

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution to show the world, especially our adversaries, that the United States stands behind our allies and will not back down to terrorists.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### 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.

□ 1600

#### TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 838 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4820.

Will the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. STEEL) kindly take the chair.

□ 1600

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4820) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, with Mrs. STEEL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 30, printed in part B of House Report 118-261, offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRECHEEN) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. STRONG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. STRONG. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 84, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. STRONG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STRONG. Madam Chair, I offer an amendment to H.R. 4820, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies Fiscal Year 2024 appropriations bill.

My amendment is simple. It expresses Congress' support for public housing authorities to conduct drug testing as a condition of receiving benefits.

My colleagues across the aisle will argue that the purpose of this amendment is to punish. I want to be clear: The purpose of this amendment is to protect. It is to protect taxpayer-funded resources and ensure that they are available for those who truly need them and are prepared to make positive contributions to society.

Drug testing would put drug abusers on notice and provide a clear incentive to get off of drugs and to work toward self-sufficiency.

Shouldn't that be something we all support?

We must have protections in place and tools to enforce them which discourage lifelong dependency and ensure these programs are used as they are intended, as a temporary safety net for our most vulnerable and needy, not a way of life for generations.

I am under no illusion that drug testing alone would solve all the problems of abuse and dependency that plague our welfare system. However, I do believe that any tool that helps to accomplish this goal should be fully leveraged and fully supported by Congress.

Drugs are absolutely ravaging our country. It can be seen in every community. In 2020, over 37 million Americans 12 years and older—think about it, 12 years and older—were illegal drug users.

As a first responder, I have seen the devastation and impact of drug abuse on individuals, their families, and our communities. We have a real drug problem on our hands in this country, and it is not getting any better with this administration's border policies which allow massive quantities of illicit drugs, including fentanyl, to pour into our country.

Not only would drug testing ensure the responsible use of taxpayer-funded benefits, it would also provide a valuable opportunity to identify drug users and connect them with existing resources to get the help that they need.

Voting against this amendment ignores the obligation we have to the American people to be responsible stewards of their hard-earned taxpayer money.

Voting for this amendment sends a clear message to each of our constituents: Protecting Federal resources for those who wish to improve their lives and break free from the cycle of dependency is a priority of Congress.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), and I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the distinguished Democrat whip and former member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Chair, we are 10 days from a GOP shutdown, and instead of finding a bipartisan way forward, instead of working with us to lower costs for families at home, instead of honoring the budget deal that we already agreed to, Republicans have turned around and become a pro-lead poisoning caucus.

Really. Read the bill. They have written a housing and transportation budget that defunds lead removal in low-income housing, lead removal in the homes of 46,000 children.

That is not all. This bill cuts affordable housing construction by two-thirds. It guts transit funding, leaving parents with longer, more dangerous, less reliable commutes.

News flash. Nobody's gas prices were ever lowered by banning Pride flags, but the open discrimination against the LGBTQ+ Americans in this bill will hurt communities in every single one of our districts.

This bill is more of the same from the MAGA Republican majority: Unserious, heartless extremism.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to put children over politics and vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Chair, yesterday President Biden announced significant new funding for passenger rail projects across New Jersey and the Northeast region, first and foremost for the Gateway Program that is the Nation's most critical infrastructure project.

It is a critical win for New Jersey families, and it comes as a result of funding through the bipartisan infrastructure law to get these important projects completed.

By making this investment in Gateway, we will prevent a shutdown of the Hudson River tunnel that could cost the United States economy \$16 billion over 4 years and reduce property values by \$22 billion in New Jersey alone. In fact, every dollar we invest in Gateway will create almost \$4 of benefits for the residents of our region, whether through lower travel costs, faster travel times, improved safety, or reduced highway congestion.

Unfortunately, the Republican majority's appropriations bill is a severe threat to the bipartisan work we have done to revitalize America's infrastructure, especially for passenger rail. The bill guts the main funding source for rail projects—the Capital Investment Grants program—by 85 percent and cuts Amtrak's Northeast Corridor funding by 92 percent. Not only that, but Republican amendments now propose cutting all Capital Investment Grants and Amtrak National Network funding.

These provisions are unacceptable and completely out of touch with the needs of the American people. They put all of our work on Gateway at risk and could eliminate over \$19 billion in economic activity for New Jerseyans and cost tens of thousands of good-paying jobs.

House Republicans' extreme agenda will make it harder for families to get to work or to their kids' soccer games. It will increase their travel costs and will worsen pollution and congestion in New Jersey.

Last Congress, I was proud to work across the aisle to enact historic legislation to revitalize rail in the Northeast region and more broadly to invest in New Jersey's infrastructure. Today, I urge my colleagues to not forsake all that work and to instead reach across the aisle and finish Gateway, strengthen Amtrak and the Northeast Corridor, and improve travel access and reliability for all of our constituents.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 84, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, this amendment would increase and decrease the Section 8 housing program to call for a U.S. Government Accountability Office study on: first, the marital demographics of HUD-administered housing program beneficiaries;

Second, the existence and effects of any marriage penalties for means-tested housing benefits administered by HUD—in here, we are getting not only the Section 8 but also the 42 credits and that sort of housing— Third, any recommendations and policy solutions for reducing marriage penalties within the HUD-administered programs.

In the last 80 years in this country, we have had what I believe are means-

tested programs. The practical effect is to discourage marriage and, in particular, discourage men from getting involved in their children's families.

I remember touring a low-income housing project about 5 years ago, and the woman who was administering it, who was a crackerjack girl, really tremendous job, but she pointed out one of her major goals is to make sure she had no men in any of the housing units.

I can believe that a lot of those men, since they weren't husbands, were maybe causing trouble, maybe doing drugs. It brought home the fact that right now an effect, and sometimes goal, of low-income housing projects is to keep men away from their families. This is, of course, only one.

I am highlighting the housing programs because we are dealing with HUD right now. It is, of course, true of all sorts of other income-transfer programs as well. Food stamps, medical programs, and Pell grants all come with their marriage penalties.

We want to focus on this. We want to see if this is a program that largely benefits people who are not married, largely benefits families without men in them. We know that there was a powerful group in this country, whose prescribed purpose, they said, was to get rid of the Western-prescribed nuclear family. We know under Marxism, one of the goals is to get rid of the family.

The purpose here is we want to have hard statistics, a GAO study, on the degree to which we are penalizing families with both parents there.

Madam Chair, we have all sorts of statistics here. My only comment is that, A, it is a little bit more difficult for a child, a little bit more of a tough row to hoe in life if they don't have a man at home.

I think one of the problems we have in some of our inner cities today that not only affects the children, but it affects the parents, because I think for a lot of people the most important thing they do in their life and their motivation for life is getting involved in their children's families, and right now the low-income housing program as well as other income-transfer programs are designed to deny men a role in their children's lives.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 110, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$505,000,000)".

Page 203, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$505,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chair, this amendment will decrease funding for the Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS by \$505 million and move it to the spending reduction account.

AIDS is a horrific disease. We have lots of horrific diseases in our country, but we don't have programs for everybody that gets a disease. We don't have programs specifically for people that get cancer, for example.

We have programs for AIDS because when AIDS was first spreading, people didn't understand it. They thought it would spread like a contagion, that you could get it just because you lived in the same housing development as someone else. Now that we properly understand AIDS, we don't have the same kind of denial of access to housing for people.

We do have need-based housing, and there are people with AIDS who have needs, and some of them currently are even being housed under this program.

The reality is they would still have access to housing if they are qualified for need-based assistance just like every other American. It doesn't eliminate the safety net but eliminates the special, favored treatment.

Why is that important? Well, look. We have to cut something. Ronald Reagan famously recognized that the closest thing to eternal life we will see on this Earth is a government program. There is always a new program, but there is never a time to get rid of an old program.

This program just continues on without real authorization. It just keeps getting appropriated. It is time. It is time to take it away.

It is time to curb our spending. This HUD program spends almost \$3 billion more than it used to spend in discretionary spending.

We are going to have to turn something off. We have over \$33 trillion in debt, and in the next 18 months, we are supposed to add another \$3 trillion. Are we supposed to take spending seriously once we get to \$50 trillion? At some point, people recognize that if something can't continue, it will eventually stop.

It is not compassionate to bankrupt America. We put these programs out there, and we say they are so compassionate, but they are not because they are leading our country toward a crash site. This is going to end in financial ruin.

This is the same kind of point we tried to make when they said, let's close the economy and print money. We are spending more money than anyone will even lend us. The Federal Reserve became the lender of last resort,

and their balance sheet grew by \$5 trillion.

We knew that was going to cause inflation. That is why I created the Sound Money Caucus in July of 2020. They said it wouldn't cause inflation. We said it would. They said it wouldn't hit consumers. We said it would.

They finally acknowledged, well, maybe it will be transitory. That is the phase we are in. How transitory is it?

All this goes back to policy decisions. You might be able to print money, but you can't guarantee that it will keep buying the same amount of stuff. We do have to turn something off. I think this is a tragic situation when anyone has a disease, but we need to turn this program off.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, this program saves lives. HOPWA provides long-term housing assistance, permanent support of housing, homelessness prevention, and support of services to one of the most vulnerable populations—low-income people with HIV.

Housing is the greatest unmet need for people living with HIV, and HOPWA is the only Federal funding dedicated to directly addressing this need.

Multiple studies have shown the lack of stable housing is the most significant factor limiting the use of antiretroviral medications regardless of insurance, substitutes, and other factors. Housing interventions improve stability and access to care. Let's be clear. If passed, this amendment will harm people's access to life-saving treatment.

Let's get down to it. It is not lost upon me that among all the programs in this bill that support people with chronic diseases and other disabilities, this is the only one that has been singled out.

This is a disease that can affect anyone, but HIV disproportionately affects racial and ethnic minorities, the LGBTQI+ community, young people, and people who inject drugs.

It seems to me in an effort to deny resources to LGBTQI+ people in this country, this amendment will worsen health inequalities, exacerbate the opiate epidemic, and otherwise do irreparable damage to our Nation's public health.

It is difficult to overstate the cruelty of this amendment and the damage it would do to public health and to one of our most vulnerable populations.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no", and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chair, the amendment doesn't stop people who have genuine needs as defined by our current needs-based program from receiving assistance.

It maintains the same level of compassion it has for all Americans. It

doesn't treat them with any special distinction. In fact, it restores equality instead of denying it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to this amendment to eliminate funding for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, or HOPWA program.

This amendment would cut off housing support for tens of thousands of people living with HIV. In doing so, we take ourselves back to the 1980s—when the government ignored the needs of those living with HIV and the urgency of the HIV epidemic.

For more than three decades, HOPWA has provided critical support for low-income people living with HIV. HOPWA is a bipartisan program that serves over 75,000 people, providing housing assistance including rental assistance, transitional housing, and permanent housing.

Stable housing is essential for helping people living with HIV to achieve better health outcomes. Linking individuals living with HIV to stable, supportive housing is directly linked to decreased viral load, an 80 percent reduction in mortality from AIDS, and a 57 percent reduction in hospitalizations.

To destabilize housing for 55,000 households and over 75,000 people would create a public health disaster. Cutting funding to HOPWA would cost far more money in increased healthcare costs than investing in this critical program at the outset.

This amendment would significantly impede our Nation's efforts both to support those living with HIV and to end the HIV epidemic.

With Veterans Day on Saturday, I also want to inform my colleagues that 10 percent of HOPWA recipients are veterans.

I strongly oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to join me in calling for continued funding for HOPWA, just as this body has done since 1992.

If the gentleman is truly interested in cutting the deficit, he might consider supporting repeal of President Trump's tax cuts of 2018 where 83 percent of the benefits went to the top 1 percent of the people and which increased the deficit by several trillion dollars.

In summary, I urge the defeat of this amendment for health reasons and for fiscal reasons.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, I am prepared to close.

Madam Chairwoman, research conducted in my home city of Chicago showed that homeless individuals living with HIV had significantly im-

proved health outcomes and transmission risk when provided with HOPWA assistance, and substantial cost savings were achieved by reducing healthcare costs for this population.

For people with HIV, housing is healthcare. That stability is healthcare. It means the difference often between life and death.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no", and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chairwoman, our colleague just makes the point. If Chicago needs a program, Chicago could operate a program. If the State of Illinois needs a program, Illinois could operate a program. If the State of New York needs a program, the State could operate a program. The Federal Government does not need to operate this program.

It disproportionately goes to high-density populations in urban areas. It doesn't affect rural America. Frankly, it federalizes a problem that is much more localized.

It is time to let something finally expire and say this need has largely been met. The health conditions are much more survivable than they were when this program was launched.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to finally trim something that is no longer needed. It restores equality in our social safety net rather than continuing to distort it. Please support my amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. BLUNT  
ROCHESTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 111, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000) (reduced by \$100,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, amendment No. 36. This

amendment highlights the importance of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Pathways to Removing Obstacles to Housing, otherwise known as the PRO Housing grant program and land-use reform policies, which were shortsightedly omitted entirely from this partisan bill that we are reconsidering tonight, H.R. 4820.

This grant program, funded for the first time in fiscal year 2023, is based on broadly supported bipartisan bills, including my Housing Supply and Affordability Act and the Yes in My Backyard Act.

The program incentivizes reform of local land-use policies that hinder the expansion of an affordable housing supply.

Our Nation is facing an affordable housing crisis. We have a shortage of as many as 7 million affordable homes.

This drastic underproduction hurts American families. It hurts communities, businesses, and costs the economy about \$2 trillion per year in lower productivity and wages.

The lack of affordable housing also increases the strain on the labor market with about 9.6 million job openings in the U.S.

From food service to cybersecurity, employers in nearly every industry are struggling to find and retain workers. The bottom line is to take a job, you need to be able to afford to live near that job.

I hear about this problem in almost every meeting that I attend up and down my State. It is a problem that impacts people in Delaware, from our beaches to the cities to the rural communities, and I know it is impacting Americans across this country.

I urge my colleagues to think about the human impact of the lack of affordable housing; extreme stress, homelessness, increased workforce shortages, and poorer health outcomes. It is clear that housing is foundational to our well-being.

Strict land-use policies create artificial restrictions that drive up costs and delay production. In many cases, they are horrific vestiges from the past, where discriminatory redlining broke up communities and prevented all Americans from having access to the American Dream.

□ 1630

Unfortunately, the bill that we are voting on today will squander another opportunity to right those wrongs of the past.

We know the bill in its current form has no chance of becoming law. The lack of meaningful housing reform and support, like the PRO Housing program and land reform policies, are examples of the many fatal flaws with this bill.

