by State law for the receipt of a completed voter registration application for the election; or

“(B) in the case of a State which permits an individual to register to vote in an election for Federal office at a polling place on the day of the election and on any day when voting, including early voting, is permitted for the election, the applicant presents documentary proof of United States citizenship to the appropriate election official at the polling place not later than the date of the election.

“(2) NOTIFICATION OF REQUIREMENT.—Upon receiving an otherwise completed mail voter registration application form prescribed by the Election Assistance Commission pursuant to section 9(a)(2) or a form described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the appropriate election official shall transmit a notice to the applicant of the requirement to present documentary proof of United States citizenship under this subsection, and shall include in the notice instructions to enable the applicant to meet the requirement.

“(3) ACCESSIBILITY.—Each State shall, in consultation with the Election Assistance Commission, ensure that reasonable accommodations are made to allow an individual with a disability who submits the mail voter registration application form prescribed by the Election Assistance Commission pursuant to section 9(a)(2) or a form described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) to present documentary proof of United States citizenship to the appropriate election official.”

(e) REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTER REGISTRATION AGENCIES.—Section 7 of the National Voter Reg-

istration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20506) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (4)(A), by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) Receipt of documentary proof of United States citizenship of each applicant to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State.”; and

(B) in paragraph (6)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i)(I), by striking “(including citizenship)” and inserting “, including the requirement that the applicant provides documentary proof of United States citizenship”; and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) ask the applicant the question, ‘Are you a citizen of the United States?’ and if the applicant answers in the affirmative require documentary proof of United States citizenship prior to providing the form under subparagraph (C).”;

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting “who are citizens of the United States” after “for persons”;

(f) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO ADMINISTRATION OF VOTER REGISTRATION.—Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “In the administration of voter registration” and inserting “Subject to the requirements of subsection (j), in the administration of voter registration”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(D) based on documentary proof or verified information that the registrant is not a United States citizen; or

“(E) the registration otherwise fails to comply with applicable State law;”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (l); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsections:

“(j) ENSURING ONLY CITIZENS ARE REGISTERED TO VOTE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a State may not register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State unless, at the time the individual applies to register to vote, the individual provides documentary proof of United States citizenship.

“(2) ADDITIONAL PROCESSES IN CERTAIN CASES.—

“(A) PROCESS FOR THOSE WITHOUT DOCUMENTARY PROOF.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to any relevant guidance adopted by the Election Assistance Commission, each State shall establish a process under which an applicant who cannot provide documentary proof of United States citizenship under paragraph (1) may, if the applicant signs an attestation under penalty of perjury that the applicant is a citizen of the United States and eligible to vote in elections for Federal office, submit such other evidence to the appropriate State or local official demonstrating that the applicant is a citizen of the United States and such official shall make a determination as to whether the applicant has sufficiently established United States citizenship for purposes of registering to vote in elections for Federal office in the State.

“(ii) AFFIDAVIT REQUIREMENT.—If a State or local official makes a determination under clause (i) that an applicant has sufficiently established United States citizenship for purposes of registering to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, such determination shall be accompanied by an affidavit developed under

clause (iii) signed by the official swearing or affirming the applicant sufficiently established United States citizenship for purposes of registering to vote.

“(iii) DEVELOPMENT OF AFFIDAVIT BY THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—The Election Assistance Commission shall develop a uniform affidavit for use by State and local officials under clause (ii), which shall—

“(I) include an explanation of the minimum standards required for a State or local official to register an applicant who cannot provide documentary proof of United States citizenship to vote in elections for Federal office in the State; and

“(II) require the official to explain the basis for registering such applicant to vote in such elections.

“(B) PROCESS IN CASE OF CERTAIN DISCREPANCIES IN DOCUMENTATION.—Subject to any relevant guidance adopted by the Election Assistance Commission, each State shall establish a process under which an applicant can provide such additional documentation to the appropriate election official of the State as may be necessary to establish that the applicant is a citizen of the United States in the event of a discrepancy with respect to the applicant's documentary proof of United States citizenship.

“(3) STATE REQUIREMENTS.—Each State shall take affirmative steps on an ongoing basis to ensure that only United States citizens are registered to vote under the provisions of this Act, which shall include the establishment of a program described in paragraph (4) not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(4) PROGRAM DESCRIBED.—A State may meet the requirements of paragraph (3) by establishing a program under which the State identifies individuals who are not United States citizens using information supplied by one or more of the following sources:

“(A) The Department of Homeland Security through the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (“SAVE”) or otherwise.

“(B) The Social Security Administration through the Social Security Number Verification Service, or otherwise.

“(C) State agencies that supply State identification cards or driver's licenses where the agency confirms the United States citizenship status of applicants.

“(D) Other sources, including databases, which provide confirmation of United States citizenship status.

“(5) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the request of a State election official (including a request related to a process established by a State under paragraph (2)(A) or (2)(B)), any head of a Federal department or agency possessing information relevant to determining the eligibility of an individual to vote in elections for Federal office shall, not later than 24 hours after receipt of such request, provide the official with such information as may be necessary to enable the official to verify that an applicant for voter registration in elections for Federal office held in the State or a registrant on the official list of eligible voters in elections for Federal office held in the State is a citizen of the United States, which shall include providing the official with such batched information as may be requested by the official.

“(B) USE OF SAVE SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may respond to a request received under paragraph (1) by using the system for the verification of immigration status under the applicable provisions of section 1137 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-7), as established pursuant to section 121(c) of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-603).

“(C) SHARING OF INFORMATION.—The heads of Federal departments and agencies shall share information with each other with respect to an individual who is the subject of a request received under paragraph (A) in order to enable them to respond to the request.

“(D) INVESTIGATION FOR PURPOSES OF REMOVAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall conduct an investigation to determine whether to initiate removal proceedings under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229) if it is determined pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) that an alien (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101)) is unlawfully registered to vote in elections for Federal office.

“(E) PROHIBITING FEES.—The head of a Federal department or agency may not charge a fee for responding to a State's request under paragraph (A).

“(k) REMOVAL OF NONCITIZENS FROM REGISTRATION ROLLS.—A State shall remove an individual who is not a citizen of the United States from the official list of eligible voters for elections for Federal office held in the State at any time upon receipt of documentation or verified information that a registrant is not a United States citizen.”

(g) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF STATE TO REMOVE NONCITIZENS FROM OFFICIAL LIST OF ELIGIBLE VOTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(a)(4) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by adding “or” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) documentary proof or verified information that the registrant is not a United States citizen;”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8(c)(2)(B)(i) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20507(c)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “(4)(A)” and inserting “(4)(A) or (C)”.

(h) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO FEDERAL MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.—

(1) CONTENTS OF MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.—Section 9(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20508(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “(including citizenship)” and inserting “(including an explanation of what is required to present documentary proof of United States citizenship)”;

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

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

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) shall include a section, for use only by a State or local election official, to record the type of document the applicant presented as documentary proof of United States citizenship, including the date of issuance, the date of expiration (if any), the office which issued the document, and any unique identification number associated with the document.”

(2) INFORMATION ON MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.—Section 9(b)(4) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20508(b)(4)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively; and

(B) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated and as amended by paragraph (1)(C)), by striking “; and” and inserting the following: “, other than as evidence in a criminal proceeding or immigration proceeding brought against an applicant who attempts to register to vote and makes a false declaration under penalty of perjury that the applicant meets the eligibility requirements to register to vote in an election for Federal office; and”.

(i) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Section 11(b)(1) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20510(b)(1)) is amended by striking “a violation of this Act” and inserting “a violation of this Act, including the act of an election official who registers an applicant to vote in an election for Federal office who fails

to present documentary proof of United States citizenship.”

(j) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Section 12(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20511(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) in the case of an officer or employee of the executive branch, providing material assistance to a noncitizen in attempting to register to vote or vote in an election for Federal office;

“(C) registering an applicant to vote in an election for Federal office who fails to present documentary proof of United States citizenship; or”

(k) APPLICABILITY OF REQUIREMENTS TO CERTAIN STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 4 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20503), as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended by striking “This Act does not apply to a State” and inserting “Except with respect to the requirements under subsection (i) and (j) of section 8 in the case of a State described in paragraph (2), this Act does not apply to a State”.

(2) PERMITTING STATES TO ADOPT REQUIREMENTS AFTER ENACTMENT.—Section 4 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20503) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) PERMITTING STATES TO ADOPT CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS AFTER ENACTMENT.—Subsections (i) and (j) of section 8 shall not apply to a State described in subsection (c)(2) if the State, by law or regulation, adopts requirements which are identical to the requirements under such subsections not later than 60 days prior to the date of the first election for Federal office which is held in the State after the date of the enactment of the SAVE Act.”

SEC. 3. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION GUIDANCE.

Not later than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Election Assistance Commission shall adopt and transmit to the chief State election official of each State guidance with respect to the implementation of the requirements under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.), as amended by section 2.

SEC. 4. INAPPLICABILITY OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.

Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44 (commonly referred to as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”) shall not apply with respect to the development or modification of voter registration materials under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.), as amended by section 2, including the development or modification of any voter registration application forms.

SEC. 5. DUTY OF SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY TO NOTIFY ELECTION OFFICIALS OF NATURALIZATION.

Upon receiving information that an individual has become a naturalized citizen of the United States, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall promptly provide notice of such information to the appropriate chief election official of the State in which such individual is domiciled.

SEC. 6. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING PROVISIONAL BALLOTS.

Nothing in this Act or in any amendment made by this Act may be construed to supercede, restrict, or otherwise affect the ability of an individual to cast a provisional ballot in an election for Federal office or to have the ballot counted in the election if the individual is verified as a citizen of the United States pursuant to section 8(j) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (as added by section 2(f)).

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING EFFECT ON STATE EXEMPTIONS FROM OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.

Nothing in this Act or in any amendment made by this Act may be construed to affect the

exemption of a State from any requirement of any Federal law other than the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.).
SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to applications for voter registration which are submitted on or after such date.

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 House Administration or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

□ 1415

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 8281, the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, known as the SAVE Act, introduced by my colleague, Representative CHIP ROY of Texas.

As chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I have been focused on improving election integrity and increasing confidence in our elections. In recent years, we have seen an increase in the number of jurisdictions across the country that allow noncitizens to vote in their elections.

Right here in our Nation's Capital, noncitizens are eligible to vote in municipal elections. In Washington, D.C., a noncitizen only has to reside in the District for 30 days in order to vote.

Last month, 143 Democrats voted to approve noncitizen voting in our Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C. We cannot allow this to spread across the United States.

Let me be clear: Noncitizen voting reduces confidence in our elections. American elections are for American citizens, and we intend to keep it that way.

Today, we consider the SAVE Act, and we will see if my Democratic colleagues are once again in support of noncitizen voting. The SAVE Act will strengthen our election administration and restore Americans' confidence in our elections.

The SAVE Act contains critical reforms to update the National Voter Registration Act, an act that requires States to give voter registration forms to everyone who receives a driver's license, regardless of citizenship status.

The bill before us will help States prevent noncitizens from voting in

Federal elections by requiring States to obtain documentary proof of U.S. citizenship and identify in person when registering an individual to vote in Federal elections.

You are sure to hear my colleagues today on the other side say that noncitizen voting doesn't exist, or that it rarely happens, so we don't need to do anything about it.

First, I point you to a 1996 congressional race in California where an investigation by this body revealed that 624 noncitizens voted in that congressional election. I also point you to a race less than 4 years ago where our colleague from Iowa won by six votes.

Every illegal vote cancels out the vote of a legal American citizen. Illegal voting risks swaying elections.

Ensuring our laws are being enforced to prevent noncitizen voting is critical. Some will say that illegal voting is already illegal for noncitizens, but it is also illegal to evade the Border Patrol and enter our country illegally. Yet, that hasn't stopped almost anyone.

In the last 3 years, Border Patrol has encountered 7 million illegal migrants at our southern border. We must strengthen our election laws to make sure that they are being properly enforced.

On top of the previously mentioned examples of noncitizen voting, we also have seen examples of noncitizens on the voter rolls in different States across our country.

Just a few years ago, Illinois removed almost 600 noncitizens from its voter rolls. A Georgia audit recently determined that more than 1,600 noncitizens had attempted to register. In Pennsylvania, almost 10,000 noncitizens were removed from their rolls.

Every State needs access to the tools necessary to remove noncitizens from their voter rolls. A crucial element of the SAVE Act would provide States with cost-free access to existing Federal and State databases so they can perform this important voter list maintenance.

Today, we see the Biden administration has weaponized our border, and they are weaponizing Federal agencies to conduct a partisan voter registration scheme using taxpayer dollars under an executive order.

I have subpoenaed each agency's strategic plan. So far, no agency has produced its strategic, secretive scheme to get out the vote, and the left continues to register folks to vote.

By passing the SAVE Act, we can ensure only eligible Americans are registering to vote. Americans deserve confidence in their elections. We must pass the SAVE Act to prevent noncitizens from voting.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, you are going to hear a lot of fear-mongering rhetoric from my colleagues across the aisle today.

They claim the American people have no confidence in our elections. Where have we heard that one before? In 2020, Republican after Republican debased themselves by parroting lies about the election, by repeating claims they knew to be false.

They claimed that Americans had doubts about the election outcome, knowing full well that those doubts only existed because of the easily disproved conspiracy theories MAGA Republicans had been spreading. Those same Republicans organized illegal efforts to subvert the peaceful transfer of power that undergirds our cherished democracy.

There were criminal efforts to send false slates of electors to Washington to steal the Presidency from Joe Biden. People have been charged with crimes for these fake elector schemes, the very schemes that MAGA Republicans cheered on.

More than that, the former administration used the levers of government to try to retain their failing grip on power. Where is the respect for law and order? Where is reverence for justice?

As criminal indictments have shown, there were coordinated, intentional schemes among some in the White House and members of the Department of Justice to override the will of the American people, to suborn a coup d'etat right here in the United States.

The former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has stated publicly that Pentagon officials feared that the former President would attempt to use the military to stay in power. It is heartbreaking that this happened in our country, but what happened next is even worse.

After witnessing these corrupt efforts to stay in power, this downright shameful attempt to overthrow our system of government, what did Republicans do? Did they defend this country from all enemies, foreign and domestic? No, they cowered.

Speaker JOHNSON, joined by 126 House Republicans, filed an amicus brief with the United States Supreme Court that attempted to throw out millions of American votes. Where did this lead? To a violent and deadly attack on this historic, majestic building, to our colleagues in this very room, on both sides of the aisle, clad in escape hoods and frantically calling loved ones, praying for divine deliverance.

As the mob stormed the Capitol, savagely beating police and calling for the execution of the sitting Vice President of the United States, the former President sat idly by. He did nothing to stop the attack. He did nothing to try to save lives, to save the Republic. He watched television in the White House for hours as the democracy was shaken to its core.

As patriots like Speaker Emerita NANCY PELOSI begged for support from the National Guard, from anyone, the former President did nothing.

Even the memories of that darkest of days haven't deterred Republicans'

quest for power. They decided to try it all again.

Last month, a rogues' gallery of election deniers stood on the steps of the Capitol, spreading more inaccuracies about the security of our elections. They admitted that they had no evidence of noncitizen voting in our elections, the same rhetoric that nearly broke our Nation 4 years ago.

Republicans' continued election denialism is akin to collective hero syndrome, where individuals create harmful situations like lighting a fire only to seek praise for putting the fire out.

This was a deeply dishonorable exercise when it began in 2020, and the dishonor has not abated.

The SAVE Act, and all the untruthful rhetoric around it, is part of the same project that election deniers began years ago. They are continuing—indeed, they are magnifying—the collective delusion by claiming that noncitizens are voting in Federal elections.

Simply put, they are not. It is against the law for noncitizens to register to vote and to vote in Federal elections. Let me repeat this: It is against the law for noncitizens to register to vote and to vote in Federal elections.

The false claim that there is a conspiracy to register noncitizens is a pretext for trying to overturn the 2024 election, potentially leading to another tragedy on January 6, 2025.

Let's turn to the profoundly damaging bill in front of us, the so-called SAVE Act. If I were to summarize what this bill does, I would offer this description: It would create enormous burdens for those registering to vote, erecting barriers that would shock most Americans, including most Republicans.

To begin, as my Republican colleague admitted at the Rules Committee on Monday, the SAVE Act will prohibit most Americans from registering to vote with their driver's license alone. Yes, you heard that right. The SAVE Act will bar Americans from using a standard State-issued driver's license alone when registering to vote.

The bill will prohibit the use of the new and improved Real IDs for over 95 percent of the American public, and this bill will apply to every American citizen.

What is a citizen to do if they cannot use their Real ID-compliant driver's license? The SAVE Act will allow Americans to use a passport to register, but only 48 percent of Americans have a passport, so over 130 million Americans are out of luck.

Wait, as they say, there is more.

Can a member of our military use their military ID to register to vote? Surely, military IDs will be enough to register to vote in our elections. Not so. According to Republicans, servicemembers will need to bring their military ID and a copy of their service record showing their place of birth within the United States.

Many servicemembers were born abroad, say, to military parents overseas. Those servicemembers will be entirely blocked from using their military ID to register.

This bill requires any new registrant to show their proof of citizenship in person at an election office. Any servicemember deployed overseas who wants to register to vote will not be able to. No dice.

That is right. The SAVE Act will prevent members of our Armed Forces deployed overseas from registering to vote.

Republicans are pushing a bill that will disenfranchise U.S. military personnel protecting us overseas from registering. It is unpatriotic, and it is shameful.

Wait, there is even more.

Native American voters will be unable to use their Tribal IDs to register to vote unless their Tribal ID demonstrates their place of birth in the United States.

Does every American's State or Tribal-issued ID show their place of birth? The answer almost certainly is no.

What about birth certificates? Under this bill, one could present their birth certificate alongside their photo ID, but herein lies the problem: Tens of millions of Americans, particularly married women, have a different name on their birth certificates than they have on their photo IDs.

Under the terms of the SAVE Act, these millions of married women will not be able to use their birth certificates to register to vote. The bill would disenfranchise countless married women who are U.S. citizens.

Let's be very clear: What is a voter supposed to do if they don't have a passport? What if their Real ID, like almost every American, does not show citizenship status? The SAVE Act will not allow them to register, especially millions upon millions of American women, students, servicemembers, Native voters, and many more.

This bill is not actually about preventing noncitizens from voting in Federal elections. I will repeat what I said before: It is already illegal for noncitizens to register and to vote in Federal elections.

We litigated this back in 2020 when Republicans alleged mass voter fraud in State after State. Yet, every recount, audit, and lawsuit demonstrated the 2020 election was fair and free from fraud. Our Federal elections are safe and secure. It is that simple.

During today's debate, we will hear from my colleagues across the aisle about the risk of noncitizens flooding our border and then somehow registering and voting in Federal elections on a massive scale. It is rich to hear so-called concern from the party that killed a bipartisan border deal to address this problem.

My Democratic colleagues and I have clearly responded with the truth. The American people know Republicans are misleading them. Here is what the SAVE Act is actually about.

This bill is about scaring Americans. This bill is about silencing Americans. This bill is about disenfranchising Americans. This bill is about further damaging the foundations of our democracy.

As they look back on the wreckage they wrought 4 years ago, Republicans are not chagrined. They are not ashamed. They are, in fact, emboldened.

This is a deeply damaging bill. It will disenfranchise tens of millions of Americans. It will disenfranchise military voters, especially those serving bravely and courageously overseas. It will disenfranchise married women who change their names.

It will disenfranchise rural voters. It will disenfranchise Native voters, students, poor voters, and elderly voters. It will disenfranchise survivors of natural disasters like so many are experiencing this week across the United States.

□ 1430

House Republicans are fine with increasing the burdens and amplifying the costs in time, in money, and in effort for American citizens to vote.

House Democrats are not.

This bill is an overt effort to make Americans believe that American elections are rife with fraud. There is no evidence this is the case.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the defeat of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LEE), who are not is the chair of the Subcommittee on Elections.

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill should not be controversial. The vast majority of Americans agree that only U.S. citizens should be voting in our elections.

The Safeguard American Voter Eligibility, or SAVE Act, is a crucial piece of legislation that will protect our elections and ensure American citizens have confidence in our elections system and that their vote is not being canceled out by those who are not legally eligible to vote.

As Florida's former Secretary of State, I oversaw all of Florida's elections, working diligently to ensure that Floridians had accurate and fair elections that they could be confident in.

Now as the House Administration Subcommittee on Elections chair, I am working to advance policies that lead to stronger elections across our Nation, like the SAVE Act.

While it is already illegal for noncitizens to vote, this legislation provides much-needed enforcement and tools for States to verify that their voter rolls are accurate and that illegal aliens are not slipping through the cracks and voting.

We all know that President Biden's border crisis poses a clear threat to our elections system as millions of illegal

aliens have poured into our country at record levels. In recent years, election outcomes have included razor-thin margins. We must ensure that Americans can trust our election administration process, and one of the sure ways to accomplish that is by ensuring that noncitizens do not vote in our Federal elections.

Recently, we have seen documented instances of noncitizen voting in jurisdictions across the country, including right here in our Nation's Capital.

That is unacceptable.

The SAVE Act will strengthen current law by requiring documentary proof of U.S. citizenship to register to vote in Federal elections.

As a former elections official myself, I urge my colleagues to support the SAVE Act to enhance election security, to minimize the risk of foreign interference, and to restore Americans' confidence in U.S. elections.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just note something that has been talked about for some time which is going back to an election that happened nearly 30 years ago in California.

It talks about Representative Loretta Sanchez in her 1996 election in California. My Republican colleagues continue to make allegations that there were roughly 600 noncitizens who voted in the race. It is patently false. The reality is the exact opposite. Many of the supposed noncitizens identified in the contest had, in fact, already become U.S. citizens through naturalization by the time they cast their ballots in 1996, and some had been U.S. citizens for decades.

Other U.S. citizens were erroneously identified as noncitizens because their names were like noncitizens' names that were in an INS database.

It is no accident. Even then, the Republicans were in charge of the Committee on House Administration. They investigated it, and they concluded that the committee's investigation had no irregularities. They dismissed the contested election. They concluded that the outcome of the election was not in doubt.

The fact that they would, 30 years later, bring up a contest that was decided admittedly by a few votes, where claims of widespread noncitizens voting has been thoroughly debunked says more about their lack of evidence than it does anything else.

It simply does not happen, and there is no evidence that that is the case.

I just use that as one more example of misleading the public into believing something that is false is true.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLÁN).

Mr. SABLÁN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8281 would deny United States citizens in my district their right to vote. This Delegate standing here speaking in this Hall will be denied the right to vote for this seat. So for that reason, I rise in opposition to the bill.

To register to vote, H.R. 8281 requires documentary proof of citizenship issued by a State or a Tribal Government, but my constituents do not live in a State. My constituents live in a U.S. territory, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. So if my constituents try to use a valid photo identification card issued by the Commonwealth showing place of birth as the Northern Marianas, they would be denied registration.

If I were to produce the Department of State-issued passport given to Members of Congress, it says my place of birth is the Northern Mariana Islands, and I will be denied the right to vote.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. SABLÁN. H.R. 8281 says unless the birth certificate was issued by a State, you can't vote. The same is true for U.S. citizens in Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The same is true for all naturalized U.S. citizens throughout the country. All will be denied the right to vote because H.R. 8281 does not recognize these territories as part of the United States, and people being born in these territories are United States citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this poorly drafted legislation. I don't understand something that only Americans can vote and the U.S. citizens who are not Americans cannot vote.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE).

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Wisconsin for yielding.

First, I want to say that my colleague on the other side of the aisle referenced an issue with an election where 624 noncitizens illegally voted. He suggested that that actually wasn't accurate.

So my question would be: What is an accurate number?

Because in my opinion, one person voting illegally in an election is one too many.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the SAVE Act. Since taking office, more than 9.6 million illegal immigrants have crossed into the United States.

This crisis is not only a national security threat, but one that can seriously alter the outcome of our elections.

We have seen efforts from States and localities, including the District of Columbia, to allow noncitizens to vote.

Securing our elections is of paramount importance, and we must ensure that it is easy to vote and hard to cheat. The SAVE Act will strengthen our election security, improve voter confidence, and ensure American elections are only for American citizens.

Specifically, this legislation requires State election officials to ask about

citizenship before providing voter registration forms, and it requires an individual to provide proof of citizenship in order to register to vote in Federal elections.

These commonsense solutions are not controversial, which is why I am deeply concerned that the President of the United States has threatened to veto this legislation. In fact, this step should alarm every citizen living in this country.

We must ask: Why?

Why is this administration refusing to take steps to safeguard our elections and protect the votes of every single American?

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the SAVE Act, and I look forward to voting for it.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, to my dear friend from Oklahoma, what I was suggesting was the Republican-controlled Committee on House Administration reviewed the allegations that 600 people who were not citizens had voted and ultimately made the determination that it was without merit and seated the individual, the Democrat at that time, Ms. SÁNCHEZ from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when we say that the right to vote is under attack, we are not talking about hypotheticals. It is under attack right now and right here with this very bill.

Republicans want to throw up barriers because when people vote, they lose.

Let me be clear: They don't want you to vote. They don't want to hear Black voices, Brown voices, LBGTQIA+ voices, or young voices. Our fundamental access to our democracy is being politicized, and this xenophobic attack that we are debating today will make it harder for Americans to vote.

My Republican colleagues will claim that requiring IDs is a small ask, but nearly 30 million people lack a valid driver's license, and 15 to 18 million of those adults don't have access to documents proving their birth or citizenship.

Americans don't need more obstacles to vote. It is already hard enough. That is why I am proud to have introduced the Right to Vote Act with my colleagues, Assistant Leader NEGUSE and Senator OSSOFF. This bill would enshrine people's right to vote and prohibit governments on all levels from restricting that right with bills like this one.

This bill is part of the Democrats' Freedom to Vote Act.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this bill is part of the Democrats' Freedom to Vote Act. Along with the

John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, these are the types of bills we should be bringing to the floor, not this nonsense.

Every day that we let rightwing Republicans pass laws like this that restrict ballot access, reduce polling stations in Black neighborhoods, or drown out our voices with big money campaigns, we fail the American people.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this harmful legislation.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), who is the bill's sponsor.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding, I thank his committee for their great leadership in moving this bill to the floor, and I thank the Speaker for his great work in leading this important piece of legislation, the SAVE Act, which is critical to ensure that only American citizens will vote in American elections.

It is really that simple, but our Democratic colleagues and the President of the United States are giving up the game. They are telling the American people very plainly and clearly that it is their preference that noncitizens vote in American elections.

That is their current position.

The fact of the matter is this administration and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been damaging and breaking American sovereignty for the entirety of this administration and before.

They are destroying our borders. They are allowing people to flood into our country. Millions of people are being released into the United States. Americans are getting killed. We are seeing abuse of Americans throughout the country, and now all we simply want to do is ensure the integrity of American elections.

What we see is absolute resistance and lies from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

They want to go do the normal scare tactics that we are going to be disenfranchising voters when, in fact, we are following the same procedures that we have got in place in States all across the country in requiring documentary proof that you are a citizen.

That is very simple. We do it on many different fronts. In this case, you can provide a passport; you can provide documentation of your military ID if it has your citizenship on it; REAL ID, you can go with your driver's license; and you can produce your birth certificate.

Nevertheless, importantly, we have procedures in place that allow for States to come up with ways to check Federal databases or to provide other mechanisms and means provided that the State officials then sign an affidavit saying that this is, in fact, a citizen.

The reality is there is going to be no disenfranchisement. The truth is our colleagues on the other side of the aisle

do not want us to actually check citizenship.

I find it pretty amazing that the gentleman from New York is trying to make a case out of the stealing of elections when it is he who currently wants to be able to say right now that the current President should not be the nominee of a party that just nominated that President.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the passion of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who is the sponsor of the bill, but I have not heard anyone dispute what I said in going through the incredibly burdensome path that citizens, American citizens, will now have to take in order to register to vote.

Your ID from your driver's license will not be sufficient if it doesn't have your place of citizenship. Mr. Speaker, 95 percent or more of REAL IDs, which will have replaced driver's licenses in many States, do not list citizenship. Birth certificates will be okay unless your name has been changed because you have gotten married. A military voter, particularly one overseas who has no way to go physically to an election office to register, will be unable to register to vote. The military IDs will be insignificant, particularly if their military ID and their service record don't show them as being born in the United States.

Frankly, to be a citizen of the United States, you don't have to be born on the continent or in Texas or Alaska or Hawaii. You have to be born somewhere, but you can become a U.S. citizen after you are born.

So all I am saying is it is incredibly burdensome.

I would further say since there is no evidence that this happened, all they talk about are scare tactics, the demonizing of people, and saying that there is this effort, it sounds like there is a suggestion that there is an organized effort to have noncitizens vote in Federal elections.

There is absolutely no evidence that that is the case, and we have had so many meetings of the standing committee and Subcommittee of the House Administration on Elections, that I would think if there were evidence of that, then it would have been presented to us.

□ 1445

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

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to another big lie bill, this one H.R. 8281.

Mr. Speaker, we know that elections are the cornerstone of American democracy, and it is our duty as Congress Members to protect every American's constitutional right to vote.

The threat to Americans' constitutional right to vote today is the Republican Party and H.R. 8281. In the long and consistent Republican tradition of

disenfranchising voters, the majority is pushing H.R. 8281 while simultaneously underfunding our election's infrastructure to safeguard free and fair elections.

In their desperation to roll back the clock to a time when women, people of color, and naturalized citizens couldn't vote, Republicans have introduced countless bills based on mis- and disinformation to erode the American people's trust in our elections and democratic institutions.

Here is the bottom line: H.R. 8281 does nothing to make our elections safer. It only perpetrates lies now to set up even bigger lies later when Republicans are unhappy with the outcome of the November election.

How do I know that? The majority's own former President's appointed commission to investigate claims of voter fraud by noncitizens was disbanded without identifying one single case. If we believe in the power of democracy, we should reject discriminatory rules rooted in fear and division and instead increase protections and access.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans call this bill the SAVE Act. It should be called the don't let Americans vote act, and so I rise here opposing and asking my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, safe and secure elections are fundamental to our Republic. Unfortunately, poll after poll is showing that Americans have lost trust in our election process. It is time for us to act and restore faith in that process.

One way to accomplish this is to limit American elections to American citizens. It should be of great concern to all Americans that the Biden administration, with the full support of my Democratic colleagues in the House, has allowed millions of people to enter the United States illegally.

Now Democrats want to leave the door open for noncitizens to potentially register to vote. If we do not act to prohibit this, it will further diminish American citizens' trust in our elections and ultimately in our government.

The legislation before us rightly requires States to have individuals provide proof of citizenship when they register to vote and to remove noncitizens from their voter rolls. Americans being the ones to determine the outcome of American elections should not be controversial.

In an Oversight Committee hearing, I asked former directors of the Census if they supported Federal laws that prohibit noncitizens from running for office.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, in an Oversight Committee hearing, I asked

the former directors of the Census if they supported Federal laws that prohibit noncitizens from running for office, making financial contributions to candidates, and voting. All three said they support these safeguards to our elections, and all three were Democratic appointees.

Mr. Speaker, my question to my Democratic colleagues is: Do Democrats support sensible safeguards for our elections? The minority can demonstrate their support and their answer by voting for the SAVE Act.

I appreciate Representative ROY's leadership in this process and Representative STEIL's leadership and encourage all my colleagues to vote for the SAVE Act.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), our distinguished leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member of the House Administration Committee, for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this extreme MAGA Republican voter suppression bill.

The right to vote is sacred. The right to vote is special. The right to vote is sacrosanct. The right to vote is central to the integrity of our democracy. It is the foundation of the principle of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The problem is apparently my extreme MAGA Republican colleagues have concluded that, rather than trying to win a debate and the hearts and minds of the American people anchored in ideas, the majority has instead chosen a strategy to engage in voter suppression. There is no evidence that has been presented to suggest that undocumented individuals have been participating in Federal elections. Republicans who investigated these allegations on their own committee have been unable to document these allegations.

It is unconstitutional. It is the state of the law that only citizens can vote in Federal elections. Only citizens can vote for the House of Representatives. Only citizens can vote for the United States Senate. Only citizens can vote for the Presidency of the United States.

This extreme MAGA Republican voter suppression bill is not designed to solve any problem on behalf of the American people. It is designed to jam people up and prevent Americans from voting.

The extreme MAGA Republican voter suppression bill will not allow Americans to vote who have a State-issued driver's license.

The extreme MAGA Republican voter suppression bill will not allow Americans who are serving in the military to use their military ID while they are serving this country to vote.

The extreme MAGA Republican voter suppression bill won't allow young peo-

ple, college students who are attending State universities all across the land and who have been issued college IDs through their State colleges and universities, to vote.

There is a big difference between the House Democratic view of free and fair elections, the peaceful transfer of power, and government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and the extreme MAGA Republican view.

House Democrats want to make it easier to vote and harder to obtain weapons of war. Extreme MAGA Republicans want to make it harder to vote and easier to deploy weapons of war. These are weapons, by the way, not used to hunt deer, but to hunt children in classrooms and other human beings.

The extreme MAGA Republican voter suppression bill has given us an opportunity again to communicate with the American people on the difference between our values, House Democrats putting people over politics, focused on the things that matter, like lower costs, growing the middle class, ending price gouging, defending democracy, and fighting for reproductive freedom.

We embrace having a debate with our extreme MAGA Republican colleagues about issues that matter. Why won't Republicans just take their issues to the American people? Why are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle trying to hide their plans that are connected to Trump's Project 2025 publicly, but then come to the House floor and bring this extreme MAGA Republican voter suppression bill that is part of the blueprint of Trump's Project 2025? The majority can't fool the American people. They are smarter than my colleagues think.

Republicans don't want to have a real debate about issues because the extreme MAGA Republicans want to criminalize abortion care and impose a nationwide ban. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to hide that now from the American people, stripping it from their convention platform.

We know what Republicans really want to do. The extreme MAGA Republicans put the Justices on the Supreme Court who detonated *Roe v. Wade*. That is Republicans' agenda. That is part of Trump's Project 2025.

Republicans don't want to debate the issues. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to suppress the right to vote because Trump's Project 2025, which is part of the majority's platform, wants to detonate and destroy the Department of Education, which the American people don't support.

Republicans don't really want to embrace the ability for young people of every race, of every part of America, including the heartland of America and rural America and Appalachia and suburban America, to get a high-quality public education. That is what Trump's Project 2025 is about.

The majority doesn't want to have a discussion about that. My colleagues

don't want that exposed to the American people, so we are on the floor right now with an extreme MAGA Republican voter suppression bill that does nothing because the law is already clear: Noncitizens cannot vote in Federal elections.

We are going to continue to do everything we can to make sure that the American people can participate in free and fair elections, have the freedom to determine their own destiny by exercising their right to vote in an uncompromised and unfettered fashion, as opposed to engaging in this type of frivolous legislative activity, at best, perhaps designed as a cover already trying to set up an excuse for what may happen in November, just like what was done in advance of January 6.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is sacrosanct, and that is why we need to protect it for U.S. citizens.

In New York City, a law was passed to allow noncitizens to vote in municipal elections. Here in our Nation's Capital, 143 Democrats voted to allow noncitizens to vote in municipal elections here in our Nation's Capital.

In the State of New York, there is no photo ID requirement. If there was, it should be noted that the State of New York provides drivers' licenses to illegal immigrants. It is the reason that the SAVE Act is necessary, to make sure that we are protecting U.S. elections for U.S. citizens only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO), a great State.

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I have to disagree with Leader JEFFRIES. He claims that Republicans don't want to debate the issues. There was a debate 2 weeks ago. There was a winner of that debate, and that debate has sent Democrats into disarray.

I also want to counteract the claim that there are laws in place. President Biden has made his entire administration about not following or enforcing laws, and that is one of the reasons as to why the SAVE Act is so important.

Under the Biden administration and the failed policies, there has been over 10 million people that have come across our southern border illegally. In March of 2021, President Biden issued an executive order promoting access to voting, requiring Federal agencies to assist States with voter registration.

We do not have concrete methods to ensure illegals do not vote in Federal elections. The SAVE Act ensures that only United States citizens can vote in elections. Quite frankly, it is insane that we are even having this debate. We should all agree that only those who are citizens of this great country can vote in our elections.

It also expands Federal databases, such as DHS' SAVE database, Social Security databases, and others, to prove citizenship and assist States.

Joe Biden's open-border policy has put America in a position where

illegals could potentially vote in elections. It is bad for election integrity, it is bad for democracy, and it is unfair to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, before Joe Biden, citizenship mattered in the United States of America, and citizenship should matter once again.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I do agree with my distinguished colleague and friend from New York. I don't know why we are having this bill on the floor either. Yes, we can all agree that only U.S. citizens vote in Federal elections. I know that we agree because it is the law of the land.

□ 1500

You can't register if you are not an American citizen to vote in a Federal election. It is against the law. It is also against the law to vote. I agree with him. There is no reason to be here. There is nothing to be gained. There is no problem to be solved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. McCLELLAN).

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, voting rights are sacrosanct and they are personal to many of us.

Over 150 years ago, Black men were allowed to vote for the first time in this country. Thousands were elected to office, particularly across the South, including into this body, including one of my predecessors, John Mercer Langston, the first Black man elected to Congress from Virginia. I stand here as the first Black woman elected to Congress from Virginia. I am the great-granddaughter of a man, who after reconstruction when voter suppression laws passed across the South, had to take a literacy test and find three White men to vouch for his character to be able to vote. He was an American citizen.

I stood in the well and took my oath of office on March 7, 2023, on my father's Bible. Inside that Bible, he kept the poll tax receipt from when he registered to vote, and his father paid a poll tax. I kept that. He kept it in the Bible to remind himself of the barriers put in place to him, an American citizen, to vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRONG). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is essentially a poll tax because I am not aware of a single proof of citizenship document that does not cost an individual money to get, unless we are requiring every State to provide one for free, and then it is an unfunded mandate. This is the 2024 version of the Jim Crow poll tax, and we should vote against it.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Congressman Roy's bill to save

our elections from illegal alien interference.

Sacrosanct voting is only theory unless we protect the election process.

Over the past 3½ years, President Biden has deliberately thrown the border open to over 11 million illegal aliens, many of whom now have Social Security numbers, driver's licenses, and other government-issued IDs, which enable them to vote in our U.S. Federal elections.

Today, many States and municipalities have no way to detect whether an individual with a government-issued ID is a U.S. citizen or not. In some States, any noncitizen can simply check "yes" on one box: "Are you a citizen of the United States," and boom, they are a registered voter.

This is not right. If you are here illegally and interfere in our elections, you deserve a pair of handcuffs, not an "I voted" sticker.

We must pass the SAVE Act to prevent these loopholes from debasing and ultimately destroying our election system.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), my friend.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, as a daughter of Selma and a Representative of Alabama's Civil Rights District, the fight for voting rights is very personal to me.

It was in Selma where hundreds of Foot Soldiers like John Lewis shed blood on a bridge for the equal right of all Americans to vote. They marched, they bled, they prayed, and some even died for the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today makes a mockery of their legacy. House Republicans' so-called SAVE Act is a dangerous antidemocratic bill that would do nothing to protect our elections.

While our colleagues across the aisle claim that this bill will prevent noncitizens from voting, we know that it is already illegal for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections. In fact, under current law, noncitizens would face up to 5 years in prison for attempting to vote in Federal elections and even risk being deported.

In reality, this legislation would purge thousands of eligible voters from the rolls, including Americans who recently got married or changed their last names and those with military and Tribal IDs.

Americans should see this bill for what it is, a cynical attempt to sow doubt in the minds of voters about the integrity of our elections. It is yet another attempt to fan the flames of election denial by the same extremists who brought us the January 6th insurrection.