The adoption of my amendment will at least signal to the Senate and our appropriations leaders that we need to include the PRO Housing program and land use policy reforms in a final appropriations bill.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Chair, we are going to use \$100 million, to use the Senate's number, to influence what should be a local decisionmaking process on zoning for affordable housing.

We all support affordable housing. That is not really the issue. The issue is who is going to make the zoning decisions within each and every location and jurisdiction throughout this country. We don't believe that it should be the Federal Government imposing its will on local government in those zoning decisions. That should be up to the locals.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my friend's amendment.

According to Up For Growth's recent 2023 report, we have underproduced housing by millions of missing homes across our country. That reality pushes homeownership out of reach for too many Americans, and we have to fix that.

While there is no silver bullet solution to this problem, several studies have indicated that restrictive zoning laws remain among the largest barriers preventing construction of additional housing supply, and that drives up prices.

As a result, Representative FLOOD and I introduced a bill called the Yes in My Backyard Act. Our bill is designed to eliminate some of these discriminatory land use policies and remove some of those barriers that prevent new housing construction across our country.

That bill is consistent with this amendment. My friend and colleague from Delaware and I have championed funding through the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Pathways to Removing Obstacles to Housing grant program. This isn't about forcing any community to do anything. It is about trying to encourage communities to make decisions that allow for more housing construction.

Madam Chair, I am disappointed that this year's bill cuts funding for that program because that hurts our ability to solve this crisis.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Chair, let me reiterate that Washington bureaucrats ought not be getting into the zoning business of local jurisdictions across the United States with \$100 million to influence folks to make decisions that may not be in the best interests of those in the community.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment.

In FY23, we provided funding for a new grant program in the community development fund to support communities that are taking active steps to remove barriers to the construction of new housing.

This is just one piece of the puzzle to help address the affordable housing crisis that American families are facing. This shortage is especially harmful to seniors and people with disabilities, who make up nearly half of the lowest income renters.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support and vote for this amendment.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Chair, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

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

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 111, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,650,000,000)".

Page 111, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,650,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, let's look at the big picture here for a second.

In the year that just wrapped up, the year ending September 30, the Federal Government was borrowing 22 percent of every dollar it spent. That should shock and scare people to death.

We reached a neat agreement that I maybe think the Republicans should be

paying a little more attention to on the debt limit increase. In that debt limit increase, there is going to be a mild cut in spending, discretionary spending. Even if we stick to that amendment, we will go from borrowing 22 percent of everything we spend in fiscal year 2023 up to 23 percent, another percentage increase in the next year.

In other words, we have a pretty scary situation going on here. I think as we approach all these bills, our goal should always be to spend a little less money. It is kind of frustrating when you hear people wanting to spend more money.

Madam Chair, perusing this bill, there seems to be one area that is obviously not the Federal Government's business, which is that of the Community Development Block Grant program. I cannot imagine why it would be the Federal Government's business to get involved in housing or any other sort of construction on a local level.

We are broke, broke, broke out of our mind, and getting more broke every minute. Actually, some of our States are running surpluses. I know Wisconsin right now has a tremendous amount of money, so I thought we could look at the Community Block Grant Program. President Trump, or at least his finance director, tried to get rid of it altogether. Because I am so easygoing, I thought we would introduce an amendment just to reduce it by half, which would save \$1.65 billion in the next fiscal year.

I think one would be hard-pressed to say that these programs have been effective. Like every program that is paid for on a Federal level but administered on the local level, they have all sorts of rules involved that make things unnecessary, costly, and take a longer period of time. Insofar as it is a good program, the States and locals will be able to do it.

I have a list here of things that I don't think we were anticipating when this program began: \$500,000 to expand Niagara County brewing; \$276,000 to fund a skateboard park in North Adams, Massachusetts; \$500,000 in corporate subsidies to persuade Procter & Gamble's Natura acquisition to move to Fremont, California, probably from some other city around this country.

In any event, I think this is a small effort at spending a little bit less money and weaning the local governments off the Federal Government. If they want to do their own stuff, they can.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chairwoman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment and its attack on the resources of Democratic and Republican mayors, Governors, and county officials who rely

on this to close the gap in funding for housing and infrastructure needs in their communities.

CDBG investments reach every corner of every district. In Wisconsin, the cut to the State would be from \$27 million to \$13 million; in Chicago, it would be from \$75 million to \$37 million; and Sheboygan—yes, Sheboygan—would go from \$865,000 to \$432,000.

These investments reach every corner of every district. These funds remain one of the most important resources for State and local governments to rehab affordable housing, upgrade essential infrastructure, promote business redevelopment in distressed areas, and provide services such as job training.

In fact, in fiscal year 2022, the largest share of CDBG program funding was for projects that support rehabbing single-family housing, critical water and sewer improvements, and street improvements.

In Chicago, programs supported by CDBG include lead poisoning prevention, homeownership counseling, and home accessibility repairs for seniors and people with disabilities.

The program also provides high impact, high return on investments for taxpayers, with over \$2.4 billion leveraged across CDBG projects in 2021. From 2005 to 2022, CDBG facilitated the creation and retention of 521,000 jobs, contributed to infrastructure benefiting approximately 609 million individuals, assisted over 980 million constituents through public services, and met the housing needs of nearly 1.8 million households.

This amendment is representative of a larger problem with the Republican appropriation proposals—cutting spending, but only on the backs of low-income and middle-class Americans, and divesting in programs that support job creation and curb the housing affordability crisis, all while making it easier for billionaires and corporations to cheat on their taxes.

Madam Chair, I urge a “no” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, I love my colleagues, but the States right now—at least Wisconsin big time—are running a surplus. If the State of Wisconsin feels they need more government involvement in building things, they are perfectly capable of appropriating their funds on their own. If the individual cities want to subsidize one part of town, they are perfectly capable of doing that on their own. There will be less paperwork, and it will be done quicker and at lower costs without Federal Government involvement.

Again, I emphasize that we are borrowing over 22 percent of what we spend as it is. Our goal shouldn't be to look for more things for the Federal Government to do. Our goal should be to go through each and every one of these appropriations bills to look for less before the value of the dollar completely collapses.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, the CDBG program is one of the few opportunities that the Federal Government has where we actually take taxpayer dollars and send them back to the State and local governments to use the way they see fit.

That is the reason I rise in opposition to this amendment. This will cut \$13 million just from the State of Florida and a little over \$4 million just from my district alone.

Madam Chair, having been in local government as a sheriff for 12 years, I can say that CDBG was a tremendous opportunity to help public safety in the way that our community needed assistance. It wasn't a mandate down from bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. It was an opportunity to take tax dollars, return them to the taxpayer, and allow their elected representatives to decide how best to use that money.

For that reason, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment, and I ask all my colleagues to vote “no.”

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

□ 1645

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands amendment No. 40 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 118–261.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On page 177, after section 244, insert the following:

SEC. 245. No funds made available under this title may be used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for remote work performed by an employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development at an alternative worksite within a 50 mile radius of an office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in favor of my amendment No. 43, which would prohibit HUD remote work agreements when the employee is working within 50 miles of a HUD office.

Madam Chair, HUD's handbook defines remote work as an arrangement where the employee is not required to report to an agency worksite on a regular or recurring basis. It then defines two forms of remote work, one being near HUD office, which is within 50 miles of a HUD office, to work remotely.

As an example, it cites an employee who would normally be based in HUD's Robert C. Weaver headquarters in Washington, D.C., who is allowed to work from their home in Arlington, Virginia.

Now, Madam Chair, they are not even trying to hide it anymore. The agencies are baking into their policies unseen benefits and perks for bureaucrats who quite frankly aren't entitled to them and for which the taxpaying public is paying, yet we are not receiving an adequate return on our investment.

Thousands of congressional staffers commute to the Capitol building every morning from the surrounding neighborhoods, whether they live in Arlington, Alexandria, or cities in Maryland. Why can't the agency employees do the same?

Pre-COVID, the oversight of Federal agencies was slim, as was the accountability that the American people are entitled to. Today, it is even harder to monitor the efficacy, the efficiency, and the legal compliance of many agency employees because we don't even know where they are. Are they at home doing laundry when they should be processing applications? Are they picking their children up from school during work hours? Are they taking a 2-hour lunch because there is no oversight? We don't know.

I believe that if you are being paid by the American people, you should work for the American people. My amendment is designed to bring some semblance of accountability back to HUD.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, the remote work agreements addressed in this amendment, where they exist, have been thoughtfully negotiated by OMB, labor unions, and management and have been in place under Republican and Democratic administrations.

To impede on that process with a provision would be yet another Republican overreach that fails to take into consideration any special accommodation employees may need related to remote work.

This prohibition, which fails to address circumstances under which remote work arrangements may be beneficial to the taxpayer or a necessary accommodation for an employee, is not a serious approach to policymaking.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, HUD's remote work policy shows that its employees are not showing up to work at the Robert C. Weaver building but are instead spending their days in the homes, coffee shops, and other locations across the greater D.C. area. My amendment addresses that situation and requires the employees to show up at their job.

Bureaucracy already moves way too slowly, even when the employees are working in the same building, down the hall from one another, and with access to all of the work accoutrements that are necessary for them to do their jobs.

HUD's policy means that today we are not even sure if they are working in the same State. That is unacceptable.

The basic principles of oversight and accountability require that employees go to work. Basic principles of avoiding further waste, fraud, and abuse means not leaving Federal agency buildings barren.

COVID is over. It is time to return to work. The Republican majority has made clear that we believe government employees should be working at their places of employment. My amendment furthers that policy.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

The Chair understands amendment No. 45 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$18,443,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Chair, as a traditional courtesy, I am offering this for Mr. BUCK, who has been very kind to us.

This is an amendment I think we have all seen versions of. It is structurally very simple. It moves the appropriation amount back to the 2019 fiscal year.

You all know the reasons. We have all had this discussion and debate here. It is before the pandemic plus-ups, reaching back to a year where the economy was good and the mechanics were good. Apparently the agency seemed to be able to do its work. Here we are a couple fiscal years later, but we keep plugging back in the plus-ups that were supposed to be the pandemic emergency. This actually rolls it back to 2019.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, this amendment makes drastic, indiscriminate cuts from programs in transportation and housing without any regard for the merits of the programs contained in the bill or the people and communities involved across America that would benefit from these programs and rely on them to keep air traffic moving and roofs over their heads.

I want to be clear up front about what this bill would mean. It would result in mass evictions. It would decimate funding for Amtrak operations and rail safety, and it would bring air traffic to a halt. Hundreds of thousands of families would be evicted upon losing rental assistance. The hiring of air traffic controllers would halt, towers would be forced to shut down, and air travel would become at best unsafe and at worst impossible. Funding for Amtrak would be decimated even further than it already is in the base bill, significantly reducing operations.

The amendment trivializes the Appropriations Committee's process and disregards the consideration of Member requests that committee members put into writing bills.

It will result in unimaginable draconian cuts to the very programs Republicans claim to support in their districts to their constituents and which provide critical, basic housing and safety needs. This includes: the FAA's air traffic control operations; Amtrak's operation and maintenance; the Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvement Program, which supports rail safety; housing assistance programs for the elderly and people with disabilities; housing rental assistance vouchers for which cuts would result in mass evictions across the country; all programs that support Tribal housing and infrastructure needs; the Continuation of Care program, which

supports hundreds of thousands of homeless veterans, domestic violence survivors, and youth; the popular Community Development Block Grant program; Community Project Funding, which Republicans and Democrats alike requested to address transportation and housing challenges; and critical investments in port infrastructure.

This amendment would even cut the small amount of defense spending included in the T-HUD bill for critical maritime security programs.

It would not encourage DOT or HUD to do more with less. Simply put, it would force our constituents to do less with less. This is particularly galling, because the bill rescinds enforcement money that will ensure wealthy individuals and corporations pay their taxes, which actually increases the deficit due to lost revenue.

Is it really more important to give the wealthy a tax break rather than provide housing, roads, bridges, trains, and safety services from which all citizens benefit?

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the appropriations process. I have some sense of how difficult it has been for both sides.

This is the 2019 fiscal budget. Was that really, really that difficult, that draconian?

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 118–261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 57 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, this is one of those amendments I just felt I needed to make a point here. It is a brutal amendment, but we did some calculations.

Fifty-seven percent of this appropriation within this piece of this budget goes to entities that have their own taxing authority.

Why do we care about that?

Do you realize every dime we are appropriating here, every dime we get to vote on, lives on borrowed money? We borrow every dime of defense and every dime of discretionary if you look at the 2023 budget. It looks like we are going to do the same thing in the 2024 that we are working on right now. We borrowed \$300 billion to \$400 billion of functionally what is Medicare.

I know that no one really wants to go near this because it is radioactive and uncomfortable, but it is math. This is from a couple hours ago, Bloomberg’s headline, Bloomberg Analytics. It is behind the payroll, so if you have a Bloomberg terminal, go look it up, “U.S. Debt Interest Bill Rockets Past a Cool \$1 Trillion a Year.” They are estimating that our interest bill for this fiscal year, total gross interest, is \$1 trillion.

□ 1700

Stop and think about that. That means Social Security is the number one spend, interest just became number two, Medicare just became number three, and defense is now number four. These are numbers we were not supposed to hit for a decade. It is here.

Sometimes I feel like an absolute idiot because I come behind this microphone—and I have done this for years—and we walk through numbers like this. People just stare at you and say, well, that is not interesting, that is math. The math will always win.

Our amendment here is tough, but it makes a point. Is it moral, is it ethical, is it rational to borrow money and give it to entities that have their own taxing authority?

Trust me, I have been the treasurer of the fourth most populous county in the United States. I know how hard it is to be the tax collector. I was the tax collector in Maricopa County. It makes you really popular when that is your title.

Understand what we are doing here. We are going to borrow money to send it to entities that ultimately do have the ability to raise the receipts and revenues.

The last comment I will make on this for my brothers and sisters on the left, how often do they scream at us: We should raise revenues. Okay. Guess what? Talk to your locals. Let them raise the revenues.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I could roll the tape of what I just said last time to respond because these are indiscriminate cuts, but that is not particularly helpful.

If we are here to make a point, let’s make this point. If this is all about reducing the debt, let’s not kid ourselves that we are going to accomplish this beating the hell out of nondefense discretionary. Let’s go back to the Simpson-Bowles discussion and the debt commission that took place back then.

The conclusions they came up with on a bipartisan basis was that anything to be serious had to be big, had to be balanced, and had to be bipartisan. But balanced meant cutting across all the lines.

Now, what we have learned, if you spend any time in this House, is that there are sacred cows. If we are talking to our left and our right, what I would say to my friends on the right is that you got your sacred cows, too. Right now they are mooing everywhere because you are not touching them, and therefore, you are not serious about dealing with the debt.