Mr. Speaker, we are elected officials who should be fighting to protect and expand access to the ballot box, not restrict it. We should be working to advance the progress made by the civil

rights and voting rights movement rather than rolling it back.

Let's be clear, the biggest threat to our elections is not noncitizen voting; it is the lack of Federal oversight which has allowed States to advance hundreds of new laws and new bills making it harder for Americans to vote.

Mr. Speaker, the House should be considering H.R. 14, the John Robert Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, which I introduced in September. H.R. 14 would restore Federal oversight. It would establish a new formula to protect and prevent States with a recent history of voter discrimination from restricting voter access.

In doing so, it would protect access to the ballot box for every eligible American.

With State lawmakers working overtime to erect barriers to the ballot box, the need for Federal voting rights protections is just as urgent today as it was 60 years ago. After all, it is up to the voters to choose our elected leaders, not the other way around.

Never did I think that 60 years after John Lewis was bludgeoned on a bridge in my hometown of Selma, Alabama, that I would be fighting to restore the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It goes to show that progress is elusive, and every generation must fight to preserve the progress of the past and to advance it. John Lewis didn't give up and neither will we.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans' so-called SAVE Act is a dangerous antidemocratic bill that has no place on this floor. It is for that reason that at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to the committee. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the motion to recommit.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8281, the SAVE Act.

For years, Democrats have called Republicans conspiracy theorists for stating Democrats want illegal aliens to vote in our elections. Yet, President Biden and every single Democrat in Washington want this bill to fail.

If Biden and the Democrats want to clear up this conspiracy theory, the President, when this bill passes, needs to sign it into law.

On another note, I have been Black for my entire life. The most racist thing I have ever heard is the insinuation by Democrats that Black and Brown Americans are too stupid to get

an ID to vote just like everybody else. I call this the soft bigotry of low expectations.

Figuring out how to vote in this country is a very low bar, and we could all figure it out regardless of your race, religion, color, or creed, and we should all want free and fair elections.

With me today are six forms of government-issued ID that I won't pull out at this time. How did I acquire that? It is by personal responsibility in this country.

I have also heard a lot about Jim Crow here today. I am here to tell you Jim Crow is over, and I know it because my parents grew up in it. I think it is absolutely insulting to those that actually experienced the ills of Jim Crow.

Having an ID to vote in our Nation's elections should be a requirement, which is why I stand before you today urging my colleagues on the left to support this bill. If you want secure elections, if you want your vote to count, vote for the SAVE Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it bears repeating. We are suggesting that every American, if this bill were to become law, would face enormous burdens with registering to vote. You can't vote, you can't cast a ballot if you can't register.

Let's take again the situation as it will relate to military personnel of the United States. The SAVE Act will prohibit any servicemember deployed overseas from registering to vote at all. That is what the bill says. Check it out.

You have to be in person. You may not register online, and there is no exception in the bill for a servicemember to do that. It requires Americans registering to vote by mail or online to present their proof of citizenship in person.

Good luck doing that if you are on a naval vessel in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. That applies to military personnel. It means that any servicemember deployed overseas will have to travel back to the United States and physically visit an election office to register to vote.

You don't think that is burdensome? You don't think most Americans, if they were watching this debate, would say that can't be right? It can't be right, but it is right. That is what the bill says.

Republicans are supporting a bill that would prohibit members of the military serving overseas from registering to vote while they are deployed. It is unpatriotic. It is outrageous. Also, they won't even allow any amendments to this bill, which we asked for. We asked for amendments which would make this better, although, frankly, it is hard to imagine that we could make this any better, but still no amendments were allowed. I asked for a structured rule on this and was denied the ability to do that.

The Freedom to Vote Act by Congress would expand the ability of every

American, including our servicemembers, to register to vote online. We want members of the military to vote. Frankly, we want every American to vote. If we have a problem in America, it is that too few Americans are voting, not that people who aren't registered or who aren't American citizens are voting. That is not the problem.

This committee and this House and this body ought to be working on ways to expand the franchise to every American because every right that we possess in the Bill of Rights in the Constitution is dependent upon our right to self-governance, and our ability to have self-governance flows from the ability for every American to vote. This bill puts enormous burdens and barriers to making that the reality.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, if anyone is wondering why we need a bill requiring proof of citizenship to vote, look no further than my home, New York City, where in 2021, the city council under Mayor Bill de Blasio passed legislation allowing noncitizens who have resided in our city for just 30 days to vote in municipal elections.

Not only this, but in November, after our office obtained copies of migrant shelter contracts by Freedom of Information Act requests, we discovered that New York City included a provision requiring contractors to distribute voter registration forms, assist in voter registration, and promote campaign material within the shelter themselves, all while prohibiting city agencies from asking about citizenship status in the same contract.

As a daughter of immigrants who came to this Nation legally and earned their right to vote, I have joined city and State leaders as a plaintiff in a lawsuit to stop New York City's misguided voting law. We have won not once, but twice; however, we continue to fight because the city continues to waste taxpayer dollars to appeal the ruling. This is why we need this bill today.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, as the co-chair and founder of the House Election Integrity Caucus, I rise in support of the SAVE Act, which will safeguard the right for every American citizen to vote. We must have proof of citizenship in order to vote.

Since President Biden took office, there have been over 9.7 million illegal immigrant encounters across our Nation, threatening our communities, our national security, and now the Democrats are attempting to undermine our elections. There are over 2 million so-called got-aways.

Many States, including New York, allow illegal immigrants to get reg-

istered to vote and also have driver's licenses. There is no requirement, they are on their honor, to prove whether or not they are actually citizens of this country.

Article II of the New York State Constitution sets forth in section 1: "Every citizen shall be entitled to vote in every election." That is citizens.

In order to protect the sacred right to vote, we have one citizen, one vote in this country. Yet, Democrats oppose the SAVE Act because they want millions of illegal immigrants they allowed into our country to vote in order to undermine and manipulate the outcome of our elections.

This will undermine our sacred right to vote, the most profound expression of our self-governance.

□ 1515

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say: Well, it is against the law for people here illegally to register to vote. It is against the law, Mr. Speaker, for them to vote. It is against the law.

Do you know what else is against the law? Coming into our country illegally, but, oh my goodness, who knew? It happens.

As the past speaker just said, we have the honor system. Do you know how to register to vote? Just sign it and say, "I can vote." That is how to do the honor system.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you who we are providing the honor system to: people who human traffic, drug dealers, cartel members, people on the terrorist watch list.

Mr. Speaker, do we want to count on the honor system to have those folks, people coming from the Communist Party of China, from Russia, our adversaries, our enemies, selecting the leaders of our country? That is what they are telling you right now. That is exactly what they are saying.

By the way, this whole thing about military members can't vote, someone can come here illegally and serve in the fire department, in the soup kitchen, in any number of places, including the military, without being an American citizen. I have been overseas, and I have voted as an American military citizen.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS).

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, it is good to see so many people up in the gallery. What a great day. I can tell you something: Our democracy is at stake. Let me tell you exactly why.

President Biden has released millions of illegal aliens into the United States,

and he has done catastrophic damage to our great country in just 3 years.

Why would a guy do this? Why would he do such a thing? Make no mistake—everybody listening, make no mistake—this administration is facilitating an invasion of our country to import new voters. He wants new voters. He wants to establish one-party rule, and it is all by design. I repeat, it is all by design.

Thankfully, this legislation before us today would ensure that only American citizens are eligible to vote. Protecting our Nation's election integrity should not be a partisan issue, yet here we are.

Remember when my friends on the left falsely claimed the 2016 election was stolen due to foreign election interference? Russia, Russia, Russia. Lies, lies by the left.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this great legislation.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, in 2004, Arizona voters approved a ballot measure requiring proof of citizenship when registering to vote.

Today, Arizona has two voter registration forms. There is one for those who can provide proof of citizenship, and those voters can vote in all offices, State and Federal. The other voter registration form is for people who don't show any proof of citizenship. Those voters are allowed to vote in Federal elections. The number of Arizona voter registration forms where voters don't show proof of citizenship has skyrocketed in Arizona to 35,000 forms.

Arizona voters and the Arizona Legislature have tried everything to ensure only citizens can vote. Arizona and the Nation need Congress to pass the SAVE Act so we can ensure only U.S. citizens vote in our elections, as required by law.

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

I do note that my friends and colleagues on the other side have turned this into a discussion about immigration and the border, which is not the bill before the House. The reason I know that is because they were too embarrassed, perhaps, or perhaps were influenced by folks outside this Chamber to bring a bipartisan border deal that would have dealt with challenges at the border.

They didn't want to do that, so what are they doing? They are making this burdensome bill now a question of the border. They had their chance to do that. We would love them to do that. What they will do instead is demonize people and talk about a problem that doesn't exist.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, with the Biden administration's allowance of 10 million illegals into the country, the immigration issue does have a bearing on this issue.

Radical, progressive Democrats answer the merits of this legislation with logical fallacies. The 2020 election was perfect, they say; therefore, we should not think about, act to end, or prevent unlawful voting by noncitizens, should not speak of the possibility, should avoid the issue entirely, all to improve Americans' confidence in elections.

Since noncitizen voting is unlawful, they say, it does not occur. Since undetectable conduct in the ordinary course is not evidenced by huge masses of evidence, then the absence of evidence is evidence of absence.

In other words, Biden debate logic. Every vote cast by an illegal alien cancels out the vote of an American citizen, and with millions of "newcomers" flooded into the country by the Biden administration, the threat is greater than ever.

Without secure elections, the American experiment is finished. We must pass the SAVE Act.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8281, the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, known as the SAVE Act.

It should not be controversial to say that Americans should decide who Americans vote for. As a former Texas secretary of state, I know the importance of election security.

Now more than ever, with Biden's border invasion releasing millions of illegal immigrants into our country, we must ensure that only American citizens can vote.

The SAVE Act does just that. This legislation will require proof of citizenship for voters to register for Federal elections and will empower States to clean up their voter rolls. It is critical that we safeguard our elections.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to put America first and pass the SAVE Act. In God we trust.

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

The SAVE Act is the most severe voter suppression bill ever considered at the Federal level. It would make it burdensome for Americans to register to vote and to cast a ballot.

It has been brought before this body not to solve any problem, since Republicans have admitted they have no evidence of noncitizen voting in Federal elections. The bill before us is for Republicans to lay the groundwork to undermine the outcome of the Presidential election, just as they did 4 years ago, just as they will again and again until they realize either the futility of this exercise or the Republic crumbles. I pray for the former.

Democrats, on the other hand, want a stronger and more equitable democ-

racy, one that respects the rule of law and ensures that every voice is heard. That is why Democrats champion bills like the Freedom to Vote Act, the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, and the Native American Voting Rights Act, not the SAVE Act.

I fiercely oppose this anti-American bill. I urge every one of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to support the motion to recommit and defeat this extremist SAVE Act.

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

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

This is our opportunity to safeguard American elections for American citizens. We have heard time and again from those on the other side of the aisle that this problem doesn't exist; yet, in our committee hearings, we have shown where noncitizens have voted in U.S. elections, whether it is the 1996 election in California, fully investigated by this House, or Fairfax, Virginia, which in 2011 found 278 noncitizens were on the voter rolls and determined 117 of those individuals had voted illegally, or counties across the country. Chicago, Illinois; San Diego County, California; and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, all found noncitizens had participated in Federal elections.

This is our opportunity to make sure that U.S. elections are for U.S. citizens.

We have also heard that it is already illegal in Federal elections for individuals who are not citizens to vote. That is true, but it is also illegal to cross the border into the United States illegally. That hasn't stopped millions of individuals.

This is our opportunity to safeguard our elections, to make sure that U.S. elections are for U.S. citizens only.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the SAVE Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Sewell of Alabama moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8281 to the Committee on House Administration.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO HONG KONG—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-150)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Hong Kong that was declared in Executive Order 13936 of July 14, 2020, is to continue in effect beyond July 14, 2024.

The situation with respect to Hong Kong, including recent actions taken by the People's Republic of China to fundamentally undermine Hong Kong's autonomy, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat, which has its source in substantial part outside the United States, to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13936 with respect to the situation in Hong Kong.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 10, 2024.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1645

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OBERNOLTE) at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 8281;

Passage of H.R. 8281, if ordered;

Passage of H.J. Res. 165; and

Passage of H.J. Res. 109, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT

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. 8281) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 197, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

YEAS—184

Adams	Crow	Jeffries
Aguilar	Cuellar	Kamlager-Dove
Alfred	Davids (KS)	Kaptur
Amo	Davis (IL)	Keating
Auchincloss	Davis (NC)	Kelly (IL)
Balint	Dean (PA)	Kennedy
Barragán	DeGette	Khanna
Beatty	DeLauro	Kildee
Bera	DelBene	Kilmer
Beyer	Deluzio	Kim (NJ)
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Krishnamoorthi
Blumenauer	Dingell	Kuster
Blunt Rochester	Escobar	Landsman
Bonamici	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Bowman	Españolat	Larson (CT)
Boyle (PA)	Foushee	Lee (CA)
Brown	Frost	Lee (NV)
Budzinski	Galleo	Lee (PA)
Bush	Garcia (IL)	Leger Fernandez
Caraveo	Garcia (TX)	Levin
Carbajal	Garcia, Robert	Lieu
Carson	Golden (ME)	Lofgren
Carter (LA)	Goldman (NY)	Lynch
Cartwright	Gomez	Magaziner
Casar	Gonzalez,	Manning
Case	Vicente	Matsui
Casten	Gottheimer	McBath
Castor (FL)	Green, Al (TX)	McClellan
Castro (TX)	Hayes	McCollum
Cherfilus-	Himes	McGarvey
McCormick	Horsford	McGovern
Chu	Houlahan	Meeks
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Menendez
Clarke (NY)	Hoyle (OR)	Meng
Cleaver	Huffman	Mfume
Clyburn	Ivey	Morelle
Cohen	Jackson (IL)	Moulton
Connolly	Jackson (NC)	Mrvan
Correa	Jacobs	Mullin
Crockett	Jayapal	Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas

Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano

Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)

NAYS—197

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott

Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Joyce (CA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Lopez
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mast
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro

Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—52

Arrington
Banks
Craig
Crenshaw
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Evans
Courtney
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Garamendi
Garbarino
Good (VA)

Granger	LaTurner	Rutherford
Greene (GA)	Massie	Salazar
Grijalva	McCaul	Sarbanes
Harder (CA)	McHenry	Scalise
Higgins (LA)	Moore (WI)	Scott, David
Hill	Moskowitz	Sherrill
Jackson (TX)	Nickel	Tenney
Jackson Lee	Ocasio-Cortez	Titus
James	Omar	Torres (NY)
Johnson (GA)	Pascarell	Wilson (FL)
Jordan	Peltola	
Joyce (OH)	Ramirez	

□ 1705

Messrs. FLOOD, LUTTRELL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. SPARTZ, Messrs. CLINE, GROTHMAN, NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. HOUCHIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. LEVIN and POCAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I missed a vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 344.

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, today I missed a vote on the House Floor. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 344, the Democratic Motion to Recommit on H.R. 8281.

Stated against:

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to vote on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 8281. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 344.

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

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

THANKING KEITH STERN FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful House of Representatives, I rise to offer thanks to one of the most skilled staffers that I—and I know many of us agree—have ever worked with.

After nearly three decades of service to the people's House, this is Keith Stern's last week on Capitol Hill. Anyone who has had the pleasure of working with Keith has not only witnessed a commanding knowledge of rules and parliamentary procedure but a commitment to using that knowledge to help all of us serve the American people.

He has helped the House fulfill its critical mission at every stage of his remarkable career. As an eager intern fresh out of Allegheny College, as an

L.A., as a Rules associate, as a chief of staff, as a floor director, and now as my senior adviser, he has brought to every job a reverence for this institution and for its duty to the American people.

No matter what storm may have been raging—the horrors of 9/11, a global financial meltdown, an unprecedented pandemic, and on January 6, when we saw Keith muster calm, steadfast courage as he maintained order in this Chamber and ensured our safety—throughout it all, Keith's service to us and our country has never wavered. His resolve has only strengthened.

Over the years, he has become a friend, a confidant, and an adviser to our entire Caucus. He has earned the profound respect of our colleagues across the aisle because whatever your politics are, true talent is undeniable—on the floor and on the basketball court.

This institution is stronger, our country is better off, and our future more promising because of what Keith has brought to bear. I will always be grateful for his wise counsel that has guided me and so many of us.

While Keith may never come to respect the Boston Celtics, he has always respected the work that we do here in the people's House. He is a model for anyone who enters this building looking to make a difference.

Keith, you will be missed. I thank you for your work, your grace, your humor, and your friendship.

To your family—Cara, Sandy, and Colleen, and your dad and Judy, who are here with us—please know how grateful we are for your service, as well.

We look forward to all the success ahead, and know this: You will always have a home here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our Speaker Emerita.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished whip for yielding and for her beautiful statement about a great person who has honored us with his work and his patriotism in this body.

It is my privilege to join my colleagues on the floor of the House as we celebrate a true public servant and a trusted aide to so many of us, Keith Stern.

Keith first came to Congress in 1997 to work for Representative Lucille Roybal-Allard. He comes from Los Angeles, so we are very proud of him as a Californian—even though he is a Dodger fan, but that is a different story.

Over the next three decades, he went on to hold many top jobs in the House, always working for the people. For JIM MCGOVERN, he was at the center of policy development on the powerful Rules Committee. As floor director of operations for me as Speaker of the House, he provided expertise for Democrats' major legislative achievements. For Whip CLARK, he has provided counsel on major issues facing the House. He

has been tactically, strategically, philosophically, and in every way a major asset.

Working for more than 7 years in my office, he was simply invaluable. Throughout his tenure, Keith has offered indispensable expertise in House procedure. Coming from the Rules Committee, his vast institutional knowledge made Keith a trusted strategic resource in legislating.

In every role, his service has been marked by insight, integrity, dependability, and unending devotion to this House of Representatives, even in the most trying of times.

My staff in the Office of the Speaker were the finest group of public servants in the House. I always brag about them, the greatest staff ever assembled in the history of the House of Representatives. Keith was a shining example of that brilliance, dedication, and patriotism.

Congratulations, Keith, on a job well done. Thank you for your leadership, which has made a difference in the lives of so many people. Best wishes to you, and gratitude for sharing you with us to Cara; your two beautiful children, Sandy and Colleen; your parents, your mom, your stepmom, and your dad, who are here with us in the gallery, as you embark on this new chapter.

Thank you, Keith Stern, for your patriotism and your service, and best wishes to you as you go forward.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my fellow Bay Stater and ranking member of the Rules Committee.

□ 1715

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in honoring Keith Stern and expressing gratitude for his service to this Congress and to our country.

In between working for former Representative Lucille Roybal-Allard and then for Speaker PELOSI and Democratic Whip CLARK, he worked with me first as a legislative assistant and then as my top person on the Rules Committee.

Keith has an incredible knowledge of the legislative process. He knows how to get stuff over the finish line. He has made a real difference.

As my colleagues know, ending hunger has been a top priority of mine. In 2022, the Biden administration convened a White House Conference on Hunger, Nutrition, and Health. It was only the second time a White House convened such a conference. The first one was held in 1969. Keith actually wrote the first bill back in 2010 directing the White House to bring together experts to craft a national plan to end hunger.

I have learned an awful lot from Keith, and he has helped me achieve countless policies to help people here at home and around the world. I will always be grateful.

A lot of Members of Congress and a lot of staff have also benefited from

Keith's guidance, and I have talked to countless Members and staffers who say that he has served as a mentor to them, teaching them about procedure and how to use the legislative process to do good.

There are people who began as interns on the Hill who never thought of making a career here but who did because of Keith.

Keith is not only a great member of this congressional community; more importantly, he is a good person. He is decent, he is caring, and he respects this institution.

I acknowledge his incredible family. I acknowledge his wife, Cara; and his incredible kids, Sandy and Colleen. They have all sacrificed a lot so that Keith can serve his country.

I appreciate his many years of friendship. My wife, Lisa; and my kids, Molly and Patrick, adore him. They like him better than me.

Keith, I am proud to know you. I feel privileged to be your friend, and I am confident you will do great things in the future.

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the passage of the bill (H.R. 8281) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

RECORDED VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 198, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

AYES—221

Aderholt	Burlison	Duarte
Alford	Calvert	Duncan
Allen	Cammack	Dunn (FL)
Amodei	Carey	Edwards
Armstrong	Carl	Ellzey
Arrington	Carter (GA)	Emmer
Babin	Carter (TX)	Estes
Bacon	Chavez-DeRemer	Ezell
Baird	Ciscomani	Fallon
Balderson	Cline	Feenstra
Banks	Cloud	Ferguson
Barr	Clyde	Finstad
Bean (FL)	Cole	Fischbach
Bentz	Collins	Fitzgerald
Bergman	Comer	Fitzpatrick
Bice	Crane	Fleischmann
Biggs	Crawford	Flood
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Fong
Bishop (NC)	Curtis	Fox
Boebert	D'Esposito	Franklin, Scott
Bost	Davidson	Fry
Brecheen	Davis (NC)	Fulcher
Buchanan	De La Cruz	Gaetz
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Garbarino
Burchett	Diaz-Balart	Garcia, Mike
Burgess	Donalds	Gimenez

Golden (ME)	Lee (FL)	Rogers (KY)
Gonzales, Tony	Lesko	Rose
Gonzalez,	Letlow	Rosendale
Vicente	Lopez	Rouzer
Good (VA)	Loudermilk	Roy
Gooden (TX)	Lucas	Rulli
Gosar	Luetkemeyer	Rutherford
Graves (LA)	Luna	Salazar
Graves (MO)	Luttrell	Scalise
Green (TN)	Mace	Schweikert
Greene (GA)	Malliotakis	Scott, Austin
Griffith	Maloy	Self
Grothman	Mann	Sessions
Guest	Mast	Simpson
Guthrie	McCauley	Smith (MO)
Hageman	McClain	Smith (NE)
Harris	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Harshbarger	McCormick	Smucker
Hern	McHenry	Spartz
Higgins (LA)	Meuser	Stauber
Hill	Miller (IL)	Steel
Hinson	Miller (OH)	Stefanik
Houchin	Miller (WV)	Steil
Hudson	Miller-Meeks	Steube
Huizenga	Mills	Strong
Hunt	Molinaro	Tenney
Issa	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)
Jackson (TX)	Mooney	Tiffany
James	Moore (AL)	Timmons
Johnson (LA)	Moore (UT)	Turner
Johnson (SD)	Moran	Valadao
Jordan	Murphy	Van Drew
Joyce (OH)	Nehls	Van Dwyne
Joyce (PA)	Newhouse	Van Orden
Kean (NJ)	Norman	Wagner
Kelly (MS)	Nunn (IA)	Walberg
Kelly (PA)	Oberholte	Waltz
Kiggans (VA)	Ogles	Weber (TX)
Kiley	Owens	Webster (FL)
Kim (CA)	Palmer	Wenstrup
Kustoff	Pence	Westerman
LaHood	Perez	Williams (NY)
LaLota	Perry	Williams (TX)
LaMalfa	Pfluger	Wilson (SC)
Lamborn	Posey	Wittman
Langworthy	Reschenthaler	Womack
Latta	Rodgers (WA)	Yakym
Lawler	Rogers (AL)	Zinke

NOES—198

Adams	DeGette	Larson (CT)
Agullar	DeLauro	Lee (CA)
Allred	DelBene	Lee (NV)
Amo	Deluzio	Lee (PA)
Auchincloss	DeSaulnier	Leger Fernandez
Balint	Dingell	Levin
Barragan	Doggett	Lieu
Beatty	Escobar	Lofgren
Bera	Eshoo	Lynch
Beyer	Espallat	Magaziner
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Manning
Blumenauer	Foushee	Matsui
Blunt Rochester	Frankel, Lois	McBath
Bonamicci	Prost	McClellan
Bowman	Gallo	McCollum
Boyle (PA)	Garcia (IL)	McGarvey
Brown	Garcia (TX)	McGovern
Brownley	Garcia, Robert	Meeks
Budzinski	Goldman (NY)	Menendez
Bush	Gomez	Meng
Caraveo	Gottheimer	Mfume
Carbajal	Green, Al (TX)	Morelle
Cardenas	Hayes	Moulton
Carson	Himes	Mrvan
Carter (LA)	Horsford	Mullin
Cartwright	Houlahan	Nadler
Casas	Hoyer	Napolitano
Case	Hoyle (OR)	Neal
Casten	Huffman	Neguse
Castor (FL)	Ivey	Nickel
Castro (TX)	Jackson (IL)	Norcross
Cherfilus-	Jackson (NC)	Ocasio-Cortez
McCormick	Jacobs	Omar
Chu	Jayapal	Pallone
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Panetta
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Pappas
Cleaver	Kamlager-Dove	Pelosi
Clyburn	Kaptur	Peters
Cohen	Keating	Petterson
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Phillips
Correa	Kennedy	Pingree
Costa	Khanna	Pocan
Courtney	Kildee	Porter
Craig	Kilmer	Pressley
Crockett	Kim (NJ)	Quigley
Crow	Krishnamoorthi	Ramirez
Davids (KS)	Kuster	Raskin
Davis (IL)	Landsman	Ross
Dean (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz

Ruppersberger	Sorensen	Torres (CA)
Ryan	Soto	Torres (NY)
Salinas	Spanberger	Trahan
Sanchez	Stansbury	Trone
Sarbanes	Stanton	Underwood
Scanlon	Stevens	Vargas
Shakowsky	Strickland	Vasquez
Schiff	Suozzi	Veasey
Schneider	Swalwell	Velazquez
Scholten	Sykes	Wasserman
Schrier	Takano	Schultz
Scott (VA)	Thandor	Waters
Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman
Sewell	Thompson (MS)	Wexton
Sherman	Titus	Wild
Sherrill	Tlaib	Williams (GA)
Slotkin	Tokuda	Wilson (FL)
Smith (WA)	Tonko	

NOT VOTING—14

Crenshaw	Grijalva	Moore (WI)
Evans	Harder (CA)	Moskowitz
Fletcher	Jackson Lee	Pascarella
Garamendi	LaTurner	Peltola
Granger	Massie	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1722

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUES- TION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I seek recognition to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 1344, finding that Merrick Garland, Attorney General of the United States, is in contempt of the House of Representatives for disobeying a certain subpoena.

Finding that Merrick Garland, Attorney General of the United States, is in contempt of the House of Representatives for disobeying a certain subpoena.

Whereas, on February 27, 2024, Merrick Garland, Attorney General of the United States, was duly served with a subpoena to produce a narrow and specific set of materials possessed by the Department of Justice and related to Special Counsel Robert K. Hur's investigation of President Joe Biden's "willful" mishandling of classified documents to the Committee of the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas, Attorney General Garland has, in disobedience of such subpoena, failed to produce the set of materials; and

Whereas, a set of materials possessed by the Department of Justice is material and necessary in order that the House of Representatives may properly execute the functions imposed on it and may obtain information necessary

as a basis for such legislative and other action as the House of Representatives may deem necessary and proper: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That— (1) Merrick Garland, Attorney General of the United States, is found in contempt of the House of Representatives for disobeying the February 27, 2024, subpoena; and

(2) the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall impose a fine, which may not be paid with appropriated funds, on Attorney General Garland of \$10,000 per day, until such a time as Attorney General Garland complies with the subpoena of the House of Representatives by turning over the audio tapes.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Florida offer the resolution?

Mrs. LUNA. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1344

Whereas, on February 27, 2024, Merrick Garland, Attorney General of the United States, was duly served with a subpoena to produce a narrow and specific set of materials possessed by the Department of Justice and related to Special Counsel Robert K. Hur's investigation of President Joe Biden's "willful" mishandling of classified documents to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives in Washington, DC;

Whereas Attorney General Garland has, in disobedience of such subpoena, failed to produce the set of materials; and

Whereas the set of materials possessed by the Department of Justice is material and necessary in order that the House of Representatives may properly execute the functions imposed on it and may obtain information necessary as a basis for such legislative and other action as the House of Representatives may deem necessary and proper: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That—

(1) Merrick Garland, Attorney General of the United States, is found in contempt of the House of Representatives for disobeying the February 27, 2024, subpoena; and

(2) the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall impose a fine, which may not be paid with appropriated funds, on Attorney General Garland of \$10,000 per day, until such time as Attorney General Garland complies with the subpoena of the House of Representatives by turning over the audio tapes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Clark of Massachusetts moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 209, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—207

Adams	Golden (ME)	Panetta
Aguilar	Goldman (NY)	Pappas
Alfred	Gomez	Pelosi
Amo	Gonzalez,	Perez
Auchincloss	Vicente	Peters
Balint	Gottheimer	Pettersen
Barragan	Green, Al (TX)	Phillips
Beatty	Hayes	Pingree
Bera	Himes	Pocan
Beyer	Horsford	Porter
Bishop (GA)	Houlahan	Pressley
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Quigley
Blunt Rochester	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
Bonamici	Huffman	Raskin
Bowman	Ivey	Ross
Boyle (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Ruiz
Brown	Jackson (NC)	Ruppersberger
Brownley	Jacobs	Ryan
Buddzinski	Jayapal	Salinas
Bush	Jeffries	Sánchez
Caraveo	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Carbajal	Joyce (OH)	Scanlon
Cárdenas	Kamlager-Dove	Schakowsky
Carson	Kaptur	Schiff
Carter (LA)	Keating	Schneider
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Scholten
Caspar	Kennedy	Schrier
Case	Khanna	Scott (VA)
Casten	Kildee	Scott, David
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Sewell
Castro (TX)	Kim (NJ)	Sherman
Cherfilus-	Krishnamoorthi	Sherrill
McCormick	Kuster	Slotkin
Chu	Landsman	Smith (WA)
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Sorensen
Clarke (NY)	Larson (CT)	Soto
Cleaver	Lee (CA)	Spanberger
Clyburn	Lee (NV)	Stansbury
Cohen	Lee (PA)	Stanton
Connolly	Leger Fernandez	Stevens
Correa	Levin	Strickland
Costa	Lieu	Suozzi
Courtney	Lofgren	Swalwell
Craig	Lynch	Sykes
Crockett	Magaziner	Takano
Crow	Manning	Thanedar
Cuellar	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Davids (KS)	McBath	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	McClellan	Titus
Davis (NC)	McClintock	Tlaib
Dean (PA)	McCollum	Tokuda
DeGette	McGarvey	Tonko
DeLauro	McGovern	Torres (CA)
DelBene	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Deluzio	Menendez	Trahan
DeSaulnier	Meng	Trone
Dingell	Mfume	Turner
Doggett	Morelle	Underwood
Duarte	Moulton	Vargas
Escobar	Mrvan	Vasquez
Eshoo	Mullin	Veasey
Espallat	Nadler	Velázquez
Foster	Napolitano	Wasserman
Foushee	Neal	Schultz
Frankel, Lois	Neguse	Waters
Frost	Nickel	Watson Coleman
Gallego	Norcross	Wexton
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Garcia (TX)	Omar	Williams (GA)
Garcia, Robert	Pallone	Wilson (FL)

NAYS—209

Aderholt	Bentz	Burgess
Alford	Bergman	Burlison
Allen	Bice	Calvert
Amodei	Biggs	Cammack
Arrington	Bilirakis	Carey
Babin	Bishop (NC)	Carl
Bacon	Boebert	Carter (GA)
Baird	Bost	Carter (TX)
Balderson	Brecheen	Chavez-DeRemer
Banks	Buchanan	Ciscomani
Barr	Bucshon	Cline
Bean (FL)	Burchett	Cloud

Clyde	Hudson	Obernolte
Cole	Huizenga	Ogles
Collins	Hunt	Owens
Comer	Issa	Palmer
Crane	Jackson (TX)	Pence
Crawford	James	Perry
Curtis	Johnson (LA)	Pfuger
D'Esposito	Johnson (SD)	Posey
Davidson	Jordan	Reschenthaler
De La Cruz	Joyce (PA)	Rodgers (WA)
DesJarlais	Kean (NJ)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)
Donalds	Kelly (PA)	Rose
Duncan	Kiggans (VA)	Rosendale
Dunn (FL)	Kiley	Rouzer
Edwards	Kim (CA)	Roy
Ellzey	Kustoff	Rulli
Emmer	LaHood	Rutherford
Estes	LaLota	Salazar
Ezell	LaMalfa	Scalise
Fallon	Lamborn	Schweikert
Feenstra	Langworthy	Scott, Austin
Ferguson	Latta	Self
Finstad	Lawler	Sessions
Fischbach	Lee (FL)	Simpson
Fitzgerald	Lesko	Smith (MO)
Fitzpatrick	Letlow	Smith (NE)
Fleischmann	Lopez	Smucker
Flood	Loudermilk	Spartz
Fong	Lucas	Staubert
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Steel
Franklin, Scott	Luna	Stefanik
Fry	Luttrell	Steil
Fulcher	Mace	Steube
Gaetz	Malliotakis	Strong
Garbarino	Maloy	Tenney
Garcia, Mike	Mann	Thompson (PA)
Gimenez	Mast	Tiffany
Gonzales, Tony	McCauley	Timmons
Good (VA)	McClain	Valadao
Gooden (TX)	McCormick	Van Drew
Gosar	Meuser	Van Dwyne
Graves (LA)	Miller (IL)	Van Orden
Graves (MO)	Miller (OH)	Wagner
Green (TN)	Miller (WV)	Walberg
Greene (GA)	Miller-Meeks	Waltz
Griffith	Mills	Weber (TX)
Grothman	Molinaro	Webster (FL)
Guest	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Guthrie	Mooney	Westerman
Hageman	Moore (AL)	Williams (NY)
Harris	Moore (UT)	Williams (TX)
Harshbarger	Moran	Wilson (SC)
Hern	Murphy	Wittman
Higgins (LA)	Nehls	Womack
Hill	Newhouse	Yakym
Hinson	Norman	Zinke
Houchin	Nunn (IA)	

NOT VOTING—17

Armstrong	Grijalva	Moore (WI)
Crenshaw	Harder (CA)	Moskowitz
Evans	Jackson Lee	Pascarell
Fletcher	LaTurner	Peltola
Garamendi	Massie	Smith (NJ)
Granger	McHenry	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1733

So the motion to table was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO REFER

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Clark of Massachusetts moves to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have already taken up way too much of the House's time, of the American people's time. Let's get back

to doing the work that they sent us here to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to refer.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 211, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

YEAS—207

Adams	Golden (ME)	Panetta
Aguilar	Goldman (NY)	Pappas
Allred	Gomez	Pelosi
Amo	Gonzalez,	Perez
Auchincloss	Vicente	Peters
Balint	Gottheimer	Pettersen
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Phillips
Beatty	Hayes	Pingree
Bera	Himes	Pocan
Beyer	Horsford	Porter
Bishop (GA)	Houlahan	Pressley
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Quigley
Blunt Rochester	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
Bonamici	Huffman	Raskin
Bowman	Ivey	Ross
Boyle (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Ruiz
Brown	Jackson (NC)	Ruppersberger
Brownley	Jacobs	Ryan
Budzinski	Jayapal	Salinas
Bush	Jeffries	Sánchez
Caraveo	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Carbajal	Joyce (OH)	Scanlon
Kardenas	Kamlager-Dove	Schakowsky
Carson	Kaptur	Schiff
Carter (LA)	Keating	Schneider
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Scholten
Casar	Kennedy	Schrier
Case	Khanna	Scott (VA)
Casten	Kildee	Scott, David
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Sewell
Castro (TX)	Kim (NJ)	Sherman
Cherfilus-	Krishnamoorthi	Sherrill
McCormick	Kuster	Slotkin
Chu	Landsman	Smith (WA)
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Sorensen
Clarke (NY)	Larson (CT)	Soto
Cleaver	Lee (CA)	Spanberger
Clyburn	Lee (NV)	Stansbury
Cohen	Lee (PA)	Stanton
Connolly	Leger Fernandez	Stevens
Correa	Levin	Strickland
Costa	Lieu	Suozzi
Courtney	Lofgren	Swalwell
Craig	Lynch	Sykes
Crockett	Magaziner	Takano
Crow	Manning	Thanedar
Cuellar	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Davids (KS)	McBath	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	McClellan	Titus
Davis (NC)	McClintock	Tlaib
Dean (PA)	McCollum	Tokuda
DeGette	McGarvey	Tonko
DeLauro	McGovern	Torres (CA)
DelBene	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Deluzio	Menendez	Trahan
DeSaulnier	Meng	Trone
Dingell	Mfume	Turner
Doggett	Morelle	Underwood
Duarte	Moulton	Vargas
Escobar	Mirvan	Vasquez
Eshoo	Mullin	Veasey
Espallat	Nadler	Velázquez
Foster	Napolitano	Wasserman
Foushee	Neal	Schultz
Frankel, Lois	Neguse	Waters
Frost	Nickel	Watson Coleman
Galleo	Norcross	Wexton
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Garcia (TX)	Omar	Williams (GA)
Garcia, Robert	Pallone	Wilson (FL)

NAYS—211

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

NOT VOTING—15

Crenshaw	Grijalva	McHenry
Evans	Harder (CA)	Moore (WI)
Fletcher	Jackson Lee	Moskowitz
Garamendi	LaTurner	Pascrell
Granger	Massie	Peltola

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1733

Ms. PETTERSEN changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to refer was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully missed four roll call votes today. Had I been

present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call Vote 344, NO on Roll Call Vote 345, YEA on Roll Call Vote 346, and YEA on Roll Call Vote 347.

□ 1745

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD). Pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA).

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

Mr. Speaker, the American people have a deep distrust in our ability to govern effectively. The executive branch's blatant disregard for Congress as an institution, shown most recently by the Department of Justice's failure to prosecute Attorney General Merrick Garland, undermines the effectiveness of this body. It also begs the question: What is Attorney General Garland hiding?

On February 27, 2024, the Oversight and Judiciary Committees issued subpoenas to Attorney General Garland to provide a narrow and specific set of materials related to Special Counsel Robert Hur's investigation into President Joe Biden's willful mishandling of classified documents.

Instead of complying with the lawfully issued congressional subpoenas, Attorney General Garland refused to hand over unredacted audio recordings and materials.

This is why House Republicans voted to hold Garland in criminal contempt of Congress. However, on June 14, 2024, the Department of Justice informed us that they would not uphold the law and prosecute the Attorney General for contempt of Congress. While we all expected DOJ's response, the dangerous precedent it set cannot be overstated.

In order for the House of Representatives to do its job, we must have access to the information that will allow us to make informed decisions on behalf of our constituents.

With Attorney General Garland and the Department of Justice refusing to follow the law, we have been left with no choice but to rely on inherent contempt, our constitutional authority to hold an individual accountable for refusing to comply with congressional demands.

Inherent contempt is within our Article I authority. It was first used in 1795 and was upheld by the Supreme Court in 1821 in *Anderson v. Dunn*. Since then, it has been reaffirmed many times by the Court.

If we fail to hold Garland accountable, we will signal to whoever controls the White House that it is impervious to congressional oversight and that the constitutionally recognized power of the House of Representatives is merely a suggestion and not to be taken seriously.

If an American is presented with a lawful subpoena, he or she is expected

that they comply or face the consequences of their defiance. Why should the Attorney General of the United States be held to a different standard? No one is above the law.

We have reached a turning point where the urgency of this situation cannot be overlooked.

I want to remind my colleagues that House Republicans have already agreed that Merrick Garland must be held accountable for defying two lawfully issued subpoenas. Today's vote will hold Attorney General Garland in inherent contempt of Congress and fine him \$10,000 per day until he complies with our subpoenas by turning over the audiotapes.