If you are, let’s remember Simpson-Bowles did come over here one time under the late Mr. LaTourette and our friend, Mr. Cooper. Under Cooper-LaTourette, which was some feigned attempt to do this on a big, balanced, bipartisan basis with no sacred cows, it got 36 votes.

If we are serious about this, let’s talk about the commission and let’s talk about all things. You can agree or disagree, but don’t try to con the American people that we are serious about this, pounding on housing and transportation. It won’t get the job done, and it will do a lot of damage.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I actually give the ranking member kudos for being intellectually honest. That is actually part of my point. The numbers now are brutally uglier than even Simpson-Bowles.

It is one of the things we don’t like to say because it doesn’t look good on a campaign brochure, but functionally every dime of future debt from today into the future is actually demographics. It is healthcare. In 9 years, do we backfill Social Security?

It is intellectually honest to say: We are borrowing every dime we get to vote on as Members of Congress. I keep wanting to say that over and over and over. Every dime of military, every dime of nondefense discretionary is now borrowed, plus, probably my math is about \$4 billion to \$5 billion of mandatory. Now we will live on borrowed money.

Until that starts to hit our intellectual lexicon of what we say and how we think, it makes it very hard to try to

make the argument that if we don't step up and do this, the bond market is going to do it for us.

Remember, we borrowed 8.4 percent of GDP last year. To my brothers and sisters who say the solution is often to raise taxes on the wealthy, the best model says that we can only get about 1½ percent of GDP by maximizing every tax on \$400,000 and up.

Mr. Chairman, 1½ percent isn't anywhere close when you just borrowed 8.4 percent.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I just have to say that across the board 57 percent—and it does look like we are going above the 2023 numbers, but actually we had to start off with a cut of about \$8 billion to fill a hole that was caused by last year's Democratic budget gimmicks and the disasters of the Biden economic plan.

We reduced wasteful spending funding across 19 different DOT and HUD grant programs. We have right-sized spending for transportation infrastructure. We have prioritized two things in this bill: transportation safety and housing assistance for vulnerable Americans. That is where the focus lies.

We have cut significantly from the 2023 numbers. Cutting this bill through indiscriminate across-the-board cuts really abdicates our responsibility to make sure that we are protecting the priorities of this Nation in transportation safety and housing for America's most vulnerable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" on this amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. BURLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the grant program under section 151(f) of title 23, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would prohibit funds from going to the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Program. This grant program was created in 2021 in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to strategically deploy electric vehicle charging stations around the country.

The reason that I filed this amendment is simple. It is not the role of the Federal Government to subsidize the electric vehicle charging industry.

After spending billions of taxpayer dollars and bribing the affluent to buy electric vehicles, it turns out only one-third of the population wants to even buy one or aspires to buy one, and two-thirds are not even considering purchasing one. The two-thirds who are not considering it don't want to be forced to pay for the others.

Maybe you like electric vehicles. In fact, I actually do, personally. I test-drove a Tesla and loved it, but it would be immoral for me to force my neighbors and compel them through the force of government to subsidize my new electric vehicle.

In essence, we are robbing Peter to pay Paul. The fact is, this program will cost taxpayers \$2.5 billion dollars, which will all be debt, for something that most Americans cannot afford and are unable to appreciate.

It is not the government's job to pick winners and losers in the energy market. That is the role of consumers and businesses operating in a free market.

Here we are, once again, using tax dollars to subsidize and force a product on people where there is little demand. If the direct cost to taxpayers doesn't bother you, the indirect costs, including the higher energy prices, the cost of making the electricity grid more reliable, and increased dependence on China are arguably worse.

When the government subsidizes the EV infrastructure, it does so by raising energy prices for everyone. The installation of new charging stations also makes our electricity grid less reliable, further putting Americans at risk to having blackouts, brownouts, or other reliability issues.

Finally, maybe worst of all, it is not just that Americans are being priced out of affordable, reliable energy; it is not just that we are rigging the market against our own constituents, but we are also selling them out to the Chinese Communist Party.

These electric charging stations and electric car batteries require a massive amount of resources from China, which controls the world's critical minerals supply chain.

America was energy independent just 3 short years ago, but through the government electric vehicle scam we have

allowed Communist China to establish an EV monopoly all while Americans get poorer. It is time that we stop forcing Americans to foot the bill for other people and instead focus on making our energy system more reliable and affordable.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, this grant program will provide critical resources toward making community charging stations for electric vehicles available and accessible. Oh, by the way, it will make EVs more popular.

By increasing EV charging stations in communities across the country, we are modernizing our infrastructure, working toward our emission reduction goals, and creating good jobs in the process.

Ensuring that charging stations are visible and accessible in our communities addresses concerns many drivers have when considering making the switch to electric.

By prioritizing funding to projects in rural communities and low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, this program will help blue and red States.

We have heard from State departments of transportation and private partners, like gas stations, who want this funding to build their customer base to bring consumers into their convenience shops. This is a Federal investment in partnership with industry.

Additionally, this Charging and Fueling Infrastructure program is an authorized program, funded through the Highway Trust Fund. Authorizers, on a bipartisan basis, have authorized funding to be used for these purposes.

This funding is wanted and is another important step in the Nation's efforts to battle climate change, meet emission reductions goals, and meet the automobile industry where they are at.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, we didn't have to subsidize or have grant programs to create the very robust infrastructure of fuel stations that exist across this country. It happened on its own through the free market. That is all I am suggesting.

The average price of an electric vehicle now is around \$66,000, and the median income is less than that. It is \$59,000 a year. So when the government subsidizes an electric vehicle infrastructure, it is not free money. It is not free. It is taxpayer money. Because of the situation we are in, this is all debt.

It is not just a one-time cost, as well. These subsidies are a continuous drain on the public funds that could be used for real hard infrastructure that all Americans can use, things like roads and bridges.



The average family is priced out entirely from purchasing an EV in the market but is still paying for it on the back end with higher energy costs, higher taxes, and a less reliable grid.

Ultimately, it is the poorest people in this country who are hit the hardest when the Federal Government redistributes tax dollars to subsidize the EVs for those who can't afford it.

□ 1715

This is basically a reverse Robin Hood. I repeat, it is a reverse Robin Hood. Instead of taking from the rich and giving to the poor, we are taking from the poor, and we are giving it to the rich. We are making them pay taxes on someone else's luxury item while telling them to stop using cheap, reliable energy that they need to survive.

The Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Grant Program is just another classic example of the government picking winners and losers. If Americans want a product, then the market will reflect that without our need to artificially increase the demand.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MRS. CAMMACK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to finalize any rule or regulation that meets the definition of section 804(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment which would restrict funds at the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies from being used to finalize any rule or regulation that would have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more.

Under the Biden administration, regulatory agencies are out of control. We know this. We have seen hundreds of billions of dollars in regulatory costs fall on the shoulders of average Americans without any input from elected Representatives in Congress, indeed, those Americans' elected Representatives.

Agencies that fall under the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development create unreasonable hurdles for American citizens in pursuit of a radical climate change initiative and the so-called sustainable housing development programs.

My amendment seeks to restore congressional oversight over these regulations by requiring that any major rule proposed by these agencies be approved by Congress before they take effect. If Congress chooses to approve them, then so be it. At least the American people's voice will have been heard rather than that of an unelected, nameless, and faceless bureaucrat in a basement somewhere in Washington.

By including my amendment in this bill, we restore Congress' Article I authority by bringing significant regulatory decisions back to the body that is closest to the will and the voice of the people.

We will no longer allow unelected bureaucrats to impose these regulatory costs that are so costly and that are done behind closed doors but rather commit ourselves to more open and transparent governance.

We have already seen the Biden administration's impractical rule to slash greenhouse gas emissions over the next decade inevitably leading to higher vehicle prices for consumers with very little impact on greenhouse gas emissions. This rule is especially burdensome for rural States and districts such as mine where the infrastructure to shift to electrification is not even close to being operable let alone economical.

We have also seen the recent Department of Housing and Urban Development affirmatively furthering a fair housing rule which imposes a burden on small municipalities and public housing authorities and other entities by requiring them to develop equity plans every 5 years.

These plans are extensive and expensive endeavors that require housing authorities to submit numerous details of progress and modifications to HUD. The rule effectively drowns these entities in paperwork while doing nothing to further their missions of providing safe and secure housing for hard-working American families.

Heck, Mr. Chair, we have such a backlog of maintenance through HUD that that is where we should be talking about our moneys going toward rather than another additional burden on the American people.

Lastly, we have seen the Federal Housing finance agency announce that it is hiking loan-level pricing adjustment fees on home buyers with high credit scores and redistributing them to funds for borrowers with low credit scores, essentially penalizing people who have made tough decisions, sacrificed, and worked very hard.

This rule penalizes financially responsible borrowers with additional fees that subsidize housing payments

for borrowers with bad credit. These additional fees can be significant according to a report by the Heritage Foundation and found that if a young homeowner in their thirties were able to invest their additional mortgage expenses at 8 percent annual returns, which is pretty average, that investment could grow by nearly \$31,000 upon retirement. That is not miniscule.

Once again, this rule was created outside the purview of duly elected Representatives.

All in all, my amendment is simple. It restores the people's voice in these significant Federal agency decisions that impact their daily lives. It is time that we restore Article I authority and give the American people the transparent and accountable government that they deserve.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment prohibits the administration or any administration from finalizing any rule or regulation that has a significant impact on the economy. This is just another example of bad policy riders aimed at tying any administration's hands when carrying out the duly enacted laws by a Congress.

It will stop the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development from finalizing rules that keep Americans safe on the roads, in the skies, or in their homes.

This amendment has little to do with an appropriations bill, and it has less to do with supporting American infrastructure, advancing transportation safety, and addressing our housing shortage.

Mr. Chairman, I must respectfully oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am very supportive of this amendment. The gentlewoman has been leading on this topic for quite a while through the REINS Act. I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the two areas that most threaten our democracy right now, and that is rulemaking in executive orders that absolutely go around our Article I authority here in this body.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I would love to see it in every bill that we pass in appropriations.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Florida for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, this is simple. It is about accountability and transparency, and the language of this amendment

was passed in a bipartisan manner earlier this year. This is a no-brainer.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. FRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any Federal law, rule, or regulation that would require an individual to wear a mask on public transportation conveyances and at transportation hubs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit mask mandates on any form of public transit and at transportation hubs.

The COVID-19 pandemic robbed Americans of far too many individual liberties. For 15 months, Americans were required by Federal law to wear masks on all forms of public transportation across the country, on planes, trains, buses, you name it, Mr. Chairman.

Americans were also required to wear a mask while going through security and waiting at the airport, navigating a train station, or waiting at a bus stop.

The government forced Americans to cover up.

The kicker is that multiple studies have shown that wearing masks had an adverse effect on people. Wearing a mask does not actually have a statistically significant effect on preventing the spread of COVID-19. In fact, States without mask mandates, like my home State of South Carolina, had lower death rates from COVID-19 than States with mask mandates.

We also have seen, unfortunately, catastrophic impacts that these mandates have on our children, worsening their communication and social skills and delaying their cognitive development while increasing their vulnerability and decreasing confidence.

My amendment does not prohibit any individual from wearing a mask on public transportation should they choose to do so.

This amendment would safeguard the freedom of all Americans to make important decisions for themselves, in-

cluding whether or not to wear that mask.

This amendment would put an end to Government overreach and protect the freedoms that Americans have. Our Constitution expressly protects those certain rights and liberties for individuals from government interference. We must defend and protect the principles our Nation was founded on and put a stop to extreme executive overreach mandates. This is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. Chairman, also, this amendment previously passed the Senate I think 1 week ago on a bipartisan basis, so I encourage Members of the other side to support this.

We cannot allow policies and practices used during the pandemic to continue for future generations endlessly. Americans are uniquely independent and self-reliant. We as Congress should empower the individual and not government. We should not put a nationwide mandate on the American people again. Mask mandates only give more power to the Federal Government and to the bureaucrats who run this town.

Let's get back to the basics. We the People demand it. I am committed to standing up to this administration's infringement on any individual liberties and working for the American people. Let's ensure that Government overreach comes to an end. Individual freedoms must be protected. It is as simple as that.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I would suggest that this legislation comes from that same denial caucus that if you don't like history then change it or ignore it; if you don't like facts and you don't like science, then you ignore it.

You do that at great risk, Mr. Chairman.

We have had epidemics and we have had pandemics in our past, and we will have them again. If we are not prepared, then we risk people's lives.

This amendment would prohibit the Department of Transportation and its agencies and public transportation operators from complying with any Federal law or regulation that requires an individual to wear a mask on public transportation or transportation hubs such as airports or any other circumstances.

Let's be clear: There is currently no Federal mask requirement in place for users or employees of public transportation, yet this amendment would leave the Federal Government ill-equipped to implement evidence-based policies that protect the health and safety of the public and of essential workers in the event we are faced with another public health emergency such

as a dangerous new COVID-19 variant or another even more deadly pandemic.

In the event of a public health emergency where evidence shows that the use of face masks can prevent transmission and deaths, we must be able to respond quickly and allow agencies like DOT and CDC to provide guidance and measures that protect healthcare workers, caregivers, grocery store employees, retail workers, and so many other Americans who rely on public transportation for essential travel.

This sweeping amendment is unnecessary and puts us all at risk. New variants are an expected part of the evolution of viruses and can be and will be more aggressive, transmittable, or cause even more severe disease than the original strain. We saw that in the great influenza of over 100 years ago.

Our Nation's public health officials need to have options available to them to protect our communities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what evidence-based things that my colleague on the other side was talking about.

Was it the zero masks that were initially prescribed by Dr. Fauci?

Was it one mask?

Was it two?

Was it no mask while vaccinated?

South Carolina never imposed a statewide mask mandate, and I think Congress could learn a thing or two from my home State.

Let's empower individuals to make that informed choice for themselves instead of bogging them down with these burdensome regulations.

This amendment would simply prevent mask mandates from occurring on airplanes, airports, trains, metros, subways, buses, train stations, and more.

We know Americans have been frustrated by this and by the ever-changing guidance coming from this Federal Government. I am proud to stand here today on behalf of these frustrated American citizens who do not want a mask mandate in the future.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this passed in a bipartisan manner in the Senate. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, this form of denial is the same sort of denial that didn't believe in vaccinations when it deals with COVID and when the vast majority of those in ICU units were unvaccinated, risking other people and putting other people's health at risk.

For this and so many other reasons, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1730

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 51 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. GOODEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in part B of House Report 118–261.

Mr. GOODEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 203, after line 2, insert the following:  
SEC. 435. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to take an enforcement action under section 578.6(a)(3) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to a center high-mounted stop lamp.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOODEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOODEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to urge passage of my amendment regarding certain enforcement actions with regard to center high-mounted stop lamps.

I know my colleagues probably don't know what that is, but we refer to those commonly as center brake lights. This amendment is intended to prevent the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration from advancing on its misguided effort to overregulate and further confuse the collision avoidance industry that manufactures pulsating brake lights.

These devices, with over 4 million operating effectively today, have a demonstrated track record of improving safety. Studies have shown a reduction in rear-end collisions in excess of 30 percent with the vehicles that have utilized this technology.

These safety devices are simple, aftermarket products installed by dealerships when a vehicle is purchased. They allow the top brake light on a vehicle to pulse rapidly, which provides a heightened visual alert to trailing drivers who may be distracted and don't notice that the vehicle in front of them is braking.

This reduces the likelihood of rear-end collisions and creates a safer environment on our roads, especially in stop-and-go traffic.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to safeguard drivers across the Nation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, this amendment would disrupt the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's ability to enforce rules and regulations when vehicles are not in compliance with current Federal law.

For my colleague concerned about vendors who have been selling pulsating brake lights, it is my understanding

that the issue is now in litigation. We should not be impeding on or presupposing the outcome of the matter that has been referred to the courts.

My colleagues may disagree with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's longstanding interpretation that high-mounted brake lights must be steady burning, not pulsing, but this is not an appropriations issue.

If my colleague feels strongly that NHTSA should be considering new regulations related to the potential benefits of these lights, they should work together through regular order, which would be through the appropriate authorizing committees.

This amendment, as written, would not just address the pulsing light issue. It would impact the NHTSA's ability to conduct compliance investigations involving all high-mounted stop lamps and prevent them from gathering information related to compliance test failures.

In 2021, there were over 1.7 million rear-end crashes involving light vehicles, which resulted in almost 3,000 deaths and over 475,000 injuries. This amendment adds an unreasonable restriction on NHTSA's ability to conduct research and improve public safety on the Nation's roads. We cannot tie their hands to carry out their safety mission.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I suspected I would hear what I just heard, but I would like to correct a few things.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is not doing their job. Congress passed a law ordering them to conduct a study in 2019. They said they would, and they haven't done it yet. Not only have they not conducted a study, but they just recently reengaged on this issue this past summer. They failed to engage with me.

I have sent several letters asking them to do the job that Congress instructed them to do, but they have managed to order those manufacturers of this pulsating brake light to turn over all of their client lists because they wanted to then go after the dealers that have installed these lights and force them to turn over their client lists, and I think that is wrong.

This amendment is intended to force action by NHTSA to step back. If they are not going to do their job, then at least don't get in the way of something that works.

The studies have shown a reduction in rear-end collisions by over 30 percent with vehicles that have these brake lights. I will also point to something that is really shocking to me, frankly, and that is that 10 to 15 States, including Maryland, Texas, California, Utah, and Tennessee, have expressly agreed with the industry's analysis that these are actually helpful to the safety of Americans on the road.

Any time Texas and California agree on something, I am inclined to think it might actually be a good thing.

The other thing I will point out is something that I think many of those watching this debate are afraid to mention, and that is the fact that we have these manufacturers that have these deals that they worked out with these auto dealers, and they make these parts. They talk with these auto dealers and say they can sell this and make this amount of profit. They got all this worked out.

When it comes to this pulsing brake light, it is not a manufacturer-provided part. This is something a private company—and now there are four, five, or six. They all compete against each other. This industry makes these lights and has now dealt with the auto dealers outside of the manufacturers. As a consequence, the manufacturers don't like it.

I am not going to accuse the manufacturers of dealing with NHTSA, but I will say it is very bizarre to me that NHTSA is not going forward with the study that this Congress, in 2019, asked them to do.

It is very bizarre to me that NHTSA, instead of conducting a study, instead of working with members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, like myself, are asking for client lists of this industry. That is just really weird to me, especially when the device that is so controversial is approved by Texas, California, and, frankly, some liberal States that all think this is really great.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues from across the aisle to recognize this is not a partisan issue. This is bipartisan. This is a good amendment, and I hope that we will all vote for it tonight when Americans have gone to bed and we are back here on the House floor voting late tonight. I hope my colleagues from across the aisle will join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for offering this amendment.

Let's be clear: The only entity that has not done its job is NHTSA.

They were directed by Congress to do a study to establish standards and failed to do that. Rather than them being punished, they are now taking it out on manufacturers and dealers.

As Mr. GOODEN said, this is not a safety issue. States have already studied this. We should not be coming in and imposing penalties and restrictions on manufacturers and dealers whenever it is NHTSA that has failed to do its job.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate new rules that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

(1) an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more;

(2) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

(3) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, my amendment simply comes in and establishes a threshold by which Congress must be involved in actually approving costs that are imposed upon our constituents.

Mr. Chairman, we all represent somewhere in excess of 700,000 people, and whenever we have unelected bureaucrats carrying out regulations that may impose costs on our constituents, we should have a say in that.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply says that any regulation that has a cost in excess of \$100 million must be approved by the Congress. That is what representation looks like.

Mr. Chairman, we shouldn't be allowing unelected bureaucrats who are sitting in dark cubicles in Washington, D.C., and who don't have a clear understanding of what it is like across America, making these decisions.

This is our job. If we support these regulations, if they provide a positive cost-to-benefit, put us on record supporting it.

To put things in perspective, Mr. Chair, in the first 2 years of the Biden administration, these very bureaucrats wrote regulations costing Americans \$200 billion. These are hidden taxes, Mr. Chair, that the families we are representing have to pay.

In comparison, during the Trump administration, they actually withdrew regulations costing the American household \$11,000 per household. They withdrew or reduced the costs, yet under this administration, we are watching as thousands and thousands

of additional dollars are being heaped upon these same households.

Let me say it again. That is a hidden tax. If folks want to vote for a tax, put them on the record doing it. If they want to break the backs of American families, put them on the record doing it. Unelected bureaucrats should not be making these decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, this is very similar to a recent amendment discussed by the gentlewoman from Florida, and for the reasons stated as to that amendment, we oppose this amendment, as well.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to put a face on it. The National Association of Manufacturers says that the average business has \$10,000 in regulatory compliance costs per employee. If it is a manufacturer, it is actually double, or \$20,000.

To put a face on it, Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Home Builders has estimated, in a May 2021 study, that the average home costs \$93,000 more—almost \$94,000 more—for the average single-family home as a result of complying with regulations. As a result of this administration's policies on energy, the supply chain, and labor, they estimate that there is an additional \$36,000 to \$38,000 cost on top of that \$94,000.

Mr. Chair, I can't say it enough: We can't afford this administration. Whether it is the energy policy, the regulatory policy, their inflation as a result of \$10 trillion in excess spending that they have imposed over the last few years, we simply can't afford it. American families can't afford it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The salary of Pete Buttigieg, Secretary of Transportation, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE) and a Mem-

ber opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, my amendment uses the Holman rule to reduce the salary of Secretary Pete Buttigieg to \$1.

Pete Buttigieg has failed to serve the American people as the Secretary of Transportation. He has been busy calling roads racist, enforcing equity action plans, and implementing climate change initiatives rather than strengthening our Nation's transportation and infrastructure systems and responding to emergencies like the train derailment in East Palestine.

□ 1745

He stated there is racism physically built into some of our highways. "Every transportation decision is inherently, in many ways, a decision about equity."

I would argue, people driving on dirt roads every single day in rural America may feel that way, but our Secretary of Transportation, Pete Buttigieg, doesn't care about Americans in rural America. He is more interested in declaring that roads are built on skin color and racism.

He also stated, "Ensuring equity and accessibility for every member of the traveling public is one of the Department of Transportation's highest priorities."

Again, I will point to rural America.

In the same month he was sworn in, his Department introduced racial policies and barriers to opportunities as a consideration for awarding discretionary grants, as if that is how funds should be awarded.

In June 2022, he launched a \$1 billion pilot program aimed at helping reconnect cities and neighborhoods racially segregated or divided by road projects. Under this program, over \$100 million was awarded to tear down and rebuild a freeway in Detroit because it was considered racially divisive. Taxpayer dollars are being used to cover 80 percent of the project's funds.

He has also intentionally tried to deceive the American people, as shown when a video surfaced of him faking a bike ride to a White House Cabinet meeting. The video showed Secretary Buttigieg driving to the White House but stopping in just enough time for his security detail to unload his bike from the back of the gas-guzzling SUV. He then rode his bike for the cameras to the White House as if he had been riding it all along. What a hypocrite. What a liar.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, we now enter the theater of the absurd.

Again, for the second day in a row, let's have two White people talk about

racial equality in the United States because we know so much about it from having, oh, so much experience, but here we are.

The reality of the situation is, this isn't serious, but it is the new normal. If we don't like people, we will pay them \$1. If we disagree with them, we will cut their salary. At some point in time, we have to recognize the fact that we are going to disagree. We are probably going to, for most of the rest of our lives, live in a divided government, so when we disagree with the administration or the administration disagrees with us, is the notion, well, we just won't pay them anymore because it will make a good sound bite or theoretically help us raise money because it sells well at home. However, it doesn't do anything for our constituents.

The reality is, public servants who are doing their jobs and carrying out the policy of the administration they serve should be commended, not demonized. Our government is dependent on being able to attract the best talent to bring their skills to public service.

Despite what has been said, the fact of the matter is, some of the best and brightest out there sacrifice to go back to public service or stay with it when they could do much better in the private sector. Who is going to be willing to do that if their names are dragged in the political mud because someone disagrees with them?

The Secretary is a dedicated public servant. This is not how we solve policy differences. We shouldn't make this personal. We can disagree without being disagreeable. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Georgia has 2 minutes and 15 seconds remaining.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, deserving a taxpayer-funded paycheck is about job performance, not about personalities or identity politics. Let's all recall that Pete Buttigieg was formerly a mayor and was well known as "Pothole Pete" for not repairing all the potholes in the roads in the town that he served. I assure you; this is about defunding his paycheck to \$1, which I think is \$1 too high for a Secretary of Transportation who is failing the American people when it comes to transportation.

While implementing his tyrannical climate agenda through his office and preaching for the government to curb carbon emissions, Pete Buttigieg has reportedly taken at least 18 taxpayer-funded flights on private jets managed by the FAA.

One of these flights was taken to receive an award from a Canadian gay rights organization for advancing LGBTQ rights. American taxpayers don't want to pay for Pete Buttigieg to get awards for the way people have sex.

That is not what the Secretary of Transportation should be doing.

These fraudulent actions of Secretary Buttigieg illustrate that he is not to be trusted in leading our Department of Transportation. While Secretary Buttigieg was taking taxpayer-funded, carbon-emitting private jets to receive LGBTQ awards, he failed to serve the Americans in East Palestine who were devastated by the train derailment and chemical spill earlier this year.

In response to why he hadn't visited the community, he stated that he would visit when the time is right. It turns out, the time was only right after President Trump visited, brought thousands of bottles of water, and pressured Secretary Buttigieg into visiting and maybe doing his job. It took our Secretary of Transportation almost 3 weeks to visit after this unbelievable toxic catastrophe.

Furthermore, under his watch as Secretary, the FAA was forced to order a ground stop for all air traffic in the U.S. due to a system outage. This was the first time in history the NOTAM system has ever failed, and it was the first time since 9/11.

Mr. Chair, my time has expired, and I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Gee, Mr. Chairman, I thought you were just pounding the gavel to break the monotony, but I appreciate that.

I have to be honest, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether this argument is worthy of the dignity of this House, that people who take the highest level of government function, Cabinet-level positions—and again you can disagree with them, Mr. Chairman, all you want, but to make this so personal and to take their orientation to task because you personally don't like the other people or their orientation, when it is absolutely none of your business, where has the Republican Party gone?

How has it gone from a party that said: We are going to let people live their lives; we are not going to intrude on them at all; we are going to let them live personally, and the worst thing government can do is inflict their own beliefs upon them?

That is exactly what the toxic atmosphere of language like we just heard is all about. It is not what we are as a country. Part of that personal freedom extends to everyone, even if they happen to be Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. Chair, I apologize to the Secretary and all the public servants who have to go through this disgraceful kind of treatment.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. It is not worthy of this body. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 55 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Climate Change Center of the Department of Transportation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, my amendment prohibits funding for the Climate Change Center at the Department of Transportation. This Center has recently been reinstated and expanded under the Biden administration to meet the DOT's goals in responding to the climate crisis.

The Climate Change Center creates comprehensive and multimodal approaches to reduce transportation-related greenhouse gases and to improve the resilience of the transportation system to climate change impacts. This Center announces and promotes woke grant programs that gives U.S. taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to woke universities and nonprofits to research the decarbonization of the transportation sector and to address adverse environmental impacts created by the transportation system.

Never forget, the goal of the Democrats is to take away every single gas and diesel engine, every single combustion engine, and force Americans to drive electric vehicles if they can afford them. While they claim they care about the climate and the environment, they do not care about toxic batteries and where they will be disposed, but they want to use unlimited taxpayer funds to address a climate crisis that does not exist because the climate has always changed. It is not something new.

This Center also works with DOT agencies to implement climate change criteria for grant programs, to devise climate training programs and to facilitate climate change education campaigns for its 50,000 employees across the Department.

For example, the Center is working with the Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to deliver climate information and support to transportation planners and stakeholders to enhance the safety, effectiveness, equity, and resilience of the U.S. transportation infrastructure. These climate educational training programs are for the

USDOT employees to develop a standard of language for use in performance plans for staff engaged in climate change activities.

The entire Center is a complete abuse of U.S. taxpayer dollars and should be defunded immediately.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, my friends across the aisle can turn a blind eye to the wildfires, smoke-covered skies, life-threatening heat waves and extreme weather we now face nearly every day somewhere in this Nation.

We have seen the impacts of climate change in real time, and yet this amendment would hamstring our ability to meaningfully address the accelerating threat of climate change. Ignoring climate change in our approach to the transportation sector would be particularly egregious and irresponsible. It is, quite frankly, not an option.

Our transportation infrastructure is responsible for more greenhouse emissions than any other sector of our economy. This means that our approach to transportation investment can and must be one of the biggest parts of the solution.

Climate change also makes our roads, bridges, railways, and public transit more vulnerable to damage from extreme weather. We have to recognize our climate reality in order to make our infrastructure more resilient and less costly. Instead of rebuilding the same old infrastructure after disaster, we should be investing in climate-conscious, cost-effective solutions that ensure we build back stronger in order to equip our infrastructure to withstand the test of time and future disasters.