Over the past couple of days, I have heard false statements being made about this resolution, one of which was a claim that this violated the bill of attainder. This is simply untrue. In fact, the Supreme Court rejected the idea that inherent contempt is a bill of attainder in the 1927 case of *McGrain v. Daugherty*. This means that it is a constitutional right within our authority under the Necessary and Proper Clause.

Another false statement is that the fine can be paid with appropriated money. However, this resolution clearly states that it is personal funds that will be used.

I would like to remind my colleagues that this Congress is not subordinate to the executive branch. It never has been, and it never will be. This resolution will protect the integrity and independence of the legislative branch.

To each one of my colleagues, your constituents and this institution are relying on you to be on the right side of law and order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. VAN ORDEN).

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple issue. The United States of America is a republic that is designed specifically, and our duties are articulated in the Constitution of the United States of America.

When we are speaking to the executive branch as a coequal branch, we are not sending requests. A subpoena is not an ask. It is a task. For the Attorney General of the United States to completely ignore the Congress is unlawful. It cannot be tolerated.

This should be the most bipartisan bill that would pass in this Congress because my Democratic colleagues also have been emasculated by the Attorney General. So, I am asking them to cross the aisle. Let's work together and make sure that we, collectively, are respected as Members of Congress, as articulated in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentlewoman have any further speakers?

Mrs. LUNA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, we have lots of speakers.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. McCORMICK).

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, we have a quick decision to make, and I understand this is contentious because of who is President and because of who is in control of the floor.

In the near future, we will have maybe a new President, a new Senate, and things will be looked at very differently. I think the most important thing here is empowering the legislative branch to do its duty, to have representation by the people in its most basic way.

We saw something in the debate that we have never seen before, probably the most epic and historic debate ever as far as exposing the President and how he thinks, what his mental capacity is, and his ability to lead this great Nation forward in the next 4 years.

This is about the survival of our Nation, about the representation of ideas, about the health of the most powerful person in the world. If we can get to the bottom of that, we can make great decisions on who we elect. We can also, at the same time, have the best representation from the legislative branch.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a stupid resolution. Republican leadership knows this is a stupid resolution. Their own Members know this is a stupid resolution, but they are beholden to the craziest MAGA members in their Conference.

So, this is what we get: stupid resolutions on the floor because they are too chicken to stand up to the extremism in their own party.

The Attorney General turned over the exact transcripts of the interviews that Republicans demanded, but that wasn't good enough because this isn't about a dispute over a recording. Let's be real. Republicans want to get these recordings because they think the RNC can use them in attack ads.

This is Republicans weaponizing the government to go after their political opponents, and it is sick.

The hypocrisy on the other side is stunning. It takes my breath away, Mr. Speaker. JIM JORDAN, ANDY BIGGS, SCOTT PERRY all ignored congressional subpoenas. I can go right down the list: former Speaker Kevin McCarthy, former Attorney General William Barr, former Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross, former Chief of Staff Mark Meadows, former Deputy Chief of Staff Dan Scavino all were ordered to testify, and what did they do? They ran and hid, following the lead, by the way, of their corrupter in chief, Donald Trump, who ignored his own congressional subpoena. It is like a national pastime for Republicans—golf, fishing, and ignoring subpoenas.

Now, they have the nerve to come down here and lecture anyone about

the rule of law. Get lost. Get lost. Get out of here with this nonsense.

Contrast what Republicans did with what Attorney General Garland is doing. Not only is he taking the subpoena seriously, he is doing his best to comply. He has legitimate concerns about releasing the tape after the transcript has already been made public. He is not ignoring it like they do on their side.

In fact, he made the entire underlying report public. He made the transcript public. He allowed the special counsel to testify in public for hours to explain his investigation. He sent a detailed letter, supported by the facts, the law, and the precedent, detailing why he would not release the audio recording because our side respects the rule of law while the other side uses it as a phony talking point.

By the way, not only is this resolution a BS political stunt, it is not even a good BS political stunt. This is a bad resolution that could do massive damage to this institution's standing. If they go down this road, Mr. Speaker, if this half-baked idea actually passes, this House will almost certainly lose, doing irreparable damage to our own constitutional authority.

So, I guess, you can pat yourselves on the back. Well done. Not only have you cooked up * * * a plan that will undermine any future legitimate attempts to use all our tools if it comes to a contempt proceeding.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition?

Mr. GRIFFITH. To ask that the words be stricken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be seated.

□ 1815

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the offending words.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the offending words are withdrawn.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I say for the RECORD that this is the second time there has been an attempt to silence me by the freedom-loving Republican Conference. So much for the First Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I get it. They are desperate to distract from their failures. Their own Members are saying that they have done nothing, and clearly they have deserted the American people in deference to Trump. I get it. They want to distract from Project 2025.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to think of what I can say. I get it. They want to distract from Project 2025, distract from their own nationwide abortion bans, distract from their giveaways to big donors of special interests, and what do we get? We get unserious stuff like this on the floor.

I say to the American people: You might not agree with Democrats on everything. You might not think we are perfect, but we are focused on our job. We are focused on fighting inflation, focused on getting prices down, focused on bringing jobs back from overseas, on standing up for democracy, and on protecting the freedom of our constituents.

Contrast that with what Republicans are focused on: wasting more time on political stunts instead of working with us to get things done. It is as simple and as sad as that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 24 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since Merrick Garland took over as Attorney General in March of 2021, he has completely subverted and weaponized the Department of Justice. This weaponization of the DOJ has resulted in the persecution of the left's political enemies in a two-tiered justice system. From investigating parents who protest their school boards, to going after pro-life activists and Catholics, to persecuting former President Donald J. Trump, Merrick Garland's corruption knows no bounds.

The DOJ's persecution of Joe Biden's primary political adversary, President Donald J. Trump, is illegal and an actual assault on democracy. Raiding President Trump's home for legally declassifying documents in a transparent violation of justice and persecuting a declared candidate for President of the United States is nothing short of election interference.

In the meantime, Merrick Garland has refused to comply with a lawful congressional subpoena, claiming executive privilege, the same defense argued by Steve Bannon and Peter Navarro.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. For Merrick Garland and Joe Biden, it is rules for thee, but not for me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican Conference to support this resolution, reclaim our congressional authority, and hold Merrick Garland accountable for his hypocritical and illegal actions

that spit in the faces of all Americans' rights to a fair justice system.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid to say anything now. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is so much to cover here from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

First, I address something that my colleague from Wisconsin said when he said that the Constitution lays out very clearly in Article I the powers of Congress. I would ask him or any of my colleagues on the other side if you could point me to where in the Constitution it confers subpoena power on Congress. You won't be able to because it is something established by the Supreme Court that is derivative from Congress' power to legislate.

The Supreme Court has set forth exactly what a congressional subpoena is authorized to do. In a recent case, which you may remember, the *Trump v. Mazars* case, Donald Trump sued his accountant to prevent them from providing documents to Congress pursuant to a subpoena. Congressional authority, that is what we are worried about here.

Well, the Supreme Court reiterated that there must be a legitimate legislative purpose in order for a congressional subpoena to be valid.

Mr. Speaker, I asked in our Oversight Committee when we debated this: What is the legitimate legislative purpose that any one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can identify to justify a contempt finding here where they have the substantive information of the recording included in the transcript and everything else requested in that subpoena was provided to them? Nonetheless, they are insisting on getting the audio of that transcript that they have.

Mr. Speaker, not surprisingly, in the Oversight Committee, which has no jurisdiction over this anyway, they offered nothing. I did hear in the Judiciary Committee my friend from North Carolina, who is here, refer in a subsequent hearing to demeanor evidence as a legitimate purpose for this subpoena.

Mr. Speaker, demeanor evidence sounds like sophisticated legal speak that is very esoteric and only for trial lawyers, but really it is completely irrelevant to Congress' legislative role because we don't try cases. There is no trial here. There is no demeanor evidence. As much as you may want to prosecute Joe Biden, there is no congressional prosecution of Joe Biden, and his demeanor evidence is no legitimate basis for this subpoena.

Mr. Speaker, you of course know, and I don't even think you would argue, that there is a legitimate legislative purpose to use the audio recordings in a political ad to support your dear leader, Mr. Trump, so that clearly falls outside of the range.

Of course, my friends on the other side of the aisle should refocus from de-

meanor evidence to basic concepts, like due process or executive privilege, because the President of the United States asserted executive privilege over this audiotape. You may not like it. You may not agree with it, but you have no authority to determine that that is not a correct assertion of the executive privilege.

Do you know who else doesn't have authority to determine that? The Attorney General, who you are trying to hold in contempt. Due process.

You are going to fine someone \$10,000 without notice or an opportunity to be heard? You are going to say: We are going to fine you, and you have no opportunity to make a defense, and there is no neutral adjudicator?

You can go to court all you want, and that is where you went, and that is where you belong. That is why this resolution is so bogus. I have a warning for you, my friends: You will reap what you sow.

In June of 2019, then-President Donald Trump said he would defy all congressional subpoenas. That is exactly what he did. During the first impeachment investigation, every single executive branch agency defied a lawful subpoena from Congress.

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

Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. The State Department was subpoenaed. The Defense Department was subpoenaed. Not a single document was received.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to whoever one day is the Republican Secretary of State or Secretary of Defense to be held in inherent contempt and fined \$10,000.

□ 1830

There were more than a dozen witnesses who refused to comply with the subpoena, and I am not even talking about the five House Republicans who defied subpoenas in the last Congress that were determined by a court to be lawful and who would also be subject to inherent contempt because, of course, if this case where the audiotape is not provided, then blowing off a subpoena is definitely contempt.

You ought to be careful about the precedent you are setting because it is going to hurt you and your dear leader far more than us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members, again, are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that audio recordings were used against both Trump and Nixon during impeachments. Also, I believe the precedent has already been set as there are Republicans in jail for ignoring subpoenas, and the Attorney General is not above the law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY), my colleague.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution to hold Attorney General Merrick Garland in inherent contempt of Congress.

This is not a decision that I take lightly but one that is rooted in the fundamental principle and appreciation of our separation of powers.

Merrick Garland claims that he will “not back down from defending democracy,” but he has gone to great lengths to ignore and discredit our legislative oversight.

Merrick Garland claims that there have been “unprecedented” and “unfounded” attacks on the justice system, but all the while his Department of Justice has weaponized our government in unprecedented and unfounded ways. Merrick Garland claims, again, that he will continue to do the right thing.

The right thing here, Mr. Speaker, would be to comply with a lawfully issued subpoena. We have the transcripts. You cannot now claim executive privilege over the tapes themselves.

The Supreme Court case of *McGrain v. Daugherty* put it best: “A legislative body cannot legislate wisely or effectively in the absence of information . . . and where the legislative body does not itself possess the requisite information . . . recourse must be had to others who do possess it.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will note for the record that the gentlewoman from Florida can say whatever she wants about President Biden and the DOJ, but I can’t say what I think about this resolution. Maybe that is the way it works in the Kremlin, but we are in the United States Congress, and we are supposed to be able to say what we believe and be able to express ourselves freely. That is the First Amendment.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), my colleague.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, at what point will the United States House of Representatives stand up and say we aren’t going to take it from the executive branch anymore?

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this is not about Democrats versus Republicans; this is about Congress versus the executive branch.

If the executive branch had a problem with the subpoena, they should not have filed a motion to quash. They should have taken it to the third branch of government and made sure that the subpoena was proper.

They didn’t do that. They decided to be executive across the board to dictate to this House, elected by the people, what the terms were going to be. I won’t stand for it anymore. It is time we used our inherent contempt and hold the Attorney General in contempt of Congress.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that we are here today.

Look, no one wanted to take it to this step. This has been forced upon us by the Attorney General of the United States of America. He has thumbed his nose at this very institution.

Mr. Speaker, if you look in the drawer right below you there, because I was up there 2 days ago, and you pull out the drawer, there is a book this thick, the “Jefferson’s Manual.” On page 142 through 147, you will find delineated and described caseloads of inherent contempt, upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now, I will grant you this: This tool in the toolbox of the U.S. House of Representatives has not been used in some time, but that does not mean it is ineffective and should not be used.

This body is precious. We need to protect this body, and when another branch of this government thumbs its nose at this body, we have to act to protect the reputation and prestige of this body, or we will lose it.

The Attorney General is not above the law. Merrick Garland, as a Federal judge, if someone had ignored his subpoena, he would have them in jail, locked up that night. Our option under “Jefferson’s Manual” is to do that very thing: to have the Sergeant at Arms go and arrest the Attorney General.

We are choosing not to do this but instead issue a \$10,000 fine until he turns over those tapes. At this point, this is not about what is on these tapes. This is about the principle of the United States House of Representatives protecting its reputation and bringing to justice, bringing to light the information on that tape and securing the liberties of the United States of America.

If we do not do this, our Republic will be lost. This is so important to our body and the future of what we must do here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of things that I have heard on the floor today that I find offensive, but I am not a snowflake, and I am not going to try to silence anybody.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues across the aisle, this is about the quality of the evidence. Surely everyone recognizes that the Oversight Committee is the body of authority of Congress that has responsibility to hold the executive branch accountable.

In the process of our committee work on the Oversight Committee, we seek intelligence and data from the executive branch all the time. Sometimes it is voluntary. Sometimes it requires a subpoena.

In this case, we had to use subpoena authority, which we did. That is a process that we went through. It provided us a description of the evidence. A transcript is not an audio file; it is a description of an audio file. If you have a crime committed, in the evidence you are not going to look at a picture of a knife or a description of a bloody shoe or a glove. You need the knife or the shoe or the glove.

We could provide our own description. We don’t know if the transcript is accurate or not because we don’t have the audio file. There is zero value to a transcript in a process like this without the original quality evidence. My attorney friends over there know this.

As an investigator I say it is quite simple: Give us the original evidence. What do you have to hide?

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 17 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we are here, the reason that the Attorney General of the United States has already been held in contempt, is because Special Counsel Hur interviewed the President of the United States and the Attorney General provided to Congress, at our request, a transcript rather than an audio recording.

We believe the audio recording is necessary for us to understand the extent to which the President was able to answer the questions before him and why Special Counsel Hur chose not to pursue charges directly as a result of what he put forward as the likelihood that the President would not be found effectively competent to stand trial. We believe that is central to the question.

In terms of legislative purpose, what we are talking about here, by the way, is an impeachment inquiry and the tools of the House through the Judiciary Committee includes our ability to go forward and get the appropriate information, and we have a purpose which is the impeachment inquiry. It is nothing more. It is nothing less.

Now, in the Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General of the United States in a question that I asked him, his response was that the evidence was the same. The transcript and the audio were the same.

If that is true, then the Attorney General has no real basis, having already waived privilege on the transcript, not claimed privilege on the transcript, has no real basis for not giving the audio to the United States Congress to carry out its duty for an impeachment inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I find it curious that my colleagues on the

other side of the aisle have not said one single word about JIM JORDAN defying a congressional subpoena, but then, again, this debate is not on the level.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman LUNA for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, Congress held Attorney General Merrick Garland in criminal contempt of Congress. He refused to comply with two congressional subpoenas and hand over the tapes of the President's interview with Special Counsel Robert Hur.

After the interview, Robert Hur called the President "a sympathetic, well-meaning, elderly man with a poor memory," and that is a quote. It is clear the Attorney General is trying to cover up our President's mental decline, but it is not working.

Every single person can see that the President is not well. The House already voted to hold Attorney General Merrick Garland in criminal contempt of Congress a few weeks ago for defying the subpoenas, but there are three different kinds of contempt, Mr. Speaker: criminal, civil, and inherent contempt of Congress.

Holding someone in criminal contempt puts the Justice Department, which is controlled by Merrick Garland, in charge of taking action against the person.

By holding him in inherent contempt, we put the responsibility back in the hands of Congress where it belongs. This resolution fines the Attorney General \$10,000 every day he continues to defy the congressional subpoenas and hand over those tapes.

Some folks don't want us doing this right now, and I understand that. It is an election year. I think this is exactly what we need to do, though, right now. These tapes will show the American people that our President is not well and not fit to be President of the United States.

No one, not even our Attorney General, is above the law. He needs to be held accountable and hand over those recordings to Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President to include making reference to other sources that would have been out of order if spoken in the Member's own words.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. Boebert).

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, ANNA PAULINA LUNA, the Representative from Florida, for leading this important resolution.

I just have one question: What is the Biden administration trying to hide?

Attorney General Merrick Garland's refusal to produce evidence establishes

a clear pattern of obstruction by the Department of Justice, or rather injustice during this administration, to cover up Joe Biden's wrongdoings.

Joe Biden has lied to the American people about his mishandling of classified documents. Never mind the stories about his uncle being eaten by cannibals. We are not touching that today, but he has also repeatedly denied knowing about or being involved in his family's influence peddling schemes, which the Oversight Committee can now show has raked in \$18 million from foreign individuals and entities for Biden family members, including Joe Biden himself.

After the debate, it has grown increasingly apparent that Joe Biden has repeatedly made false statements to the American people about his ability to even lead this country.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

□ 1845

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Biden's Department of Justice has taken every step to insulate him from any consequences, whether it is hiding these audio recordings or attempting to give Hunter Biden a sweetheart deal. This is absolutely unacceptable.

The House of Representatives cannot serve as a necessary check on the Presidency if the executive branch is free to ignore the House's subpoenas. It is clear the Biden crime family believes they are above the law.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important resolution and force Biden's crooked DOJ to hand over the tapes and hold Attorney General Merrick Garland in contempt of Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to formally ask that her words be taken down, but the hypocrisy here is astounding. I get silenced for characterizing a bill in a negative way, and they continue to insult the President of the United States and his family and everybody else.

This is outrageous. It has to stop. This is the House of Representatives. This is not some rightwing radio talk show. This is where we are supposed to have serious debate. This is just wrong.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I would love to first start by thanking my colleague from Florida for allowing me this time.

I have heard the other side of the aisle talk about constitutionality and

what our roles and responsibilities are here in Congress, but the one that they fail to understand the most is oversight and accountability. That is something that is afforded to us under Article I as the legislative body.

In doing so, we are requested to ensure that we have not just the written but the audio and other testimony that was actually provided, which, by the way, is paid for by the U.S. taxpayers and, therefore, has the right to be heard.

Special Counsel Robert Hur made it very clear when he was investigating the improper maintenance and keeping of classified documents that were not protected by executive privilege by President Joe Biden in his garage and University of Pennsylvania—that is what we are demanding, is to hear the further testimony to this and not just sit here and look at the written or the "elderly man with a poor memory," a quote from Robert Hur.

Again, I ask the question, what is it that they are trying to hide? Is it either that he is not mentally and physically fit and capable to be the Commander in Chief, and, therefore, the 25th Amendment should be invoked, or is it the fact that he is mentally fit and therefore should be indicted and treated in the same manner that Special Counsel Jack Smith treated President Trump? It has to be one or the other.

The Trump audio was actually demanded by Congress during their continuation of the Russia, Russia, Russia, Ukraine, Ukraine, Ukraine witch hunts.

We will also note that the House has actually done this to hold people in contempt. We have right now Peter Navarro and Steve Bannon who have been in prison for this very same thing.

I urge all of my colleagues to support Mrs. LUNA's resolution, ensuring that we, as Article I congressional bodies, uphold our constitutional oath and responsibility to guarantee that the rule of law is maintained and kept at all times.

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

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing the resolution.

To address the other side's claims about subpoenas to Members, they are invalid when you get your buddies together, predetermine the outcome, and then have an illegitimate committee, so-called, that doesn't follow and comport with the rules of the House.

By the way, some of the Members accused here were never even served those subpoenas, so let's be careful about disparaging our colleagues.

On the issue at hand, Mr. Speaker, this was a criminal investigation conducted by Robert Hur, a criminal investigation on the President of the

United States for classified documents for which he was not authorized to have because, at the time he had them, he was not the President. He was the Vice President or a Senator and, in either case, not authorized to have those documents outside the chain of custody and outside a SCIF. He had no courier orders. They were just stored in his garage or at the Penn Biden Center.