This is a matter of practicality, risk mitigation, and human safety. It also presents a tremendous opportunity to boost our economy by investing in new technologies and creating new jobs.

The Department's Climate Change Center is the agency's hub for research, policy analysis, partnerships, and action on climate change. I suppose some of my Republican colleagues are targeting it because they don't believe climate change is real and, unfortunately, we cannot have a productive debate when one side chooses to ignore scientific evidence and consensus.

Mr. Chairman, it is the functional equivalent of standing in the middle of an expressway, closing one's eyes, and saying there are no trucks. Trucks are coming. This is disheartening and puts our future at great risk.

I wholeheartedly support the Department of Transportation's efforts to create comprehensive approaches to reduce transportation-related greenhouse gases and improve the resilience of the transportation system. I believe the

American people support the cost savings, clean air, new jobs, and healthy environmental future that will come with working to achieve our climate goals.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1800

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, the DOT Climate Change Center is nothing more than an extension of the Green New Deal and just another waste of hard-earned taxpayer money to enforce the Green New Deal, forcing Americans to be transitioned over to electric vehicles, which they do not want.

I thought this was the land of freedom. I thought this was the land where Americans can pick and choose what they would like to buy and what they do not want to buy.

The Green New Deal and the Democrats' willingness to use the government to force Americans against their will to transition over to electric vehicles is nothing more than tyranny.

Here is an example of what comes out of this Climate Change Center—the Biden-Harris administration making \$100 million available to improve EV charger reliability. That was announced on September 13, 2023.

Here is a perfect example about how the Climate Change Center is being used to force Americans to drive electric vehicles, which is their goal the entire time.

The Federal Government's role is not to change how people spend their dollars and what they choose to buy for transportation.

The Federal Government's role, especially when it comes to the Department of Transportation, should be making sure that our roads are drivable and that our bridges are in good condition.

By the way, electric vehicles are heavy. That would put an undue burden on our bridges and on our roads. This is what they should be focused on, not the lie that, all of a sudden, climate change is real.

We have had tornadoes since the beginning of time. We have had earthquakes since the beginning of time. We have had hurricanes since the beginning of time.

This is not a new change in weather patterns. It is not a climate crisis. It is just called weather, and it has to do with seasons.

Another thing. The Biden administration has no right to lie to the American people and make the American people fund their lies.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Georgia has 30 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, stating the obvious, that the Department of Transportation's only purpose is to make sure that our roads and our rail systems are safe. The underlying bill, as proposed, dramatically reduces all the funds that do that and makes our rail systems and our highway systems far less safe.

To say that in the middle of a discussion on an amendment that has nothing to do with that is ridiculous, and it is a further reason I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, again, my amendment prohibits funds from being used for the Department of Transportation Climate Change Center because it is a complete waste of taxpayer money.

We are over \$33 trillion in debt, Mr. Chair. The American people cannot afford their money to be wasted and spent on lies.

We need the Federal Government to spend the Americans' hard-earned taxpayer dollars on good roads, good bridges, and good infrastructure.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOYLAN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program established under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment No. 57 to H.R. 4820, which would prevent DOT from carrying out the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program.

The Biden administration's stated goal for this latest government boondoggle is to utilize taxpayer funding to strategically deploy electric vehicle charging stations across America.

Not only is such an endeavor not the Federal Government's responsibility, but this program also doesn't work, won't work, and will end up wasting massive amounts of Federal money.

You need no further evidence than Secretary Granholm's recent experience of trying to take an electric vehicle out for a spin, a trip that ended in disaster and confirmed that EVs are overpriced, unreliable, and infeasible without massive Federal subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, the Biden administration through this policy and others that were buried in the so-called Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act is attempting to use taxpayer money to implement the Green New Deal, a pie-in-the-sky idea that is not only destined to fail but will waste massive amounts of money and further impoverish American citizens.

The Biden administration is pursuing such boondoggles despite the fact that we are already facing out-of-control inflation, increasing energy costs, and bone-crushing grocery bills, all because of Bidenomics, all because this administration is economically illiterate and obsessed with furthering the agenda of the U.N. and the World Economic Forum.

My fellow Wyoming citizens and Americans as a whole are more concerned with the prospects of heating their homes, putting food on the table, and taking care of their families.

Yet, what is the Biden administration focused on? Banning the internal combustion engine and forcing everyone into electric vehicles that won't work effectively in the vast majority of the country.

My amendment is designed to stop the Biden administration from continuing its wasteful and profligate spending on projects that do not provide a benefit to the American public.

Mr. Chair, I urge my fellow Members to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise with a great deal of respect for my colleague but in opposition to this amendment, which seeks to cut funding from the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program.

Here is the reality. The world is moving to alternative transportation. It is not all going to be electric vehicles. It could be hydrogen. It will be others.

Right now, electric vehicles are the future of transportation in this country and in the world, and we are competing in a global marketplace.

As we continue to invest in this EV transition, it is critical that we get the charging infrastructure right. We must do everything within our power to keep America competitive, to make it easier for consumers to make this transition, and that is what this program does.

It plays a vital role in expanding our charging infrastructure, alleviating fears, and creating an interconnected

network that everybody has access to, not just those that have access to expensive chargers.

The National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program provides funding to States to deploy EV charging infrastructure and establishes networks that make them more accessible.

Let's work together to expand EV charging accessibility and invest in American-made EV chargers. We must support and advance through development the production and distribution and the infrastructure nationwide.

To meet these goals, we have to get serious. We have to roll up our sleeves and get to work. Defunding these programs is not how we should be legislating.

To ensure that we have a competitive future and that we are competing in a global marketplace with other countries and their manufacturers, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Rather than supporting our domestic energy production and investing in much-needed roadway infrastructure projects, the Biden administration has opted to continue skewing the definition of infrastructure to pursue its electric vehicle and renewable energy subsidy programs.

The Biden administration, in other words, continues to do the bidding of the Chinese Communist Party and the richest among us who can afford electric vehicles while leaving everyday Americans behind.

Let me be clear. This technology that DOT is pursuing and implementing has a track record chock full of failure, particularly within my State as the freezing temperatures wreak havoc on batteries while also severely limiting the range of these vehicles.

We have story after story of electric vehicles being limited to less than 100 miles in range as they are driven over our high mountain passes in freezing temperatures.

This effort to force everyone into electric vehicles is not only wrong-headed and not within the purview of DOT but downright dangerous.

It is also important to note that under this program, State recipients are expected to construct vehicle charging stations within 50 miles of each other on major highways.

This requirement alone is not feasible when confronted with the reality of Wyoming's vast rural terrain and wide-open spaces.

There are 80,000 vehicles a day that drive across I-80 in Wyoming. I-80 is the most important commercial transportation link from the East to the West Coast, and in Wyoming it varies in elevation from 4,000 feet to 8,000 feet. Electric passenger cars and electric 18-wheelers are simply not feasible in Wyoming.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, let me be clear. This is yet another attempt by the Biden administration to force us to transition to an electric future, whatever that may mean.

It can only do so if it uses our money to artificially prop up the electric vehicle industry that could otherwise never survive in a free market system, at least not in its current space.

Mr. Chairman, it is past time for this administration to halt its wasteful allocation of billions of hard-earned taxpayer money on the infrastructure that is destined to fail.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for remote work arrangements within the Department of Transportation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of my amendment No. 58, which would prohibit the Department of Transportation from funding remote work agreements.

The DOT defines its telework agreements where an employee performs work away from the typical office location and is not expected to report to the agency official work site on a frequent, regular, or recurring basis.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stood in this Chamber and said before on numerous occasions, it is time for our Federal Government employees to return to work.

Under the panic related to COVID-19, we watched as our Federal agency buildings occupancy dwindled to almost nothing. What was the consequence? A substantial reduction in

the timely provision of Federal services to the citizens of this country.

It should not come as a surprise to anyone that when our Federal employees don't show up for work, the work of the Federal Government doesn't get done.

Now, some may say that is okay, but what it means in practice is that our tax refunds are not timely processed, our passport office effectively shuts down, creating enormous backlogs for this important service, and our veterans suffer.

I have now filed several of these let's make our government employees return to work amendments to other appropriations bills. This is a priority of the Republican Members of the 118th Congress and a priority of mine.

I know how hard our miners, farmers, ranchers, waitresses, nurses, construction contractors, home builders, grocery store clerks, and others in the private sector work.

They didn't have the luxury of working from home, COVID or no COVID. They have powered our economy over the last couple of years, and we owe them a debt of gratitude. We also should have enough respect for them to demand that the people who earn a paycheck because of their tax dollars actually show up for work.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, again, this is a very similar amendment to what has been considered before. Those agreements addressed in this amendment, where they exist, have been negotiated by OMB, labor unions, and management and have been in place under Republican and Democratic administrations.

Again, this kind of sweeping prohibition, which fails to consider or address circumstances under which remote work arrangements may be beneficial to the taxpayer or a necessary accommodation for an employee, is not a serious approach to policymaking.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, in pursuing the policy of requiring our Federal employees to work in our Federal offices, I have always been cognizant of the outlier situations whereby someone will need to work remotely. I am not opposed to such flexibility, although that flexibility has now become the rule.

I have left untouched the ad hoc telework programs for these various agencies because we never know when an emergency or unexpected situation will arise. Such an unexpected situation, however, should not become the

norm, and our employees should be required to report to work.

We still have not yet assessed the damage the Federal Government's remote work policy has had on constituent services, congressional oversight, and Federal waste in terms of the unused office buildings and agency officials unaccounted for because they are not being monitored in their official work sites.

Even the GAO admits there is not enough information to assess the long-term impacts of remote work policies, including whether it promotes a productive work environment.

Mr. Chairman, the policy of this Republican majority has consistently been that COVID is over and Federal workers must come to work, and this amendment aims to deliver on that promise.

Unelected agency officials already believe they are unaccountable to Congress and the American people. Remote work further undermines our ability to oversee their activities and to promote providing the very best services that the Federal Government can provide to our citizens.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 59 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to conduct a competitive analysis of mergers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which states: None of the funds made available by this act may be used to conduct a competitive analysis when evaluating mergers.

Beginning January 1, 1989, Congress vested primary authority to review airline mergers with the U.S. Department of Justice. Since that time, the Department of Transportation has deferred to DOJ to determine whether a merger between U.S. airlines should be challenged on competition grounds.

The Department of Transportation's general counsel under President Obama described the DOT's role in airline mergers as follows: "With respect to

DOT's competition and public interest review authorities, DOT's practice has been to use its expertise with respect to the airline industry to provide the Department's views and otherwise assist the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) in DOJ's analysis of airline mergers or acquisitions."

The Department of Justice recently challenged an airline merger. This amendment doesn't have anything to do with that court case. In fact, it is well within DOJ's rights and authority to challenge mergers, but what concerns me is that the DOT's Secretary, Pete Buttigieg, expressed publicly that his Department has "generally not gotten involved in these merger cases, but that is changing today."

Between 2009 and 2016, under the Obama administration, there were nine successful airline mergers. In fact, in over 30 years, the DOT has not prevented the transfer of operating certificates for any airline merger. This begs the question: Why now?

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, let me begin by saying that the sponsor of this amendment, I believe, is on the T&I Committee, which has jurisdiction over aviation and rail. This is an amendment which would be better off being moved forward as an authorizing proposal rather than going forward as an appropriations amendment.

This amendment makes it plain as day that the Republicans are happy to put the interests of big corporations ahead of protecting the American people from corporate greed that increases costs, reduces quality of service, and limits options. Specifically, it prohibits any funds for conducting a competitive analysis of mergers, which raises concerning implications for both airlines and rail.

The Department of Transportation is required by law to certify to Congress that an approved airline merger is in the public interest and provide an analysis of the effects of the merger on competition in the domestic airline industry. Congress itself has set forth in law a list of factors that are considered in the public interest, which includes several related to competition.

Yet, this amendment would prohibit the Department of Transportation from complying with that requirement and from even conducting an analysis or considering factors Congress has specifically identified as important, shirking all responsibility to the public interest.

At the same time, this broad amendment would implicate all T-HUD agencies, also impacting competition in the rail industry and our understanding of competition in the housing market.

The Surface Transportation Board has authority over railroad corporate



mergers and acquisitions and similarly may approve such mergers only when it finds them to be in the public interest. This requires evidence that the proposed merger will affirmatively enhance competition, efficiency, and quality of service.

This amendment ties the hands of the agency with exclusive merger jurisdiction involving railroads, even as the number of Class 1 railroads has fallen from 40 to 6 since 1980.

Further, the Department of Housing and Urban Development would be prevented from conducting any competition-related analyses to inform our understanding of rental markets, even as Americans face rising rents and corporate landlords are caught price-fixing.

Competition is critical to protecting consumers from corporate greed and fostering a flourishing market economy, something we should all fight for.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this misguided amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), my friend across the aisle, the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative State, Regulatory Reform, and Antitrust.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. MASSIE's amendment, which prohibits the Department of Transportation from expediting funds to conduct competitive analyses of mergers.

In 1989, Congress transferred authority to review airline mergers to the Department of Justice. Mr. Chair, 35 years of DOT policy is clear. DOJ has the lead role in reviewing proposed airline mergers, given its statutory authority to enforce the antitrust laws. This is consistent with Congress' determination that the deregulated airline industry should generally be subject to the same application of antitrust laws as other unregulated industries.

I must say that as ranking member of the Administrative State, Regulatory Reform, and Antitrust Subcommittee, I am committed to protecting consumers, competition, and innovation. Before the DOT moves ahead with this new, unprecedented approach, we must take time to evaluate the merits of this policy. This amendment will grant us time to do just that.

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

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), my colleague.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. Let me reiterate the point that was just made that this is such a break from the norm in the evaluation of these antitrust analyses going forward. DOJ has had that responsibility.

I particularly thank the gentleman for really staying on top of this. This is clearly an overreach by the Biden administration, and I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure how to phrase this, but I would ask the sponsor of this amendment, through the Chair, a question.

I believe he referred to the Secretary of Transportation's name. I wasn't sure I heard that correctly. If the Chair could ask that the sponsor repeat what he referred to the Secretary of Transportation. Acoustics aren't always great here, so I want to make sure I got it right.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. Yes, well, I would reserve the balance of my time, and I would ask the question through the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman reserve?

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, but I would still like to make sure I heard what I thought I heard.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized and has the right to close.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the answer is that the sponsor doesn't want to repeat what he may have said. I just didn't hear it.

At this point, I am prepared to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, as a member of the Transportation Committee, I had the honor to question Secretary Buttigieg on whether he had this authority and what metrics he would use to exercise this authority.