That is the crime. The crime was committed. That is actually not in question. Robert Hur essentially said that there was a crime committed. The question is of the evidence of the crime committed. What the administration, the Department of Justice, and Merrick Garland have said is: You can't have the evidence. We are going to tell you our version of the evidence.

That is not how it goes in criminal trials. We don't say to the defendant: Give us your version of the evidence, and we will see if that is good enough. Prosecutors go get the evidence and then determine where it leads.

This House of Representatives demands the best evidence, not somebody else's version of the evidence, but the actual evidence, and the best evidence available, not because the House of Representatives inherently needs it, but because the American people need to judge for themselves about the crime that was committed and then why Robert Hur decided not to prosecute that crime.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just for the record, the Attorney General is not ignoring anything, like they do on their side. In fact, he made the entire underlying report public. He has released the entire transcript. He has done everything that was expected of him.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I need to point this out for the record: My Republican colleagues don't care when Republicans ignore subpoenas. That is okay, but they have a different standard for Democrats. Just like in debate, Republicans can say whatever they want: personal attacks against the President, personal attacks against the Attorney General, you know, awful things. That is fine. That is okay. They can say whatever they want. I characterize a bill in a way that they don't like, and they threaten to silence me, to take my words down.

This is not the Kremlin, my friends. This is the United States House of Representatives, and we still live in a democracy where people can express themselves. That has not changed, at least not yet.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 8 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, what I find intriguing is we have had references repeatedly tonight that this is not the Kremlin and assertions that some of us received subpoenas and didn't respond. This individual doesn't know the facts. When a subpoena was issued, does he know whether service was ever made? Does he know that? The answer is no, and it wasn't.

Let's talk about why we are here today. The other side says: Wait a second, Mr. Garland was in compliance because he provided a written transcript that was accurate—except for what happened 3 weeks ago now, the DOJ itself in pleadings to the court said: We made changes to the transcript, but don't worry, don't worry about those changes. They were de minimis. We took out repeat words. We took out pauses. We took out all kinds of things that were just small in nature.

How do we know? We don't know. However, there was an audio recording. Isn't that fortunate? There was an audio recording.

Just like in the Nixon tapes—and this is the controlling law here—the Court said if you change the written transcript, you have to provide the audio recording. That is what the Court said. My friends across the aisle said we have to rely on what the Court said. The Court said if you have doctored or altered or changed or edited the transcript, the written transcript, you have to provide the audio recording.

That is all we are asking for. Comply with that. Comply with the law. Comply with the subpoena you were given, the subpoena that you didn't contest, that you admitted you were served with, that you admitted controls.

Now, you claim executive privilege, but you can't claim executive privilege because you waived it.

The courts have ruled on that, too. It has to be timely. They didn't make a timely objection. It has to be related to official duties. This wasn't related to official duties.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it wasn't related to official duties. They have waived the privilege. Merrick Garland waived the privilege. He now needs to respond, and he continues to say no.

We have the authority. We have the inherent contempt authority, and we need to use that authority if we are going to maintain our Article I authorities and the separation of powers.

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

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding. I am sorry for this body that you have had to endure such hypo-

critical conduct in silencing you. Luckily, I am not silenced, and I am happy to respond to some of the bogus and egregious allegations from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

First, my friend from Georgia expounded upon the weaponization of the Department of Justice by President Biden. It was interesting to me that she mentioned that the Department of Justice is apparently, under Joe Biden's direction, persecuting Catholics. Joe Biden is Catholic, so that is an interesting weaponization of the Department of Justice.

You would think that if someone were going to weaponize the Department of Justice for political purposes that he would intervene or interfere in a prosecution of his own son, but, no, he didn't do that. In fact, the only people who intervened and interfered in that investigation were my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who inappropriately and improperly intervened in an ongoing Federal criminal case by urging a judge to reject the plea agreement in the Hunter Biden case.

Now, they say we are here because congressional power must be protected. Apparently, congressional power is meaningless if it is used against their buddies, Steve Bannon and Peter Navarro, who completely blew off a congressional subpoena and had no basis, no rationale, no defense for not showing up. They are in jail not because of inherent contempt. They are in jail because they were convicted of a crime, because they blew it off.

Now, you can say what you want about the January 6th Committee. You can say it was unlawful. Federal judges determined it to be lawful.

If your excuse as to why you did not comply is that you did not receive service of the subpoena, it is laughable.

Finally, I would like just to point out that the basis they have mentioned about why they need this recording, one of my colleagues said, was to determine whether President Biden was able to answer questions before him and why the special counsel did not pursue charges. It is not a legitimate legislative purpose for Congress to second-guess Federal prosecutorial discretion. You may want it, but you have no legitimate reason for it.

If your argument is that executive privilege is waived, maybe it is, but you don't get to decide that. A court decides it.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a political stunt solely designed to placate and support Donald Trump, their nominee for President. They are making sure that they do everything possible to provide him with fodder for his campaign because there is no basis for any contempt, much less inherent contempt, and it is shameful that you have stood here trying to call

upon congressional power and separation of powers when you refuse to do so for any Republican, including your own colleagues who defy subpoenas right, left, and center. Be careful because what goes around comes around.

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I have heard this motion called a political stunt. Let me assure my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, this is no political stunt. Congress must use its inherent authority when it deems it proper. This is a proper use of that.

I would say to the gentleman, my feelings on this have nothing to do with the current situation politically. I advocated to then-Speaker John Boehner that we use this measure on Eric Holder if he chose to come to the floor of the House for a State of the Union Address after having been found in contempt.

It may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that on the general contempt, the criminal contempt, the Department of Justice headed by Merrick Garland can use prosecutorial discretion, which they did, which is also why it is inherent on Congress to use its inherent contempt power because if we only can rely on the Attorney General to hold himself or charge himself with contempt, Congress no longer has the power to subpoena, Congress no longer has the power to do its oversight, to do its investigations into any part of the Federal Government, and we will be taking away all of the power. We will be emasculating the United States Congress.

It is not appropriate. We should have used this power 10 years ago. We should have used this power 8 years ago. Now, we must restore the ability of the United States Congress to get its subpoenas answered from the executive branch of this country.

If there is a problem, Mr. Speaker, if the executive branch thinks we have overreached, if the executive branch thinks we have done something wrong, we have a third branch to make a decision on that, but the first step is for us to recognize and defend our constitutional prerogatives to do our job and to defend the United States Congress with inherent contempt against the executive branch.

□ 2000

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

In closing, I feel very sad for our country based on what is happening right now on the House floor. I don't believe this is a serious effort. I believe it is very political, quite frankly.

What this really is about is Republicans are upset that they can't get their hands on an audio recording so they can use it in an RNC attack ad. That is really what this is all about.

When Republicans get subpoenas, they run and hide.

The Attorney General, in my view, and I think in the view of most people, has complied, has done what he is supposed to do, what he is expected to do.

We are faced with so many challenges in this country. I mentioned in my opening statement that we need to focus in on how do we help the American people, how do we continue to move in the direction of lowering inflation, creating more jobs, creating more opportunities for young people, helping our veterans, and protecting our environment. All of those things are incredibly important, and this is what we are doing. This is what we are doing here today. It is really sad.

Quite frankly, it is chilling and it is scary when you think about what could happen if they get more power. Just read Project 2025. It tells you all you need to know about what the plan is.

I have got to say again, Mr. Speaker, and then I will close, that I am astounded at the latitude that has been afforded the Republicans during this debate to say whatever the hell they want to say, to disparage the President in any way they want.

When I disparaged their resolution, they threatened to take my words down and have me silenced if I didn't withdraw those words. I can't believe it. I have never seen anything quite like this happen.

The freedom-loving Republicans, the way they respond in debate is to try to silence comments by people that they disagree with. This is chilling. This is not what this institution is about. This is not what this country is about.

I would urge the Speaker to take note of this. We have to find a way forward here where it is not so one-sided, where they can say whatever they want to say, but I can't say anything, basically. I have to watch every single word I say on this floor. This is unprecedented.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, they have a set of rules for themselves, and they have a set of rules for us, people they disagree with. If this is the coming attractions, God help our country. We need to do better.

Again, I would urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on this. I would like to be able to characterize it, but I am afraid my colleague will take offense and want to take my words down again.

This is not serious. This is beneath this institution, and I would urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

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

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

This is not a decision that we have reached lightly, but the actions of the Attorney General cannot be ignored. No one is above the law, yet the Attor-

ney General has sought to put himself above the law, and the DOJ failed to do their job, which is why we are using inherent contempt.

Despite what my colleagues may think, this is not a stupid idea but actually our constitutional duty and is well within the scope of our legislative authority to assert the House's power in this manner.

The arguments against the House standing up for itself are a last-ditch effort made by people who are intent on covering up for President Biden and Attorney General Garland.

The issue at hand is the enforcement of a congressional subpoena, a fundamental tool of oversight that is being undermined.

If this body is to continue, we cannot sit by any longer. The House of Representatives must not be ignored, and the time for action is now.

This resolution is more than Merrick Garland. It is about whether or not the House of Representatives will be able to function properly. As the court said in *Anderson v. Dunn*, without the power of inherent contempt, the House would be exposed to every indignity and interruption, that rudeness, or even conspiracy, may mediate against it.

We cannot allow this to happen, Mr. Speaker. If we do not assert our authority, we risk setting a dangerous precedent where the House's power is eroded and our ability to fulfill our congressional duties is compromised. The consequences of inaction are grave.

In conclusion, we must remain vigilant and assert our authority to ensure the balance of power in our Republic.

I urge all of you to support this resolution and defend the integrity of the House of Representatives.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate having expired, without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

--- HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2024.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 10, 2024, at 3:39 p.m.

That the Senate passed S. 3448.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,
Acting Clerk.

ILLEGAL ALIENS IN THE UNITED
STATES

(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, as you know, there are well over 10 million illegals living in our country brought in by this administration: gang members, rapists, terrorists, Communist Chinese spies.

We have allowed Americans to be killed. More will be killed until, I am afraid, this administration is changed.

The sad part is that we funded this. Not me, but my friends across the aisle and some of my Republican colleagues.

This President and Democrats don't care. They see these people as one thing: blue votes, Mr. Speaker. They don't care what the heck happens to Americans. They never have, and I don't think they ever will.

They are losing every single demographic of voters. It is very obvious to me what is going on. They are hoping these people will replace the ones they have lost either through the Census or at the polls themselves.

Most Republicans claim to be against illegal immigration. They are not just against funding it, Mr. Speaker.

Folks need to vote. We need to elect folks that believe in the American way. Let's take our dadgum country back, Mr. Speaker. Let's take back our schools, take back our healthcare system, and take back our jobs.

FOSTERING A POSITIVE LEARNING
ENVIRONMENT

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

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, as a former chemistry teacher, I understand how challenging fostering a positive learning environment can be. While technology can be a resource, it can also cause irreparable harm if not used properly.

Our community in Malvern, Pennsylvania, experienced a gross abuse of technology when teachers at the Great Valley Middle School were targeted by eighth grade students who set up fake TikTok accounts impersonating them and posting offensive and very hurtful content.

This wasn't a prank. It was a blatant misuse of social media, violating basic rules of human decency. It is inappropriate, regardless of a child's age, or whether the school is public, charter, or private.

These teachers are questioning why they continue in a profession where they can be so casually targeted, and I don't blame them. This incident highlights the misuse of technology and how it disturbs the classroom and stunts the growth of empathy.

We must confront this crisis in schools and our homes as well. Each of us has a responsibility to foster civility and decency. Our teachers deserve and expect our support. Anything less is unacceptable.

REMEMBERING BRYAN R. LEMONS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of Bryan Lemons. Bryan was chief counsel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, FLETC, in Glynco, Georgia.

Bryan oversaw the legal training provided for Federal, State, local, and international law enforcement officers.

Before his selection as chief counsel, he served as the assistant director for the Mission and Readiness Support Directorate.

Across four separate training sites as assistant director, he oversaw \$225 million in service contracts to help train over 70,000 students.

In his many years with FLETC, Bryan worked hard to ensure our Federal law enforcement agents received the highest caliber training possible.

Bryan was also a proud Marine Corps veteran where he served as defense attorney, prosecuting attorney, and senior legal adviser for executive level managers until 1999 when he made the move to FLETC.

In 2022, Bryan received the DHS Secretary's Exceptional Service Gold Medal Award.

I send my deepest condolences and prayers to Bryan's wife and to his four children.

TRUMP TAX SCAM

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, the trump tax scam let the largest corporations off the hook from paying their fair share of taxes.

The Trump administration bogusly claimed that slashing the corporate tax rate would raise the average household's annual income by at least \$4,000.

Unsurprisingly, economists from the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Federal Reserve found that never happened. Seven years later, the bottom 90 percent of workers still haven't received higher earnings from the tax cut.

Where did the extra money from Trump's tax changes go? Straight to the very tippy-top highest paid earners. They used them to line the pockets of their already wealthy executives and shareholders with \$4.4 trillion in stock buybacks and dividends. Congress must end this rip-off.

REPUBLICAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS
FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to be back on the House floor with my colleagues to host a Special Order on the many things House Republicans are doing on behalf of the American people.

This week, we are working hard to protect consumer choice, our elections, and our national security. We have brought to the floor the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, the SAVE Act, to defend our elections from foreign involvement and ensuring only American citizens have the right to vote in our Nation's elections.

This is commonsense legislation that would require proof of citizenship to register to vote, which is more and more critical as our borders remain wide open and our immigration crisis continues.

□ 1915

The argument on this particular bill is that it is already law that you have to be an American citizen to vote in Federal elections. We all know that. It is also illegal to continue to cross the border. We have to take action to safeguard our elections, and we are doing that this week.

We also passed the Refrigerator Freedom Act and the Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act which protects consumer choice in home appliances.

As Democrats continue to push for burdensome regulations and bans that

are not feasible, affordable, or reliable, House Republicans are advocating for American families and their ability to choose the home appliances that suit their needs and budget. We don't want to be having to bring this legislation up. This is nonsensical regulation that shouldn't exist, and we need to make sure consumers have simple choices and that manufacturers have the opportunity to make good products. They will make the products that consumers want and that consumers need. Consumers are responsible. We have to allow that to happen.

We will also consider the Fiscal Year 2025 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, which ensures Congress can better serve the American people with tools to pursue fiscal responsibility while maintaining essential resources for congressional oversight among other provisions to support staff offices and the Capitol Police.

The need for congressional oversight of the Biden administration has never been more important as inflation continues to burden Americans and the crisis at our southern border threatens the safety of communities across the Nation.

I thank my colleagues for joining me this evening to speak on these important topics. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the vice chairman for yielding me time tonight.

Mr. Speaker, election officials from my home State of Tennessee are perplexed as to why they are not allowed to certify U.S. citizenship when registering individuals to vote. Oftentimes, they tell me it is against Federal law, and they have no idea why.

That is why today the House passed the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act or the SAVE Act, which will update this archaic and idiotic impediment to securing our Nation's elections. Not only will it allow State election officials to ask prospective voters to certify their citizenship status, but it will require it by law.

My friends on the left and in the mainstream media love to argue how voting in American elections as a non-citizen is already illegal. Well, Mr. Speaker, so is entering our country illegally through the southern border. That doesn't seem to stop progressive Democrats or the Biden administration from welcoming them into our communities with open arms.

Additionally, in order to certify one's citizenship, the SAVE Act requires an individual to actually provide proof of citizenship in order to register to vote. Again, my friends would argue that this isn't necessary because it is already illegal for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections. Well, how do we currently confirm people's citizenship status? We require would-be voters to swear but not prove that they are U.S. citizens.

Democrats love to imagine a world that exists where no one, I repeat no

one, is lying when filling out these applications because according to them, illegal immigrants don't vote in our elections. Give me a break.

The SAVE Act is as common sense as it gets. It protects what is most sacred to Americans—their right to vote. It allows State officials to accept a wide variety of documents to make it easy to register, provide States with access to Federal databases so that they can remove noncitizens from their rolls, and it requires the Department of Homeland Security to notify a State chief election official whenever an individual has been naturalized to ensure that our newest citizens who come to America the right way can exercise their right to vote.

I truly have no idea why anyone would be opposed to this bill, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps those opposed fear that with 100 percent secure and safe elections in the United States that they would not remain competitive in the next election. I truly can't think of any other reason to not vote for this bill.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker. The Democrats have started saying the quiet part out loud. Letting millions of illegal immigrants into our country and letting them vote—that is their plan.

Republicans have a different plan for America—one built on honesty, safety, security, and accountability.

I stand in support of the millions of Americans who feel like their priorities, their votes, are being thrown away by each illegal immigrant voting in American elections. That is why I rise in support of the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility or SAVE Act.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the point that the gentleman makes about he just doesn't understand why anyone would be against this, as I have seen the arguments for this, it is so simple, and it is so clear. There is no reason to be against this.

The American people are concerned about this. We clearly see now this isn't just a conservative talking point that there is a problem at the southern border. This is a widespread massive issue with all Americans recognizing that this is a problem. We have gotten to the point now where Democrats are willing to admit that this is a major problem.

The point of this legislation is to remove noncitizens from voter rolls making sure that American citizens—again, it is already illegal to do what is going on at the border. Americans are right to be concerned about this seeping into our elections and municipalities and random States here or there allowing for it to take place at the municipal level, and then the voter rolls get built up, and then they end up voting for the next election because the voter rolls are overlapped.

We have to do a better job safeguarding it. That is why Mr. ROSE's point is so clear—why would anyone be against this? This is not an effort to

just divide Congress like so many times that happens here. We need to make sure we are safeguarding this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Utah, Mr. MOORE, for having this Special Order, which is so important.

Mr. Speaker, if it was not abundantly clear already to the American people before, it certainly is now. Democrats want noncitizens to vote in our Federal elections. They can't deny it now. There is no other way to spin this. They want to allow noncitizens to vote. They are certainly no longer even hiding that fact anymore.

Today, we voted on the SAVE Act, a bill that requires individuals to provide proof of citizenship when registering to vote in Federal elections and provides States with access to existing Federal databases so that they can clean up their voter registration rolls and remove noncitizens and even dead people from the rolls.

It is a commonsense bill that nearly 80 percent of voters are in support of. Yet, my colleagues across the aisle refused to support it.

Why is this? Well, the truth is simple. It is un-American, and as ridiculous and as outlandish as it is, the Democrats want foreign nationals to decide our Nation's elections, and they want them voting in their favor.

This is not a conspiracy. This is not a theory. This is a fact. Hundreds of noncitizens are already registered to vote in local elections right here in Washington, D.C., alone, but the left doesn't know when to stop.

It isn't enough to dismantle our national security by implementing open-border policies that give our adversaries easier access to the United States.

It isn't enough to blindly catch and release millions of unvetted illegal aliens and criminals and suspected terrorists all on the taxpayer's dime.

It isn't even enough that Americans are dying at the hands of those illegal border crossers or by the deadly drugs that they smuggle into the country by the hundreds of thousands every single day.

Every year, over 100,000 Americans are dying of overdoses. Joe Biden could end the illegal invasion taking place in my home State of Texas and other border States overnight, but, instead, the President and his party continue to twist the knife taking the border crisis one step further and eroding our most precious right as Americans, and that is the right to vote, the sacred right to vote.

Republicans will not stand by, I can tell you this, and allow this lawless travesty to unfold and one-party rule to take root in the United States of America.

The SAVE Act is critical to safeguard election integrity, something today's progressive Democrats clearly oppose. Is this even the same Democratic Party that I remember from just

a few decades ago, much less 50 years ago? It seems to have gone off the rails into the far-left Marxist arena and realm now.

I ask American citizens to please take note, take note of these Democrats that are voting against this bill and our President's foolish promise to veto it. Yes, your eyes are not lying. They did.

We are witnessing an attempt by the Democratic Party to simply hijack U.S. elections on a permanent basis. We cannot ever allow this to happen. If the grand experiment that is the United States of America is to continue for another 248 years, we must act now to ensure that only Americans can vote in American elections.

The law is clear. Only U.S. citizens can vote. Why do the Democrats not want voters to prove that they are U.S. citizens when they register and vote?

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I can't emphasize that last point enough. It is already law. This is extra safeguards because of the mayhem that we have seen at the border. The only way to control this is to make sure that we have American citizens showing that they are allowed to vote and then being able to clean up voter rolls.

Mr. BABIN. Amen.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. It is simple. This is not a partisan issue. There are many partisan issues here, and we know they are going to be partisan, and this is not meant to be. I will share more on that in a minute.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), one of my closest colleagues and de facto mentors, someone I shared a significant passion with on getting our debt and deficit under control. He has a message here that is even more important, I believe. He will share a message on what I believe is one of the most important things: supporting our community members.

HONORING DAVE SMITH

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah, my dear friend, fellow warrior for fiscal responsibility, and one of my favorite Members who is in the trenches fighting for the future of this country and to ensure that we don't bankrupt it but that we preserve the freedom and opportunities for our children. I know he loves his family, and that love manifests in the way he conducts himself here in Washington and his leadership. I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank him for the opportunity to rise to honor the life and legacy of a dear friend of mine, Officer Dave Smith. He passed away a couple weeks ago. This is a man that I met in a very interesting and dubious way. I was pulled over for speeding. I wasn't driving at the time. This was in my first term, my first campaign for Congress. Out of the car comes this almost 7-foot gigantic man who looked like he was going to throw me in jail, and, instead, I got a warning; but better than that, I got a friend for life, a brother in

Christ for eternity, and I just couldn't imagine the kind of relationship I would have with this very special man.

Dave would call me from time to time and leave the most encouraging messages. He was, like I said, almost 7 feet tall. He was a giant of a man. His stature was only eclipsed by the size of his heart—for God, for family, and for this country. I always looked forward to hearing the voicemails he would leave me and the encouraging words, the affirming words. He would say: "Keep your head up." He would say: "Keep your eyes on the Lord." He would say: "Keep fighting the good fight because we need you."

□ 1930

I have kept those, Mr. Speaker, on my phone, and I listened to them the other day before I went to his funeral. I think about Barnabas, the son of encouragement in the Bible. I can tell you, Dave Smith was my Barnabas. I cherish the friendship. I will cherish those words of encouragement.

His funeral was a celebration the way I would want my funeral to be. It was a testament to a life well lived, a life well lived because of the people like me whose lives he touched, for the service that he gave day in and day out to protect and serve his community as an educator, as a law enforcement officer, as a mentor, as a coach. It was a testament to the family he loved so dearly.

All of his children, eight in total, were there at the funeral. The Bible says in Proverbs that a good man will deposit an inheritance for his children and his children's children. Let me be clear, watching his son Brennon stand in that pulpit and love on his dad and honor his dad, it was clear. You could see the leadership, the love, and the character in his oldest son. It was clear to me that that proverb had been fulfilled, that Dave Smith left his children and his community a good inheritance.

It was also a homecoming celebration because as believers, the Bible teaches us that while we grieve the loss of our friends and family members, it says that we are not to grieve as the world grieves because of those promises, the promises that we hear often quoted, the promises of God that whoever believes in his Son shall not perish but live forever. I know that was a promise that Officer Dave Smith believed with all of his heart.

We lost one of west Texas' finest in Big Dave Smith. I know Taneka lost her husband, his family lost their father, the world lost a bright light, and I lost a friend and brother in Christ, but he is not lost. He is alive and well today, maybe more so than ever. He is home. He is with his Heavenly Father. He has inherited that promise, eternal life.

Because he was so dedicated to his faith, I am going to end with a scripture verse that I hope encourages everybody who would listen to this commemorative set of remarks for Dave Smith.

In Romans 8:38-39, Paul is writing to the church at Rome, and he says: "For I am convinced that neither death nor life, neither angels nor demons, neither the present nor the future, nor any powers, neither height nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

He is home. He is present with his Heavenly Father. I would just say to Taneka and his family that we will be with him again one day in paradise for all eternity. That is the hope we have.

I thank brother Dave Smith. I know he is resting on high. I know I will see him again.

God bless the Smith family. God bless our great country.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I share my condolences and offer them to the Smith family, as well. It was a beautiful tribute, and I appreciate the gentleman for highlighting these amazing community members who sacrifice so much.

I thank, as we wrap up, my Republican colleagues for being here and taking time to speak on some of the most pressing issues facing our Nation week in and week out that we are here as we try to advance various initiatives.

Congress is a tough place. The House of Representatives tends to be a more partisan body where we have a lot more partisan fights. The Senate tends to be a more collaborative body where you try to pass a filibuster.

All of that being said, the work that we did this week should not be that. We have a massive immigration problem in our Nation. Right now, we have a border with inept policies that are allowing illegal immigration to run rampant in our country.

We have to get this under control, but one of the negative externalities from this that will be dangerous to the future of our Nation is if our elections are not safeguarded.

The SAVE Act this week was a very simple measure. It was not intended to be partisan in any way to simply say American citizens are allowed to vote in Federal elections and we can take steps to prove that American citizenship, as well as remove noncitizens from voter rolls. That is the intent of the legislation. It should be basic and simple, but here we are.

This is, again, the reason why House Republicans put the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act on the floor, as I mentioned the things that it highlights.

Again, we are at this place where it became partisan, and Democrats opposed the bill. Perhaps an attempt to weaponize our elections benefits immigrants who illegally enter our country and advance the far-left agenda.

We have evidence of noncitizens voting in U.S. elections in Massachusetts, Ohio, Virginia, and more. Americans are concerned about this. The outcomes of our elections can carry significant consequences for the direction of our Nation. We cannot allow those

who do not legally live here to influence our policy decisions through elected government.

This legislation will ensure our elections stay fair, democratic, and reflective of the American people. I am hopeful that the Senate will see the value and the intent of this.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for sharing their message, and I yield back the balance of my time.

INTRODUCING ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT AGAINST ASSOCIATE JUSTICES THOMAS AND ALITO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce Articles of Impeachment against Associate Justices of the Supreme Court Clarence Thomas and Samuel Anthony Alito, Jr.

Against Justice Thomas, the resolution includes three total articles: one count of failure to disclose financial income, gifts and reimbursements, property interests, liabilities, and transactions, among other information, and two counts of refusal to recuse from matters concerning his spouse's legal and financial interests before the Court.

The second resolution includes the following Articles of Impeachment against Justice Alito: one count of refusal to recuse from cases in which he had a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party before the Court, and one count of failure to disclose financial income, gifts and reimbursements, property interests, among other information.

Mr. Speaker, nomination and appointment to the Supreme Court is one of the highest privileges and most consequential responsibilities of our Nation. Such an appointment is uniquely insulated in its power. Confirmation to the Court is a lifetime appointment whereby Justices are entrusted with decisions that powerfully shape the Nation as well as the lives of every American.

For this reason and others, the Constitution rightfully and explicitly holds Justices to even higher standards than Members of Congress or even the President. Section 1 of Article III of the Constitution commands Federal Justices to "hold their offices during good behavior," in addition to its clauses barring treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Congress has exercised its power to reinforce this higher standard of the judiciary before. This body has impeached and removed eight Federal judges for transgressions ranging from evading income tax and perjury to intoxication on the bench and abandoning the office to join the Confederacy.

Perhaps most critical to the legitimacy of the institution, these judicial standards require Justices to recuse themselves in any proceeding where their impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

In other words, if a person could reasonably believe that the legitimacy of a Justice's judgment could be, or be perceived to be, compromised due to their personal involvement in the case or its parties, the standard is clear: The Justice must recuse. They are required to recuse.

That stringent and sacred standard exists for the good of the ruling, the judiciary, and the country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that everyday Americans, independent of party or ideology, can reasonably conclude that Justices Thomas and Alito's yearslong pattern of misconduct and failure to recuse in cases bearing their clear personal and financial involvement represents an abuse of power and threat to our democracy fundamentally incompatible with continued service on our Nation's highest court.

For the good of the institution and the Nation, absent resignation, they must be removed. The proof is undeniable, and here I will lay it out.

Justice Clarence Thomas for decades now has carried on a close, financially entangled personal relationship with real estate billionaire Harlan Crow. It is of material importance to the American people to note that Justice Thomas' relationship to the billionaire only began after Thomas' powerful appointment to our Nation's highest court.

The cash, goods, and services Justice Thomas received over the years include large loan balance cancellations, tuition payments for family, and vacations in private jets and yachts worth up to half a million dollars alone. In total, Justice Thomas appears to have received \$1.5 million worth in goods, cash equivalents, and services from Mr. Crow.

That is just what we know of. Truthfully, we won't ever really know the total sum of contributions Justice Thomas received from Mr. Crow.

Justice Thomas not only accepted these contributions while Mr. Crow had business in front of the Court, but he accepted them in secret, failing for years and years to report them. Yet, Thomas did report smaller gifts during this time, demonstrating a clear understanding of his legal obligation to report.

Would a reasonable American question that receiving lavish gifts from Mr. Crow might lead Justice Thomas to have a bias toward his "friend" with business before the Court? Without a doubt, yes. But did Justice Thomas recuse? No.

Now, take Justice Samuel Alito, who has no shortage of billionaire associates of his own. After billionaire Paul Singer gave Justice Alito a luxury fishing trip via private jet, a contribution that was also hidden from the public and the Court, Justice Alito not only

refused to recuse but changed his mind regarding his gracious host's case. Just a short time after accepting the lavish undisclosed trip from Mr. Singer, Alito joined the Court in reversing its previous position and took up Mr. Singer's case. He did not recuse.

Justice Alito also refused to recuse in the case itself, ultimately leading to a ruling that netted Mr. Singer \$2.4 billion.

That ruling did not just enrich Mr. Singer. It also structurally tilted the playing field further away from working people and toward the vulture funds siphoning money away from the communities that need them most.

Could a reasonable American question whether or not Justice Alito could have acted impartially in this case given his personal relationship with Mr. Singer?

□ 1945

Absolutely.

In January 2021, after the former President of the United States incited an insurrection on the Capitol in this Chamber to interfere with the results of the U.S. election, Justice Samuel Alito and his wife flew an upside-down American flag, a symbol of solidarity with their attack, outside their home.

Two years later, they publicly displayed outside their home yet another incendiary symbol: a flag associated with extreme rightwing Christian nationalism.

Justice Alito maintains that his wife Martha-Ann Alito is the only one responsible for the flags, but common sense maintains that such a close and incendiary revelation requires recusal by the Justice from January 6-related cases.

Despite the overwhelming appearance of a conflict of interest, Justice Alito refused to recuse himself from cases surrounding the 2020 election and questions of the former President's legal immunity in the attack.

Would a reasonable person question that Justice Alito's conduct exhibits and demonstrates reasonable concern for bias in these cases?

Absolutely and without question.

Finally, Justice Thomas, who is married to Virginia Thomas, a financially and personally involved operative in the stop the steal movement and Capitol attack, also joined opinions in these cases, even as clear evidence mounted that not only was his wife fully committed to overthrowing the results of a fair election, but she was actively lobbying members of the Trump administration attempting to do just that.

The questions before the Court had unquestionable implications for Thomas' wife and consequently Thomas himself making his refusal to recuse one of the most shocking examples of conflict of interest in the Court's history. Crucially, it was both Justices Thomas and Alito who cast critical votes in the ruling.

It now follows that because of Alito's and Thomas' refusals to recuse, everyday Americans cannot, should not, and

will not believe that these Justices, and consequently the Court they serve, are working to uphold the Constitution and put the country ahead of their own individual self-interest. Americans will not believe that the Court interpreted the law independent of profit for themselves and their newly termed friends.

Without action against these blatant violations, reasonable Americans have and will continue to lose faith in the Court itself. Reasonable Americans will and do believe that Justices Thomas and Alito are prone and subject to corruption, that the institution failing to punish them is broken, and that consequently their impeachment is a constitutional imperative and our congressional duty.

The abuses of power committed by Justice Thomas and Justice Alito are precisely the types of corruption that the Framers understood was an existential threat to our democracy. Instances like these, and with conduct like that of Alito and Thomas, are precisely why the Framers gave us the tool of impeachment. Corruption without consequence infects all it touches. That is why this body, Congress, has a constitutional and moral obligation to hold these Justices accountable, to maintain the integrity of our courts, and to uphold the standards of our ju-

diciary for the integrity our institutions.

Lastly, we cannot ignore the most important, material consequences of this Court's unchecked corruption and its resulting influence, the suffering of the American people.

We cannot ignore and pretend that this corruption is wholly unrelated to the millions of pregnant Americans now suffering and bleeding out in emergency rooms under the Court's unleashing of extreme abortion bans across the United States, which was a key political priority of the undisclosed benefactors and shadow organizations surrounding Alito's and Thomas' misconduct.

Nor can we ignore the millions of Americans who now are suffering hours-long wait times in the hot sun, often without water, just to cast a ballot, also a direct result of this corrupt Court's gutting of the Voting Rights Act, allowing the closing of polling sites across the country.

Mr. Speaker, neither of these Justices nor their shadowy benefactors have to answer to the parents of developmentally delayed children about their decision to gut the power of the EPA and the entire administrative state with it, but they do have to answer to us, the Congress, whom these people have elected and entrusted to protect them and to serve them and to

defend the well-being of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today presenting these Articles of Impeachment not because I am a Democrat and not because I am blind to its odds in a Republican-led Chamber. I present them because it is the right thing to do. While our Framers perhaps may not have envisioned someone like me in this seat, they absolutely did envision the necessity and value of the impeachment action which I seek to advance today.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MOSKOWITZ (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for today and the remainder of the week.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 11, 2024, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S., dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the section quarter of 2024, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, AARON BONNAURE, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 19 AND MAY 20, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Aaron Bonnaure	5/19	5/20	Turks and Caicos		157.00						157.00
Committee total					157.00						157.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

AARON BONNAURE, June 25, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, WYNDEE PARKER, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 29 AND JUNE 2, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Wyndee Parker	5/31	6/2	Singapore		1,963.87		6,170.20				8,134.07
Committee total					1,963.87		6,170.20				8,134.07

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WYNDEE PARKER, July 2, 2024.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE PHILIPPINES, SINGAPORE, AND VIETNAM, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 25 AND JUNE 1, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Brett Horton	5/25	5/28	Philippines		905.38		8,063.60				8,968.98
Bart Reising	5/25	5/28	Philippines		905.38		8,063.60				8,968.98
Josh Grogis	5/25	5/28	Philippines		905.38		8,063.60				8,968.98
Mark Roman	5/25	5/28	Philippines		905.38		8,063.60				8,968.98
Caroline Cash	5/25	5/28	Philippines		905.38		8,063.60				8,968.98
Marcus Towns	5/25	5/28	Philippines		905.38		8,063.60				8,968.98

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE PHILIPPINES, SINGAPORE, AND VIETNAM, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 25 AND JUNE 1, 2024—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Max Huntley	5/25	5/28	Philippines		905.38		8,063.60				8,968.98
Brett Horton	5/28	5/30	Singapore		1,714.00		874.50				2,588.50
Bart Reising	5/28	5/30	Singapore		1,714.00		874.50				2,588.50
Josh Grogis	5/28	5/30	Singapore		1,714.00		874.50				2,588.50
Mark Roman	5/28	5/30	Singapore		1,714.00		874.50				2,588.50
Caroline Cash	5/28	5/30	Singapore		1,714.00		874.50				2,588.50
Marcus Towns	5/28	5/30	Singapore		1,714.00		874.50				2,588.50
Max Huntley	5/28	5/30	Singapore		1,714.00		874.50				2,588.50
Brett Horton	5/30	6/1	Vietnam		812.00		6,203.20				7,015.20
Bart Reising	5/30	6/1	Vietnam		812.00		6,203.20				7,015.20
Josh Grogis	5/30	6/1	Vietnam		812.00		6,203.20				7,015.20
Mark Roman	5/30	6/1	Vietnam		812.00		6,203.20				7,015.20
Caroline Cash	5/30	6/1	Vietnam		812.00		6,203.20				7,015.20
Marcus Towns	5/30	6/1	Vietnam		812.00		7,703.20				8,515.20
Max Huntley	5/30	6/1	Vietnam		812.00		8,248.20				9,060.20
Committee total											133,553.76

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE JOHNSON, June 28, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 5 AND JUNE 9, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steve Scalise	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Hakeem Jeffries	6/6	6/6	France		1,938.00		(³)				1,938.00
Hon. Tom Emmer	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Michael McCaul	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Mike Bost	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Mark Takano	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Brendan Boyle	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Barbara Lee	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Betty McCollum	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Joe Wilson	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Steve Cohen	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Adrian Smith	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Robert Latta	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Robert Wittman	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Bill Huizenga	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Mike Kelly	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Terri Sewell	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Mark Veasy	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Brad Wenstrup	6/6	6/9	France		4,197.00		(³)				4,197.00
Hon. Donald Norcross	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Brian Babin	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Seth Moulton	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Norma Torres	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Don Bacon	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Neal Dunn	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Brian Fitzpatrick	6/6	6/7	France		1,938.00		(³)				1,938.00
Hon. David Kustoff	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Susan Wild	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Tom Suozzi	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Jason Crow	6/6	6/8	France		3,875.00		(³)				3,875.00
Hon. Madeleine Dean	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. John Joyce	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Greg Pence	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Dean Phillips	6/6	6/7	France		1,938.00		(³)				1,938.00
Hon. Guy Reschenthaler	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Lori Trahan	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Scott Fitzgerald	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Scott Franklin	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Carlos Gimenez	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Jake LaTurner	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Kathy Manning	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Marilyn Strickland	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Morgan McGarvey	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Jill Tokuda	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Gregorio Kilili Sablan	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Hon. Stacey Plaskett	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Chaplain Margaret Grun Kibben	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Courtney Butcher	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Christopher Bien	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Taylor Haulsee	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Kerry Rom	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Claire Bienvenu	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Brian Cress	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
John Lanning	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Brett Horton	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Tasia Jackson	6/6	6/6	France		1,938.00		(³)				1,938.00
Emily Berret	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Christiana Stephenson	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Robert Boland	6/6	6/9	France		4,036.00		(³)				4,036.00
Kate Knudson	6/2	6/10	France		5,285.00		1,184.20				6,469.20
Meghan McCann	5/29	6/10	France		12,591.00		1,184.20				13,775.20
Steven Bertolini	6/6	6/9	France		4,924.00		(³)				4,924.00
Patrick Hester					3,553.00						3,553.00
Hon. Kat Cammack					3,553.00						3,553.00
Hon. Pat Fallon					3,553.00						3,553.00
Hon. Jim Baird					3,553.00						3,553.00
Hon. Jim Costa					3,553.00						3,553.00
Hon. Elise Stefanik					3,553.00						3,553.00
Hon. Gary Palmer					3,553.00						3,553.00
Committee total											287,843.40

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. MIKE JOHNSON, July 8, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JODEY C. ARRINGTON, July 1, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Michael McCaul	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		432.00		8,822.70		861.43		10,116.13
Hon. Young Kim	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		432.00		7,495.80		861.43		8,789.23
Hon. Andy Barr	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		432.00		11,728.90		861.43		13,022.33
Hon. Joe Wilson	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		432.00		14,710.20		861.43		16,003.63
Brendan Shields	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		432.00		7,530.70		861.43		8,824.13
Anubhav Gupta	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		432.00		16,062.70		861.43		17,356.13
Daniel Markus	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		432.00		13,862.70		861.43		15,156.13
Rachel Walker	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		432.00		7,577.50		861.43		8,870.93
Olivia Late	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		432.00		7,551.50		861.43		8,844.93
Jessica Steffens	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		432.00		7,495.80		861.42		8,789.22
Allison Schwartz	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		540.00		6,137.50		861.42		7,538.92
Eric Lee	5/26	5/30	Taiwan		540.00		14,740.50		861.42		16,141.92
Hon. Michael McCaul	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00				983.82		1,445.82
Hon. Gregory Meeks	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00		13,481.80		983.82		14,927.62
Hon. Young Kim	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00				983.82		1,445.82
Hon. Ami Bera	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00		12,989.40		983.82		14,435.22
Hon. Joe Wilson	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00				983.82		1,445.82
Brendan Shields	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00				983.82		1,445.82
Anubhav Gupta	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00				983.82		1,445.82
Daniel Markus	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00				983.82		1,445.82
Rachel Walker	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00				983.82		1,445.82
Olivia Late	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00				983.81		1,445.81
Jessica Steffens	5/30	6/2	Singapore		462.00				983.81		1,445.81
Committee total					10,482.00		150,187.70		21,159.13		181,828.83