It was obvious that they don't have any experience in the DOT to review these mergers because they haven't done it. It is for that reason that I urge adoption of this amendment. We don't need redundancy among the Departments. We need an all-of-government approach, and that is what this amendment seeks to do.

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

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement section 24220 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (49 U.S.C. 30111 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which states: "None of the funds made available by this act may be used to implement section 24220 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act."

My amendment is simple. It will defund the Federal mandate that requires all new vehicles after 2026 be equipped with a kill switch that can disable a vehicle if the vehicle has monitored the driver's performance and the vehicle determines that the driver is not performing well.

It is so incredible that I have to offer this amendment. It almost sounds like the domain of science fiction, dystopian science fiction, that the Federal Government would put a kill switch in vehicles that would be the judge, the jury, and the executioner on such a fundamental right as the right to travel freely, but here we are.

It is Federal law that this is mandated, and so I am offering this amendment to defund this mandate.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the ranking member of the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

□ 1830

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Let me be clear. The act that the gentleman is trying to defund does not require auto manufacturers to install kill switches. It does not do that.

Passive drunk driving technology is a vital tool in safeguarding our loved ones and other innocent people on our roads. This new technology offers a lifeline of hope to not only save lives

but to prevent the lifelong emotional toll and gargantuan costs these accidents inflict on families.

Deadly drunk driving accidents can echo across generations, but we can seize this opportunity to stop such tragedies.

Between 2019 and 2021, Florida saw a 31 percent increase in drunk driving crashes. In Mr. MASSIE's home State of Kentucky, 190 people were killed in drunk driving crashes in 2021 alone. That was a 26 percent increase.

When we saw these grim statistics, we acted in a bipartisan fashion in Congress. How often do we see that? Both Republicans and Democrats supported the HALT Act to require auto manufacturers to make this passive technology standard in new vehicles.

The sponsor of this misguided amendment will tell you that he worries about privacy concerns. We heard the same inane calls with seat belt requirements.

You don't have a right to engage in potentially fatal behavior that we know poses a major health threat to public safety.

Passive drunk driving technology is pro-police. This anti-drunk driving technology lightens the load on police officers, allowing them to focus on more pressing safety concerns.

The importance of this technology goes far beyond statistics. It is about saving lives, preventing heartbreak, and making our roads safer. It is a passionate call to action to prevent alcohol-impaired driving from shattering the lives of those we hold dear.

This amendment, I understand, was dubbed the kill switch amendment, and it does not require a kill switch. It simply requires passive technology to help us prevent drunk driving.

In the name of the 406 people who were killed by a drunk driver in my own State of Florida last year alone, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. Let's take steps to reduce deaths due to drunk driving, not increase them.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, drunk driving is a serious problem. That is why 31 States already have a law to implement interlock ignition technology where if you have been convicted of a DUI that you have to pass this test in order to operate your vehicle. This Federal law that I seek to defund goes far beyond that, and I regret that I have to spend some of my time reading the law to the other side of the aisle, but I will do that.

This law that was passed in a 1,000-page bill 2 years ago requires that automobiles can passively monitor the performance of a driver—not the blood alcohol content, but the performance of a driver of a motor vehicle—to accurately identify whether that driver may be impaired—not drunk; it says impaired—and prevent or limit motor vehicle operation. That is a kill switch.

Now, the question is how much time do you have once your dashboard tells you that it doesn't approve of your

driving? What if you are a single mother and you're out in bad weather and you're trying to avoid some obstacles, ice perhaps, and you have swerved three times and your dashboard says swerve one more time and you are going to be put over to the side of the road, that you will have 100 yards to park this vehicle in the middle of nowhere with your children in the back seat?

This isn't some fantastical scenario. This is what will happen if this is implemented. This is the law. I have read it to you here.

Now, you maybe should have read it 2 years ago when you all voted for it on that side of the aisle, but it was in a bill that was 1,039 pages long. I can understand how you don't know what the law has in it, but I have read it to you.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, more than 10,000 people die every year from drunk driving crashes. Drunk drivers are seven times more likely to be involved in a fatal crash than a sober person.

You would think that the Republicans would want to do something about it. Democrats have done something about it and said that NHTSA now will have drunk driver prevention technology.

This technology has the potential of saving thousands of lives, and I don't see that you are agreeing that we should be saving those lives. I would say we should all vote against the drunk driver protection act.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, we actually don't know how this technology is going to work. They don't know over at the DOT either, because we have sent a letter to them, that they haven't responded to yet, asking them: Will this have cameras inside the car? Will it monitor your eyes to see if you are focused on the road? Will it have cameras on the outside of the car?

How will it know what your performance is relative to the road that you are driving on, if it doesn't, in fact, know which road you are driving on? Will it need to know where you are when you are driving? If so, who has access to this data? Who has access to those cameras?

Will the Fourth Amendment be followed? Will you require a warrant for your insurance company to access this data? Will you require a warrant for the government to access this data? Once your car has been disabled and now you are on the side of the road

with your children in it, for reasons you don't understand, how long until the police show up? What if you truly are disabled and you are over to the side of the road, does anybody show up?

How long do you have to get out of the vehicle? Who decides when your vehicle kill switch is disabled and you get to drive again? Who is going to adjudicate that on the side of the road? What if it is rush-hour traffic? What if you know you have already got points against you, according to your dashboard, and it has monitored your performance and now somebody's pet is in the road? Do you swerve to miss it and get your car disabled?

What if there is an emergency vehicle approaching from behind you and you know the right thing is to swerve off the road and let that vehicle pass? What if after you have done that three times and now your car says do it one more time and we are going to leave you on the side of the road?

This is in the law. This will become law in 2026, every vehicle manufactured after that. It is not about drunk driving. If it were, it would just be about blood alcohol content.

This law has far more than that in it. It violates the Fourth Amendment. It violates so many amendments. It violates things that are so fundamental to our rights that they are not even in the Constitution, like the right to travel.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment. It will defund the law that was passed 2 years ago that the other side of the aisle doesn't even know exists.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

This amendment seeks to prohibit funding for the implementation of a bill known as the Honoring the Abbas Family Legacy to Terminate (HALT) Drunk Driving Act. I wrote it. I am the sponsor.

The HALT Drunk Driving Act honors the Abbas family from Michigan who were tragically killed in a car accident by a drunk driver. It requires NHTSA to do a rulemaking to create rules for impaired driving prevention technology in new vehicles to stop these tragedies from continuing to occur.

Thirty-seven alcohol-impaired driving deaths happen every day, equivalent to a death every 39 minutes. Studies show that the HALT Act would save over 10,000 lives annually. Our constituents agree. We need to stop drunk driving by making impairment prevention technology standard in new vehicles. If the technology exists to prevent drunk driving, why wouldn't we consider it?

Let me close by saying this amendment and the sponsor mischaracterized what the HALT Act is. It does not mandate kill switches or allow data collection that invades vehicle occupants' privacy. I protect data privacy

in vehicles probably more than the sponsor of this does. That is ridiculous. It doesn't monitor how you drive.

This amendment is an insult to every American who has been hurt or lost loved ones to drunk driving, including the Abbas family. Let's honor the memory of those affected by drunk driving.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, let me close by saying this. I gave the gentleman from Kentucky an opportunity to clarify his pronunciation of Secretary Buttigieg's name. I have the belief that he purposely mispronounced it to disrespect him. If he wants to correct that by correctly pronouncing it, I would yield the time to him.

As they say, it speaks for itself.

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

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. MCCORMICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No 61 printed in part B of House Report 118–261.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer my amendment No. 61 to H.R. 4820, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2024.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, enforce, or otherwise carry out the following:

(1) Executive Order 14037 (relating to strengthening American leadership in clean cars and trucks).

(2) Executive Order 14057 (relating to catalyzing clean energy industries and jobs through federal sustainability).

(3) Executive Order 14096 (relating to revitalizing our Nation's commitment to environmental justice for all).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chair, my amendment would prohibit funds from this act from implementing President Biden's burdensome and misguided Executive Orders 14037, 14057, and 14096.

Executive Orders 14037 and 14057 set the following goals for the Biden administration's out-of-touch energy policy regulations: 100 percent of the electricity of the U.S. to be carbon pollution free by 2030 on a net annual basis; 100 percent of vehicles purchased by the government to be zero emissions by 2035; and that 50 percent of all new passenger cars and light trucks in the United States be electric vehicles by 2030.

These economically harmful goals represent Democrats' desire for central government planning that is not driven by public demand but by bureaucrats deciding what they think is best for our diverse, vibrant Nation of over 330 million people.

A prime example of Democratic failed policy initiatives is the story of the electric bus manufacturer, Proterra, a company that received extremely high praise from President Biden, as well as other administration officials.

According to President Biden, Proterra was getting us in the game for sustainable transportation. Well, after receiving millions upon millions of dollars in Federal Government funding, on August 7 of this year, Proterra filed for bankruptcy—this is not the first time this thing has happened where a government-subsidized company has gone bankrupt—citing a multitude of reasons, including the 9-figure debt. That does not sound sustainable to me.

Almost 2 years ago, the Department of Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg said that America should purchase electric vehicles so that they won't have to worry about gas prices again. Instead, they will have to worry about supply-chain disruptions and critical mineral sourcing, not to mention the cost of these vehicles.

Now, I don't know about the average American, but I guarantee you they don't spend an extra \$17,000 per year on gas. The average cost of an electric vehicle is over \$60,000 and on average costs \$17,000 more than a gas vehicle. This does not take into account if the battery goes bad. It will, and it costs about \$17,000 to replace that, too, which means people are going to be relying on the government for more subsidies.

These types of statements show just how out of touch the leftwing officials in the Biden administration can be. Switching to electric vehicles, or whatever future technology, must come naturally through free-market forces. Mandating a change is building an entire vehicle market on an expensive house of cards, and it will eventually come crashing down, just like Proterra.

Just as concerning is Executive Order 14096 and its crusade for so-called environmental justice. Mr. Chair, instead of simply declaring what is true and promoting environmental conservation, which most people would agree is a good thing, the Biden administration makes this about cultural

Marxism, oppressor versus the oppressed. This is toxic rhetoric.

Instead of tackling economic hardships facing Americans, the fentanyl crisis in our communities, the crisis along the southern border, and multiple crises overseas, the Biden administration is creating a narrative that fits their dark view of American history and executive policy that negatively affects Americans.

□ 1845

Everyone wants clean air, safe water, and access to the outdoors for all. Let's not make this about something it is not.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, we simply oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, Congress should not allow valuable taxpayer dollars to fund these executive orders that do nothing to help the American people.

Those demanding EV vehicles know the impoverished cannot afford them, which will cause even more dependence on government. That is the built-in harassment package that liberals have created—regulate people into dependence on government so they must vote for bigger government that can never be paid for but will forever be empowered over those who would otherwise be free to live the full measure of the American Dream.

Mr. Chairman, ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in part B of House Report 118–261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. NEHLS, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The salary of Ann E. Carlson, Acting Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the salary of

Ann Carlson, who is the acting administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, to \$1.

While we abhor her radical climate change agenda, questionable ethics investigation, and overall policy decisions, the reason for my amendment is because Ms. Carlson is serving as acting administrator after she failed to clear the Senate confirmation process for the position.

In March of 2023, the Biden administration submitted Ms. Carlson's nomination for the National Highway Traffic Safety administrator. Before the Senate could vote on her nomination and after Senator CRUZ led an effective opposition, the White House pulled her nomination once it was obvious that she was not going to be confirmed.

After the Senate effectively rejected her nomination, the White House nominated her to that same role as an acting official anyway, circumventing the Advice and Consent clause in the United States Constitution on Presidential nominations.

I view this as a constitutional overreach and a violation of the Federal Vacancy Reform Act, and so do our counterparts in the Senate.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, do we really want to target dedicated public servants and threaten their livelihoods because we disagree with them?

These public servants are doing their jobs, carrying out the policy of the administration they serve. They should be commended, not demonized.

Our government is dependent on them in our ability to attract the best talent to bring their skills to public service. We shouldn't be penalizing public servants who are representing the administration they serve based on these policy disagreements.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, in September of this year, 13 Republican Commerce Committee Senators sent a letter to President Biden urging him to immediately replace Ms. Carlson and appoint a new nominee.

The letter highlights that since Ms. Carlson's nomination is a violation of the Federal Vacancy Reform Act, all the agency's actions while she has held herself out as acting administrator should be voided.

This is an unacceptable situation for the Department of Transportation. Congress represents a coequal branch of government, and this administration isn't a monarchy. Congress must hold this administration accountable, and I urge all Members to vote for my amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. NEHLS from Texas, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Electric or Low-Emitting Ferry Pilot Program established under section 71102 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds being made available for the Federal Transit Administration's Electric or Low-Emitting Ferry Pilot Program.

This \$250 million program simply serves to further Joe Biden's radical climate change agenda and fund Green New Deal pet projects to support coastal elitists in blue States.

As an example, the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority received \$3.4 million to construct a new zero-emissions ferry. The Casco Bay Island Transit in Portland, Maine, received \$3.6 million to replace a passenger ferry with a new ferry equipped with a diesel hybrid propulsion system. The Kitsap Transit in Kitsap County, Washington, received \$7.7 million to replace a diesel vessel with a new, environmentally friendly battery-electric passenger-only ferry and necessary charging infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on. This is not the taxpayers' burden to bear these individual pet projects that I just named.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, my colleague is already trying to undo the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, which

included funding to improve and expand ferry service in rural and urban communities across the country.

These funds allow places like Georgia, Representative BUDDY CARTER's district, to acquire ferries and install charging stations to build on the innovation necessary to protect our waterways, reduce costs, and lower emissions.

These projects allow communities to work within and across States where waterways are shared and there are mutual benefits to advance technology. These funds also support the use of alternative fuels, which include, but is not limited to natural gas, hydrogen, and electricity.

Innovation should be championed by the Federal Government rather than discouraged, and our industry partners should be able to trust that we will stand behind bipartisan goals to create this pilot.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, those words are just another banner of pet projects. This is what the public is sick and tired of in this country, especially when we are \$33 trillion in debt.

Overall, ferries play a minor role in the United States transportation system, providing roughly 1 percent of the public transportation trips in 2019—1 percent. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act more than tripled the annual dedicated ferry funding, setting aside \$2.3 billion, with a b, for ferry funding.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, stop this boondoggle, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The salary of Julia Gordon, Assistant Secretary for Housing and the Federal Housing Commissioner, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment reduces the salary of Julia Gordon, who is the Assistant Secretary for Housing and the Federal Housing Commissioner, to \$1.

Ms. Gordon has a long history of anti-police rhetoric that makes her unfit for public office. Among other things, she retweeted an inflammatory post that described police officers as “the people killing us.”