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, July 2, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Stephanie Bice	6/19	6/22	Finland	810.00	810.00
Hon. Derek Kilmer	6/19	6/22	Finland	707.00	707.00
Sophie Kilmer	6/19	6/22	Finland	707.00	707.00
Hon. Beth Van Duyne	6/19	6/22	Finland	707.00	707.00
Katie Wallach	6/19	6/22	Finland	707.00	707.00
Mike Platt	6/19	6/22	Finland	945.00	945.00
Jamie Fleet	6/19	6/22	Finland	945.00	945.00
Derek Harley	6/19	6/22	Finland	945.00	945.00
Jordan Wilson	6/19	6/22	Finland	945.00	945.00
Heather Painter	6/19	6/22	Finland	945.00	945.00
Hon. Stephanie Bice	6/22	6/22	Norway	699.00	699.00
Hon. Derek Kilmer	6/22	6/22	Norway	506.00	506.00
Sophie Kilmer	6/22	6/22	Norway	506.00	506.00
Hon. Beth Van Duyne	6/22	6/22	Norway	506.00	506.00
Katie Wallach	6/22	6/22	Norway	506.00	506.00
Mike Platt	6/22	6/22	Norway	827.00	827.00
Jamie Fleet	6/22	6/22	Norway	699.00	699.00
Derek Harley	6/22	6/22	Norway	699.00	699.00
Jordan Wilson	6/22	6/22	Norway	699.00	699.00
Heather Painter	6/22	6/22	Norway	699.00	699.00
CODEL Expenses	6/22	6/22	Norway		2,006.00		2,006.00
CODEL Expenses	6/23	6/23	Norway		1,764.00		1,764.00
CODEL Expenses	6/24	6/24	Norway		2,006.00		2,006.00
Committee total			19,540.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BRYAN STEIL, June 12, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS, July 5, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS, July 2, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS, July 8, 2024.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-4786. A letter from the Program Analyst, Policy Office, Regulations Branch, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Assessing Fees for Excess and Unauthorized Grazing (RIN: 0596-AD45) received May 31, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-4787. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258, Sept. 13, 1982; (96 Stat. 927); to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-4788. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Board of Actuaries, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2024 Report to the President and Congress Regarding the Status of the Military Retirement Fund, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 183(c)(1); Public Law 110-181, Sec. 906(a)(1); (122 Stat. 275); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4789. A letter from the Chair, Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the Council's 2023 Annual Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3332(a)(5); Public Law 101-73, Sec. 1103 (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1473(b)); (124 Stat. 2190); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4790. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Obsolete Regulations for Section 236 of the National Housing Act [FR-6439-F-01] received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4791. A letter from the President and Chair, Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a statement with respect to a transaction involving exports to Angola, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3); July 31, 1945, ch. 341, Sec. 2 (as added by Public Law 102-266, Sec. 102); (106 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4792. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting

the Department's Report to Congress on Employee Benefits Security Administration's Interpretive Bulletin 95-1, pursuant to Public Law 117-328, div. T, title III, Sec. 321(2); 136 Stat. 5356); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-4793. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's funding opportunity announcement — Funding Opportunity Announcement for Mine Health and Safety State Grants received June 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-4794. A letter from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting the Commission's June 2024 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1396(b)(1)(C); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XIX, Sec. 1900 (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 2801(a)(1)(A)(iv)); (124 Stat. 329); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4795. A letter from the Regulatory Policy Analyst, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicated Feed Mill License; Veterinary Feed Directive Drugs; Change of Address [Docket No.: FDA-2024-N-2731] received July 2, 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-4796. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's "National Occurrence and Causes of Boil Water Advisories in the United States Report to Congress", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 300j-18a(b)(1); Public Law 117-58, Sec. 50115(b)(1); (135 Stat. 1157); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4797. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Trade Regulation Rule Relating to Power Output Claims for Amplifiers Utilized in Home Entertainment Products (RIN: 3084-AB62) received July 2, 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-4798. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to global illicit drug trafficking that was declared in Executive

Order 14059 of December 15, 2021, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4799. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Mali that was declared in Executive Order 13882 of July 26, 2019, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4800. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to serious human rights abuse and corruption that was declared in Executive Order 13818 of December 20, 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4801. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to hostage-taking and the wrongful detention of United States nationals abroad that was declared in Executive Order 14078 of July 19, 2022, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4802. A letter from the Chief of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Foreign Trade Regulations (FTR): State Department Directorate of Defense Trade Controls Filing Requirement and Clarifications to Current Requirements [Docket No.: 230802-0181] (RIN: 0607-AA61) received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4803. A letter from the Congressional and Public Affairs Specialist, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Export Control Measures Under the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) To Address Iranian Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and Their Use by the Russian Federation Against Ukraine [Docket No.: 230221-0049] (RIN: 0694-AJ12) received July 2,

2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4804. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4805. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, transmitting the 2023 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines including financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)); (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4806. A letter from the Chief of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Population Estimates Challenge Program [Docket Number: 230313-0072] (RIN: 0607-AA60) received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4807. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4808. A letter from the Legal Counsel, Office of Legal Counsel, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Procedures for Previously Exempt State and Local Government Employee Complaints of Employment Discrimination under Section 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (RIN: 3046-AB09) received June 5, 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-4809. A letter from the Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's Office of the Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4810. A letter from the National Cyber Director, Office of the National Cyber Director, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 2024 Report on the Cybersecurity Posture of the United States, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 1500(c)(1)(C)(vi); Public Law 116-283, div. A, title XVII, Sec. 1752; (134 Stat. 4145) and 6 U.S.C. 1500(c)(1)(G); Public Law 116-283, div. A, title XVII, Sec. 1752; (134 Stat. 4146); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4811. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Office of the Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4812. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Legal Expense Fund Regulation (RIN: 3209-AA50) received June 5, 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-4813. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2016 and 2017 Report to Congress on the Administration of the Indian Health Service Tribal Self-Governance Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4814. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for the Suwannee Alligator Snapping Turtle with a Section 4(d) Rule [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2021-0007; FXES1111090FEDR-245-FF09E21000] (RIN: 1018-BE80) received July 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4815. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Civil Rights, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's guidance — Title VI and Shared Ancestry or Ethnic Characteristics Discrimination received May 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4816. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Immigration Policy, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Securing the Border (USCIS Docket No.: USCIS-2024-0006) (RIN: 1615-AC92) received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4817. A letter from the Deputy Associate General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation (RIN: 1601-AB11) received July 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4818. A letter from the Executive Director, Build America Bureau, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's 2024 report titled "Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act 1998 Report to Congress", pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 609(a); Public Law 105-178, Sec. 1503(a) (amended by Public Law 114-94, Sec. 2001(h)); (129 Stat. 1444); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4819. A letter from the Director of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reissuance and Modification of Nationwide Permits [Docket Number: COE-2020-0002] (RIN: 0710-AB29) received July 2, 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-4820. A letter from the Director of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reissuance and Modification of Nationwide Permits [Docket Number: COE-2020-0002] (RIN: 0710-AA84) received July 2, 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-4821. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Development Division, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commercial Driver's License (CDL) Standards; Incorporation by Reference of a New State Procedures Manual (SPM) [Docket No.: FMCSA-2023-0269] (RIN: 2126-AC68) received July 2, 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-4822. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Puget Sound Federal Leadership Task Force Biennial Report

for May 2024, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1276b(e)(1); June 30, 1948, ch. 758, title I, Sec. 126 (as amended by Public Law 117-263, Sec. 8501(b)); (136 Stat. 3855); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4823. A letter from the Director Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Immediate and Highest Level Owner for High-Security Leased Space [GSAR Case 2021-G527; Docket No.: GSA-GSAR-2021-0014; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 3090-AK44) received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4824. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Fixed and Moving Safety Zone; Vicinity of the M/V HAPPY DIAMOND; Houston Ship Channel and Seabrook, TX [Docket Number: USCG-2024-0425] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 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-4825. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2023-0188] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received July 2, 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-4826. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Key West July 4th Fireworks, Key West, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2024-0472] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 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-4827. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Trenton DTE Boiler Demolition, Trenton, MI [Docket Number: USCG-2024-0519] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 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-4828. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Annual Fireworks Displays within the Sector Columbia River Captain of the Port Zone [Docket Number: USCG-2024-0253] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 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-4829. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Prairie du Chien, WI [Docket Number: USCG-2024-0366] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 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-4830. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor, Norfolk, VA [Docket Number: USCG-2024-0506] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 2, 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.

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 Ms. BALINT (for herself, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 8975. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require authorized committees of candidates for election for Federal office to include in the reports the committees are required to file under such Act information on contributions received from small dollar donors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Ms. MANNING, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. SORESEN):

H.R. 8976. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 West White Street in Millstadt, Illinois, as the "Corporal Matthew A. Wyatt Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. CAREY (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 8977. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to test an emergency medical services treatment-in-place model under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 8978. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a voluntary sustainable apparel labeling program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CLINE (for himself and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 8979. A bill to clarify that the baseline is based on current laws and the assumption of continuation of current levels of discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California (for himself, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. OMAR, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. FROST, and Mr. CASAR):

H.R. 8980. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to provide grants to States, units of local government, and organizations to support the recruitment, training, and development of staff and infrastructure needed to support the due process rights of individuals facing deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Ms. BROWN, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DINGELL,

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mrs. RAMIREZ):

H.R. 8981. A bill to amend the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act to improve trauma support services and mental health care for children and youth in educational settings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia:

H.R. 8982. A bill to authorize NASA to reimburse Chincoteague for drinking water well replacement costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 8983. A bill to repeal portions of a regulation issued by the State Superintendent of Education of the District of Columbia that require child care workers to have a degree, a certificate, or a minimum number of credit hours from an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. NICKEL (for himself and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 8984. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to expand MBDA Business Centers near minority-serving institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself, Mr. GOSAR,

Mr. PENCE, Mr. SELF, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. PALMER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. MOONEY, and Ms. BOEBERT):

H.R. 8985. A bill to provide for certain conditions on the enforcement of surrogacy contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 8986. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to designating and redesignating nonattainment areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 8987. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure cost sharing for a drug does not exceed the nationwide average of consumer purchase prices for such drug; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CROW, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 8988. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals under such Act to foreign-controlled, foreign-influenced, and foreign-

owned domestic business entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 8989. A bill to require covered platforms to remove nonconsensual intimate visual depictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York):

H.R. 8990. A bill to require the publication of data sets regarding firearm trace data; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. AMO, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 8991. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a person from engaging in the business of destroying firearms unless such person has received a license to do so from the Attorney General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VASQUEZ (for himself, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, and Mr. SORESEN):

H.R. 8992. A bill making appropriations to improve border security, imposing new reporting requirements relating to border security, and enhancing criminal penalties for destroying or evading border controls; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mr. TRONE, Mr. LATURNER, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 8993. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to conduct a study regarding the use of mobile devices in elementary and secondary schools, and to establish a pilot program of awarding grants to enable certain schools to create a school environment free of mobile devices; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PALMER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois):

H.J. Res. 182. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Health and Human Services relating to "Designated Placement Requirements for LGBTQI plus Children"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. TRONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that wrongfully or unjustly deported people who have established significant ties through years of life in the United States deserve a chance to come home to reunite with loved ones through a fair and central process within the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the unveiling of the statue of Johnny Cash, provided by the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCCORMICK (for himself and Mr. HILL):

H. Res. 1348. A resolution urging the Government of Nigeria to immediately release Tigran Gambaryan from imprisonment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. McCAUL, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. BROWN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. BERA, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. LATURNER, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. AMO, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 1349. A resolution recognizing the continued success of the Food for Peace Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Mr. CROW (for himself and Mr. JAMES):

H. Res. 1350. A resolution expressing concern about the elevated levels of lead in one-third of the world's children and the global causes of lead exposure, and calling for the inclusion of lead exposure prevention in global health, education, and environment programs abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. GIMENEZ, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mrs. CAMMACK, and Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN):

H. Res. 1351. A resolution commending the courage, bravery, and resolve of the fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters of Cuba, who, three years ago, stood in the face of brutal harassment, beatings, and torture to protest against the Communist Cuban regime, demanding access to their fundamental rights to life, dignity, and freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H. Res. 1352. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 2024 as "Plastic Pollution Action Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ (for herself, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. FROST, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. CASAR, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BUSH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 1353. A resolution impeaching Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ (for herself, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. FROST, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. CASAR, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BUSH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 1354. A resolution impeaching Samuel Alito, Jr., Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOST, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. DELUZZO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EZELL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. GUEST, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. MANNING, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MEUSER, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOLINARO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RESCIENTHALER, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NICKEL, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. EVANS, Ms. PEREZ, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SORENSEN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. AMO, Mr. BERA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. PETTERSEN, and Ms. ROSS):

H. Res. 1355. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 10th as Journeyman Lineworkers Recognition Day; 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 Ms. BALINT:

H.R. 8975.

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:

Campaign Finance

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 8976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

The single subject of this legislation is:

To rename a post office.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 8977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to test an emergency medical services treatment-in-place model under the Medicare program.

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 8978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a voluntary sustainable apparel labeling program.

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 8979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill clarifies that the baseline is based on current laws and assumption of continuation of current levels of discretionary appropriations.

By Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California:

H.R. 8980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Legal representation in immigration proceedings

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 8981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "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:

The bill authorizes grants designed to help schools improve how they address the complex needs of students coping with the devastating impact of adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) such as parental addiction, abuse, and witnessing violence.

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia:

H.R. 8982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Authorizes NASA to reimburse Chincoteague for drinking water well replacement costs,

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 8983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To repeal portions of a regulation issued by the State Superintendent of Education of the District of Columbia that require child care workers to have a degree, a certificate, or a minimum number of credit hours from an institution of higher education.

By Mr. NICKEL:

H.R. 8984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Commerce

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 8985.

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 federal courts from enforcing abortion clauses in surrogacy contracts.

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 8986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Clean Air Act with respect to designating and redesignating nonattainment areas.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 8987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure cost sharing for a drug does not exceed the nationwide average of consumer purchase prices for such drug.

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 8988.

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 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals under such Act to foreign-controlled, foreign-influenced, and foreign-owned domestic business entities, and for other purposes.

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 8989.

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:

Technology

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 8990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Firearms

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 8991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Firearms

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 8992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of the Congress.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Border Security

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 8993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to conduct a study regarding the use of mobile devices in elementary and secondary schools, and to establish a pilot program of awarding grants to enable certain schools to create a school environment free of mobile devices.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.J. Res. 182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

The single subject of this legislation is:

Designated Placements rule

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 16: Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 45: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 148: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 309: Mrs. DINGELL and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 345: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 396: Mr. COSTA and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 595: Mr. LALOTA.

H.R. 640: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 727: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 856: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 884: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 974: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 1002: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1015: Ms. TLAIB and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 1088: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1199: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1235: Mr. BACON and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.

H.R. 1321: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1369: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 1507: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1572: Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1611: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1666: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 1719: Ms. PEREZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1787: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.

H.R. 1831: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. ISSA, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1839: Mr. FONG.

H.R. 2567: Mr. MULLIN and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2584: Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 2738: Ms. PEREZ.

H.R. 2743: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2802: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2870: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2908: Mr. GIMENEZ.

H.R. 2921: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 2971: Mr. MCGARVEY.

H.R. 3008: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 3036: Ms. PETTERSEN.

H.R. 3074: Ms. BUDZINSKI.

H.R. 3080: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3108: Ms. PETTERSEN.

H.R. 3148: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3159: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3161: Mr. FINSTAD.

H.R. 3184: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3240: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 3270: Mr. MORAN, Mr. DUNN of Florida, and Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 3433: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3481: Mrs. FOUSHEE.

H.R. 3519: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3851: Ms. STEVENS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3965: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4052: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 4064: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4274: Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 4335: Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Ms. JACOBS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 4611: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 4663: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4745: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4812: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 4852: Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 4867: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 4886: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4889: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4897: Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. CORREA, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 4974: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 4978: Ms. BALINT.

H.R. 4992: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 5041: Mr. KENNEDY and Mrs. KIM of California.

H.R. 5103: Mr. COSTA and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 5155: Mr. MILLS.

H.R. 5173: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 5208: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 5401: Mrs. HOUGHIN.

H.R. 5455: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 5532: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 5561: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. EZELL, and Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 5741: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H.R. 5864: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 6003: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 6023: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.

H.R. 6041: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 6101: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 6102: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 6129: Ms. HAGEMAN.

H.R. 6175: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 6201: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 6203: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 6220: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 6373: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 6634: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 6751: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 6762: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 6928: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 6933: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 6951: Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. OGLES.

H.R. 7025: Mr. OGLES, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 7056: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GALLEGU, and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 7070: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 7082: Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 7087: Ms. WILD.
 H.R. 7149: Mrs. PELTOLA.
 H.R. 7165: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. DELUZIO.
 H.R. 7213: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 7222: Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 7227: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 7274: Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 7292: Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 7297: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 7314: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 7382: Mr. CISCOMANI.
 H.R. 7393: Ms. SALINAS.
 H.R. 7438: Mr. YAKYM and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
 H.R. 7450: Mr. HARRIS.
 H.R. 7479: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 7543: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 7573: Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 7629: Mr. STANTON.
 H.R. 7634: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 7661: Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 7662: Mr. THANEDAR.
 H.R. 7770: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 7829: Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 7906: Mr. FLOOD, Mr. STEIL, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. PFLUGER.
 H.R. 7977: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
 H.R. 8030: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 8061: Mr. FALLON, Mr. STEIL, and Mr. RYAN.
 H.R. 8076: Ms. PETTERSEN.
 H.R. 8138: Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 8164: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 8231: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
 H.R. 8271: Mr. CASTEN and Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 8345: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
 H.R. 8390: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 8394: Mr. CRANE.
 H.R. 8419: Ms. BROWNLEY.
 H.R. 8425: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 8451: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 8478: Ms. TOKUDA.
 H.R. 8566: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 8589: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
 H.R. 8608: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 8609: Ms. SALINAS.
 H.R. 8639: Ms. BROWNLEY.
 H.R. 8641: Mr. COSTA and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 8702: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. YAKYM.
 H.R. 8734: Mr. DUNN of Florida.
 H.R. 8748: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 8777: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
 H.R. 8784: Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 8794: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 8796: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 8830: Ms. SALINAS.
 H.R. 8839: Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 8840: Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 8858: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 8875: Mrs. FOUSHEE.
 H.R. 8877: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 8882: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 8906: Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 8926: Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H.R. 8928: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 8932: Mr. KILEY.
 H.R. 8936: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 8938: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 8940: Mr. CRANE.
 H.R. 8959: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 8969: Mr. FALLON and Mrs. HOUCHIN.
 H.J. Res. 76: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. CASE.
 H.J. Res. 82: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
 H.J. Res. 117: Mr. BURLISON.
 H.J. Res. 139: Mr. LANGWORTHY.
 H.J. Res. 142: Mr. POSEY.
 H.J. Res. 164: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
 H.J. Res. 170: Mr. JACKSON of Texas and Mr. BERGMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. LATTA.
 H. Res. 439: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H. Res. 881: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H. Res. 946: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H. Res. 1063: Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H. Res. 1148: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. STEEL, and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H. Res. 1199: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York and Mr. LALOTA.
 H. Res. 1286: Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H. Res. 1304: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
 H. Res. 1323: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 1328: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 1344: Mr. FRY.