She also suggested in a letter that she wrote—not a tweet or a retweet—that cases of police violence are not just outliers but “. . . stem from flawed and biased systems that require structural change.”

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, it can only be described as disgraceful to target dedicated public servants and threaten their livelihoods.

Our government is dependent on their skills and their dedication to the job to help this country go forward.

Ms. Gordon has been a strong advocate for and a hands-on practitioner working to expand access to homeownership and wealth building for millions seeking the American Dream.

If you have an issue with the policy, let's discuss that and not penalize her and other public servants.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, in response, it is her words that are inflammatory in a day and time that is uncalled for. My view is shared by the National Sheriffs' Association, a leading law enforcement group that opposed her nomination.

Ms. Gordon also has a troubling history of denigrating her fellow Americans residing in southern States, as I do. She retweeted an article that asserted the South has rejected nearly everything that is good about this country and has become just one big nuclear waste site of extremely radicalized resentment. That is unheard of.

We should not spend another dollar on paying her salary. By the way, she makes \$158,500, and when you add all the other things with it, she is probably closer to \$200,000.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt my amendment, and I yield the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SMUCKER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed part B of House Report 118–261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consider the social cost of greenhouse gases in the development and implementation of a budget for a Federal agency, in any Federal procurement processes, or when preparing an environmental review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits use of funds for the consideration of the social cost of greenhouse gases—and I don't know how they define social costs—in the development and implementation of budgets, Federal procurement, or environmental reviews.

□ 1900

President Biden is directing agencies to consider the flawed social cost of greenhouse gases in the development and implementation of budgets, the Federal procurement process, and environmental reviews.

Democrats use the social cost of greenhouse gases metrics to justify sweeping climate policies and strict regulations. This impacts everything from purchasing goods and services, conducting environmental reviews of all kinds, and levying climate penalties against private businesses.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to yet another attack on scientific consensus and on evidence-based approaches to addressing our climate reality.

This amendment would prohibit any agency funded in this bill from considering the social cost of greenhouse gases in budget formulation, procurement processes, or environmental reviews. It is an unconscionable denial of reality.

The social cost of carbon is simply an estimate, in dollars, of the economic costs or damage that will result from emitting one additional ton of greenhouse gases into the air.

Climate change has tangible and measurable economic impact on a myriad of aspects of our economy from agriculture to healthcare to infrastructure and energy use.

When heat waves, drought, or extreme storms affect crop yields, that

loss costs our economy and disrupts our food supply.

When smoke from wildfires and extreme heat or cold cause illness and death or homelessness increases due to extreme weather displacing people from their homes, that costs our healthcare and emergency service systems.

When hurricanes, flooding, and mudslides destroy critical infrastructure, supply chains are disrupted, and time and money must be spent to rebuild.

We know, beyond a doubt, that greenhouse gas emissions lead to increased atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> which leads to a warming climate which leads to more extreme weather and rising sea levels.

In 2022, the cost of climate and weather disasters in the United States totaled more than \$165 billion. In every decade since the 1980s, the average annual cost of these disasters has increased substantially.

The amendment before us would prohibit agencies from considering measurable and tangible economic costs when making policy and spending decisions. It would literally prohibit accounting for reality.

This is a whole new level of climate denialism, not just a personal denial of overwhelming scientific evidence and consensus, but a sweeping prohibition on ever acknowledging and considering certain evidence that Republicans would rather ignore.

This is, of course, particularly egregious in the case of the Department of Transportation, given that our transportation infrastructure is responsible for more greenhouse gases than any other part of the economy.

I can't overstate the recklessness and cynicism of enacting a prohibition on accounting for reality into the law.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the gentleman's amendment. In fact, in the underlying bill, we have included in section 126 a prohibition on the Department of Transportation from imposing requirements on State and local governments to prove emission reductions as a condition of receiving funds.

Nonetheless, the gentleman's amendment is even more comprehensive, which I support, because it would cover programs across this entire bill and several of the Biden executive orders that would harm our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage all of our colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as Sheriff Rutherford said, the social cost of greenhouse gases is an extremely inefficient policymaking tool that can be manipulated.

The Biden administration continues to use unproven figures to attempt to

justify its radical environmental policies that drive up the cost of every family in this country today.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 435. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled "Equal Access in Accordance With an Individual's Gender Identity in Community Planning and Development Programs" published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Register on September 21, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 64763).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits the use of funds for the implementation of the rule entitled "Equal Access in Accordance with an Individual's Gender Identity in Community Planning and Development Programs."

My amendment defunds an Obama administration's Housing and Urban Development rule that requires equal access for individuals in accordance with their gender identity in shelter programs that are funded from HUD's Office of Community Planning and Development. This means women and young children can be housed in shelters with a male stranger simply because these men identify as women.

Mr. Chairman, think about the impact this has on residents of female-only shelters when men who claim to be women are allowed to share bathrooms and shower access.

These concerns are not hypothetical. In California, nine homeless women filed a civil complaint after a homeless shelter enabled sexual harassment because a male identifying as a female entered the shelter and showered with a woman. In Alaska, a faith-based shelter filed a lawsuit because female residents would rather sleep in the woods in extremely cold temperatures than get harassed alongside a biological male.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would prohibit HUD from continuing to carry out an existing rule that ensures that all individuals have equal access to many of HUD's core shelter programs in accordance with their gender identity.

I am not sure why my colleagues are so intent on targeting such a vulnerable population, but I find it unconscionable.

This amendment would do serious harm to our efforts to protect one of the most vulnerable populations, LGBTQ youth, who comprise up to 40 percent of the homeless youth population and who are 120 percent more likely to experience homelessness than non-LGBTQ youth.

These young people are at an incredibly high risk of abuse on the streets. A study by True Colors United found that among homeless transgender youth: 75 percent had been victims of physical, emotional, or sexual abuse; 25 percent had been victims of intimate partner violence; and 20 percent had been victims of sexual exploitation or trafficking.

In addition, LGBTQ youth are two to three times more likely to commit suicide. Transgender youth also have high levels of HIV/AIDS, mental health problems, and substance abuse disorders.

When these young people arrive at a shelter, they are not a safety risk to others. They are desperate for help. We should be doing everything that we can to make sure these alternatives exist to living on the streets, and then when they ask for help, they are not turned away.

Frankly, it is not that difficult to help these people who need assistance while respecting their identities.

More than 300 domestic violence and sexual violence organizations have signed a national consensus statement agreeing that it is appropriate to serve transgender women alongside other women.

This amendment is not based on the facts. In reality, transgender women are particularly vulnerable to abuse in housing systems themselves. One survey found that over one-half of transgender respondents who stayed in a shelter in the past year were verbally harassed, physically attacked, and/or were sexual assaulted because of their gender identity. We should be doing more to protect this population, not less.

To ensure continued progress toward ending youth homelessness, we cannot roll back rules that ensure basic equal access rights and protect transgender youth from discrimination and violence when seeking shelter.

This amendment would lead to increased numbers of unsheltered homeless LGBTQ youth.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing we even have to debate this. It

just shows that my friends on the opposite side of the aisle support the perpetrators of the crime rather than the victims of the crime.

Forcing women and children to share their private spaces with biological men is wrong. It is dangerous in any setting, but especially in a setting as intimate and vulnerable as a homeless shelter.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fact that the safety of individuals who sleep in single-gender shelters is of the utmost importance. It doesn't mean provisions cannot be provided elsewhere for other individuals, but in this case, we need to ensure that people are both comfortable in their surroundings and are protected as they are coming out of difficult situations.

The proposal also puts burdens on religious organizations who might feel differently about gender identity than the current administration.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to purchase or lease a vehicle for use by the Secretary of Transportation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, my amendment prohibits funds from being

used to purchase or lease a vehicle for use by the Secretary of Transportation.

Two years ago, Secretary Buttigieg was gifted with a taxpayer-funded Mustang Mach-E for dedicated use. The retail value of this electric SUV was valued at more than \$40,000 and proudly assembled in Detroit, Michigan, USA, the auto capital of the world.

No. I am just kidding.

The Ford Mustang Mach-E has since been recalled for battery issues. Apparently the battery cannot handle owners flooring it. It was made in Mexico by foreign workers.

Putting aside the Secretary's own tone-deaf decision to use taxpayers' funds to purchase a not-made-in-America vehicle, Mr. Buttigieg's noted proclivity for the finer things in life apparently extended to any mode of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for air travel by the Secretary of Transportation other than in economy class on a commercial flight.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

□ 1915

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, if there is one thing that my colleagues, Republican or Democrat, can agree on, it is that government corruption undermines faith in our Republic, and none more than this present administration.

It would, therefore, be astounding to see or hear any Democrat attempt to justify opposition to this simple amendment that would prohibit funds for air travel by the Secretary of Transportation, or any other, in economy class on a commercial flight.

In February, we learned that the Office of Inspector General at the Department of Transportation was opening an audit into Secretary Buttigieg's extensive use of private jets. Despite the Secretary's own rhetoric on the need to

combat global warming, in the first 2 years of the Biden administration, Mr. Buttigieg took at least 18 flights using taxpayer-funded private jets.

Make no mistake, there is no excuse for Secretary Buttigieg to waste taxpayers' money on private planes when commercial options were readily available to him.

Mr. Chair, I urge passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. OGLES, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration titled "Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards for Passenger Cars and Light Trucks for Model Years 2027-2032 and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Heavy-Duty Pickup Trucks and Vans for Model Years 2030-2035", and issued on August 17, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 56128).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, access to affordable, reliable cars and trucks is critical to every facet of American life.

Instead of ensuring that Americans have access, the Biden administration has included a multifront fight against the internal combustion engine as a centerpiece of its war on American consumers.

On this front, it is the new corporate average fuel economy standards, known as CAFE, for 2027 to 2032, which ratchet fuel economy standards to require automakers to meet a fleet average of 58 miles per gallon.

You might as well put a top on a riding mower. Good luck with trying to get that kind of mileage.

Based on EPA's list of most efficient vehicles, no vehicle for model year 2023, even including the small hybrids, reaches 58 miles per gallon. A bicycle would probably be over 58 miles per gallon. There is no path to reaching a fleet average, which would include larger vehicles, that high in less than 10 years.

These standards will fail to increase actual vehicle efficiency because automakers already know that the goal is unachievable, and they won't waste their time trying to comply.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, NHTSA has issued a proposal to update fuel economy standards for passenger cars and light trucks, and that proposal is going through a public comment review period. Why would we stop that?

Fuel economy standards aren't new. These standards spur the auto industry to innovate in improving fuel economy to the benefit of consumers and the environment.

The administration's July proposal increases these standards to advance energy security, reduce carbon emissions, and save families money at the pump.

The rule is going through the rule-making process, and constituents and concerned parties can and should weigh in, but let's be clear about what improving fuel economy standards can do. This rule would save consumers more than \$50 billion on fuel over vehicles' lifetimes. It would reduce our dependence on oil, saving more than 88 billion gallons of gasoline through 2050. It would prevent more than 900 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the equivalent of taking more than 233 million vehicles off the road from 2022 through 2050.

By increasing fuel economy standards, we would be decreasing costs for Americans at the pump, which is something my colleagues claim to be so concerned about, but how dare such an improvement come with positive benefits like carbon emission reductions.

I support the administration's proposal to go through the rulemaking process to improve fuel economy standards to reduce costs for drivers, promote American energy independence, and reduce carbon emissions.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, this is more than just words. This is going to force American taxpayers to pay fines for falling short, which will increase the price of any new car with an internal combustion engine by thousands of dollars.

Biden has made it clear all along that his goal isn't to improve gas-powered cars but to eliminate them in favor of electric vehicles. If you talk to any car dealer, no one is buying them. Unless they had subsidies, they wouldn't be selling.

For many drivers, EVs simply aren't a viable option. They may not have a garage and may rely on street parking. They may live in an area where the electric infrastructure can't support the fast charging of an EV. They may drive long distances where, when you run out of electricity, good luck.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for transit-oriented development.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the use of any funds in this act for so-called transit-oriented development.

Contrary to the claims of proponents of such communities, they do not increase ridership on transit lines. Rather, they just ensure taxpayers subsidize development that would likely happen anyway.

Moreover, like transit investment generally, they do not create economic growth. Instead, these communities just subsidize the growth that would likely have occurred naturally.

This is a giveaway to developers in large urban areas, as most areas do not have the population density to support these communities. It does not address the more fundamental issue plaguing our Nation's transit systems than driving down ridership, which is the problem. Doing so will only result in wasted Federal resources that would be better directed toward core highway and bridge projects.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, this amendment, which would very broadly prohibit funding for transit-oriented development, "so-called" because that is what it is called, is yet another example of vague and sweeping overreach.

Communities in all of our districts rely on flexible HUD and DOT funding to close the gap on critical housing, transportation, and community infrastructure projects. Yet, this amendment would limit a recipient's ability to locally pursue different projects to determine where and how the community wants to invest.

Cities, towns, and suburban areas may pursue transit-oriented develop-

ment, which is simply an approach to urban development that aligns housing, commercial, and transit development for a variety of reasons unique to that community.

If a community wants to pair housing and transit development to save costs, reduce traffic congestion, increase access to essential goods and services, attract businesses, or connect Americans to good jobs, the Federal Government should not prohibit them from doing so.

Mr. Chairman, I find this place amusing in that we are for States' rights until we are not. We are Federalists until we are not. Apparently, it just depends on where you stand on an issue rather than whether they really believe in local jurisdictions having control over their own destinies.

No program in the underlying bill requires that funds be used for transit-oriented development, and there is no reason to adopt a restriction that prevents the use of funds for one particular approach to urban development.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, the gentleman says that Federalism is good sometimes but not other times, and States' rights are important sometimes but not other times.

Let me be clear: We are not talking about the transit lines themselves. This is transit-oriented development.

Let me break it down for everybody here. There is a transit line running somewhere. There is not a lot of ridership on it, so we have to boost the ridership. What that means is that we are going to subsidize some developer to build housing or whatever other development adjacent to the line to hope that those people will then get on that transit line. That is what is happening here.

You know what happens next. We subsidize the development. Then, the people who get into that development take their cars to wherever they are going and don't ride on the transit line.

If you have to have transit lines, God bless you. That is awesome. If you want to ride them, God bless you. That is awesome. There is no reason whatsoever that this is a Federal requirement or a Federal nexus at all to build developments next to transit lines.

If States and localities want to do that, if they want to subsidize them, God bless them, too. They should do that, but people in Pennsylvania shouldn't be supporting transit-related development in California any more than people in California should be supporting it in Illinois. That is no Federal nexus.

If Illinois wants to do it, they should. If Pennsylvania wants to do it, they should. We shouldn't require every taxpayer in the country to pay for transit-oriented development to boost ridership on the lines that don't have any so that we can justify the lines and then build more lines without any ridership.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, let us go back to the reality of the situation. I live in a transit-oriented development. I can walk 15 seconds outside my front door, get on the Red Line, and go downtown in Chicago, and I do. Many people do.

There is a reason we encourage transit-oriented development. It actually gets more people to ride transit, which is a good thing because they are not burning gasoline, not creating more climate change. It is better for the economy. It gets people to their jobs quicker and safer. If they want to do this, and it is an option and works the way that it actually does from personal experience, great.

What I said about people being for States' rights and not being for States' rights when it is inconvenient, I am implying that this amendment does just the opposite of what my father's Republican Party used to say, which is we are not going to dictate to local governments how they should function, how they should operate. This is a page out of the opposite book, and it is a horrible idea.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this is an awesome idea. I am glad that the gentleman can walk 15 seconds outside his door and get on the train and, as he says, more quickly and safely get to his destination. That is great. That is good for him.

If my colleague wants to pay for that, he should. If Illinois wants to pay for that, they should. I shouldn't have to pay for it.

By the way, while my colleague is talking about quicker and safer, of course, there are no metrics to support any of that.

I have no interest in riding mass transit. My daughters get on the bus every morning, and I remind them, as they are standing up there at the bus stop in the freezing cold waiting for the bus, that I hope they enjoy their mass transit. I hope they enjoy their public transportation because it is inefficient. It is not getting them there more quickly.

Riding in America's cities on mass transit, my colleague said it is safer. It seems like crime is on the rise in every single city. It is not "seeming so," it is so. It is not safe. It is not safe here in the Nation's Capital to ride on transit. It is not quicker. It is not safer. I am providing the same metrics to prove my point that you provided to prove yours, which are none.

□ 1930

Mr. Chair, this is about federalism. This is about subsidies and boondoggles and things that we can't afford while we are \$33 trillion in debt.

If somebody wants to build, if some developer wants to build next to the transit line because they think it will



help them sell their properties in their development more quickly, they should do that. Taxpayers shouldn't be involved.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the notice of proposed rulemaking of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration titled "Heavy Vehicle Automatic Emergency Braking" and issued on July 6, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 43174).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the use of funds to finalize, implement, or enforce the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's rule mandating automatic emergency braking systems on new commercial vehicles.

Isn't that wonderful, another mandate? Making the world better, making America better, making us more free, making everything more affordable, except it is not.

The IIJA, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, required the Department of Transportation to issue a mandate for heavy-duty trucks to be equipped with automatic emergency braking systems. It also required the DOT to consult with the commercial vehicle user community and address any existing deficiencies with automatic emergency braking systems before issuing its mandate.

The issue is that DOT has failed to meet both requirements, or any requirement.

There are real and legitimate concerns about false activations of the systems that remain unaddressed and must be dealt with before proceeding with any requirement.

Moreover, an integrated safety system with an automatic emergency braking system can add up to \$5,000 to the cost of a single truck. Oh, but it is always worth it. It is always worth it. We are going to be more safe if we have this stuff.

Meanwhile, we can't get anybody to drive a truck anymore. That is why we

are looking at automated trucks without drivers in them because we have depleted the truck driving industry. We have driven everybody out because they can't afford to get in or stay in.

With fleets operating on exceedingly tight margins, this mandated cost increase presents a barrier to entry for new market participants. It will also likely result in extending the life of current vehicles, causing these operators to miss out on the safety improvements of newer trucks that they won't buy.

I know it is counterintuitive, but when these rules are made, they never think about the additional cost that the truck owner or the person that wishes to buy a truck or replace a truck is going to have to incur. They just assume, well, they will just spend the extra \$5,000.

This is not where it ends. This is just one system. There are multiple systems on these new trucks and all new equipment. They just keep adding and adding.

Well, I don't understand why the cost of everything goes up. I can't figure it out. If you are on the left you can never figure those things out. It is because of you and the things that you do. That is why.

Moreover, this will likely result in an older truck fleet in the U.S., which is actually probably more dangerous because people are not going to replace trucks because they don't have the extra \$5,000. I know you think all truck drivers are made of money, but they are not.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, according to data from NHTSA's Fatality Analysis Reporting System and Crash Report Sampling System, heavy vehicles are involved in about 77,000 crashes a year, resulting in over 500 fatalities and almost 34,000 injuries.

NHTSA estimates that the proposed rule would prevent over 16,000 crashes a year, saving over 100 lives and reducing over 8,000 nonfatal injuries annually once all vehicles covered under this rule are equipped with AEB.

The rule is going through the rulemaking process, and constituents and concerned parties can and should weigh in, but we shouldn't stop the process altogether. I support the administration's proposal to go through the rulemaking process and appreciate that NHTSA is looking into ways of making our roads safer.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Illinois says that we ought to just go through the rulemaking process.

However, as I told you, there are real and legitimate concerns that have not been addressed, and that is why you go through the rulemaking process. It is not just a perfunctory, well, we asked for your input, and we got it. Now we are just going to disregard it and do what we want to anyhow, which is exactly what the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is doing, which is why we cannot fund this.

It is our government. The government serves us. It is not the other way around. It is just another example where we act like we are Oliver Twist begging for more gruel. The gruel is ours, Mr. Chairman, and we should not have to beg for it as the citizens of this country. This government belongs to us, not the other way around.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Keynesian economics, I guess, aside, the gruel belongs wherever the gruel belongs, but public safety belongs to everyone else. It is not just the trucking industry, it is the people who are involved in those injuries, as well. We need to be concerned about them.

The rulemaking process has existed under every American President during our lifetime. It is part of the democratic process. It should be respected. If people want to participate, fine, that is the way it should operate.

Mr. Chair, for all those reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, my colleague says that we should respect the rulemaking process. Maybe some of my colleagues here in Washington don't understand, don't recognize, won't acknowledge that this government has gotten too big, and the rulemaking process is really meant to shut out voices across America.

It is we here in Congress who should be making these rules, not unelected bureaucrats who have no accountability to the people that they impose these rules upon. It is we who should be doing this.

By the way, there were some folks who came in, they said, We oppose your amendment. We want this emergency braking system on trucks.

I said, Well, how about on your trucks?

Oh, no, no, we don't want it on our trucks. We want it on their trucks. We want it on someone else's trucks.

Everybody wants someone else to pay the freight until it comes to their doorstep, then they are not interested.

Mr. Chairman, this government is too big. This is an example of it. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to implement any of the following executive orders:

(1) Executive Order 13990, relating to Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science To Tackle the Climate Crisis.

(2) Executive Order 14008, relating to Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad.

(3) Section 6 of Executive Order 14013, relating to Rebuilding and Enhancing Programs To Resettle Refugees and Planning for the Impact of Climate Change on Migration.

(4) Executive Order 14030, relating to Climate-Related Financial Risk.

(5) Executive Order 14057, relating to Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability.

(6) Executive Order 14082, relating to Implementation of the Energy and Infrastructure Provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.

(7) Executive Order 14096, relating to Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania offering the amendments that he has offered. I am offering here an amendment that I have offered to other appropriations bills affecting other agencies that would prohibit any of the funding in this bill, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill, from being used to carry out President Biden's executive orders on climate change.

We have had success in moving this amendment on previous appropriations bills because, frankly, it is fairly obvious to most people in the Chamber, certainly to most Americans, that these executive orders are out of step and out of touch with where the American people are. They are pushing a radical agenda that is completely devoid of recognition of what is happening in every American's life right now, that they can't afford to buy even the home they live in, much less the fuel they need for their cars, buy the car that they need, be able to afford to pursue any of the initiatives put forward in terms of solar panels and other things because we are driving up the price of energy, making it impossible for people to live their lives because we are pursuing a radical agenda.

By the way, it is making us completely dependent on China at a time when we should be decoupling from China. It is at a time that is making it where we are not holding Iran accountable, and we are actually enriching Iran right now with our energy policies.

We are not sanctioning Iran. We are allowing them to sell oil to China. We

are advancing this agenda because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to put out this notion of climate change as being more important than the inflation that is wrecking the American family. I have had Members on the other side of the aisle testify to this in the Rules Committee. They literally have said that.

They are prioritizing this agenda over the American family today who cannot afford an automobile, cannot afford the gasoline to put in the automobile, cannot afford the energy prices in their homes, electricity, and can't even afford the houses because of what this administration has done with their policies to drive up the price of energy with a radical agenda.

In this case, Secretary Buttigieg is on a mission to overhaul the transportation sector saying, "Transportation ought to be responsible for the biggest share of the solution." DOT has established a Climate Change Center with the goal of decarbonizing the transportation sector by 2050.

In July of 2022, the Secretary said, "The more pain we are all experiencing from the high price of gas, the more benefit there is for those who can access electric vehicles." Right there is the agenda of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Right there is the agenda of the Biden administration. They want the American people to feel pain. Those are the words of the Secretary of Transportation.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, no one remembers who Edward Everett is. He spoke for a couple hours at Gettysburg. That speaks for itself.

There really doesn't need to be much in response to those who deny that climate is an existential threat, so I will just say two lines.

According to the data collected by NASA, the past 9 years have been the warmest years since modern record-keeping began in 1880. The 10 warmest years on record in world history have all occurred since 2010 in recorded temperatures.

We have to address that reality, and the fact is, our transportation infrastructure is responsible for more greenhouse gas emissions than any other sector of our economy. It needs to do the most to reduce that threat, as well.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, the problem is that if you listen to our Secretary, we saw that in 2 months after he made those comments, California asked EV owners to stop charging amid a heat wave.

Secretary Granholm literally pushed aside a pregnant woman and her family from the ability to charge at a charging station in order to do a photo op.

That is what we are doing. This is all about projecting an image. It is not about the real-life impact on American families. That is the truth. For example here, one of the Secretary's appointees to DOT's Advisory Committee on Transportation Equity—don't get me started on that—has said: "All cars are bad." All cars are bad.

This is about undermining the American way of life, and the fact of the matter is, if you eliminate the internal combustion engine—by the way, the internal combustion engine that is sitting in President Biden's 1967 Corvette—which I believe is a 327; I don't think he has the 427—doesn't get exactly a great deal of really good gas mileage and, in fact, is spewing out a whole lot more carbon than the average American's vehicle. By the way, I am totally fine with that because it is a great car, a great example of American awesomeness, to be clear.

The fact is when you have got an appointee of the Committee on Transportation Equity saying, "All cars are bad," that tells you exactly what the situation is.

If you eliminate the internal combustion engine, that will do nothing when you know that China has 1,100 coal-fired plants. We have about 250, and China is building a couple coal-fired plants a week, and we think that we are going to impact CO<sub>2</sub> production around the world?

How about we develop nuclear power? How about we let the American people live their lives? How about we let the American people not have their lives get crushed with radical policies?

That is why this amendment should be adopted.

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

□ 1945

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, we were quoting Dickens before. There is a line in Shakespeare. I will let somebody else fill in the rest of the lines. "It is a tale . . . full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

We are the first generation to feel the effects of climate change. We are the last generation that can do anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SANTOS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The salary of Polly Trottenberg, Deputy Secretary of Transportation, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SANTOS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Chair, flight patterns have become a silent threat to the health and well-being of Americans. One might ask: What does that have to do with this amendment?

Well, citizens of New York's metropolitan area and the continental United States are ceaselessly burdened by aircraft noise and pollution.

Residents in NY-3 have been begging elected officials like me to support mitigation efforts to give citizens plagued by ceaseless, noisy, and polluted skies a reprieve.

Taking aim at Deputy Secretary of Transportation Polly Trottenberg is not a punishment but rather a wake-up call holding her accountable for her inaction.

By reducing her salary to \$1, we send a strong message that the well-being of Americans should be the top priority, not the convenience of a select few.

Mr. Chair, the fight against harmful flight patterns doesn't end with Polly Trottenberg. We must also demand transparency, accountability, and a comprehensive review of flight patterns across the country.

It is time to put the health of our communities first and ensure that every decision made in the aviation industry reflects our values.

Let's work together in this body of Republicans and Democrats alike to make a real difference in our communities.

For years, NY-3's constituents and communities just like it have asked for help, and now I will put it in the RECORD and let it be known that a "no" vote is a vote against accountability for the people who allow millions of Americans to suffer under the arbitrary rules of the Department of Transportation, FAA, and air traffic control, to name a few agencies.

I urge adoption of my amendment to set a new tone and to have accountability for the people suffering from a lack of leadership on this segmented issue of our decaying transportation infrastructure under this administration.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, just for reference, the last statement made—this is the first administration in my lifetime that has passed a comprehensive infrastructure bill of this magnitude.

To suggest that it is going the opposite direction while supporting a bill

that guts much of that effort belies comprehension.

I sometimes wonder what people will think in the future when they ask us, dad or granddad, what did you do in Congress?

The best you can say is I cut a dedicated public servant's salary to a dollar because I disagreed with them.

Ms. Trottenberg has an extensive, 25-year-plus public sector career in all levels of government, including stepping up to serve as acting administrator for the FAA to help ensure this country and our global partners could continue to rely on the safety of our national airspace system.

We again should not be penalizing public servants who are representing the administration they serve based on policy disagreements. I can't imagine our Founding Fathers thinking this would be a good idea, but it is, I guess, the new normal.

It is no reason to support this amendment. I encourage my colleagues to oppose it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Chair, my colleague from across the aisle, he speaks with honesty, and I believe so, but I will say this: To call a public servant a bureaucrat, I think that is disingenuous, and the American people are sick and tired of us considering people who fail at their jobs continuously to continue to keep their jobs.

I think it is cutting back bad government. I think it is holding government accountable, and I think it is holding people who are inept accountable.

Ms. Trottenberg's time as FAA administrator was abysmal with very little accountability, with very little done. I stand strong that we should adopt my amendment.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, it is clearly our responsibility to hold people accountable. There are a number of ways to do that: call them to testify, question them all day long, say whatever you want in public within reason. It is quite another thing to make it so they can't do the job because you are only paying them a dollar a year. It is outside the realm, the barriers here, of what we are supposed to be about.

At some point, we went outside the norms. I have come to believe that norms are almost as important as the Constitution. You don't treat people this way.

They couldn't imagine that we would do this to each other. They had that foundation that is so critical, and the law is almost as critical.

I am starting to believe that the way we treat each other is the most important norm. If we can't act with a baseline sense of decency and respect that nobody's going to work for a dollar a year, respectfully, you are just messaging and insulting other people and disrespecting the dignity of this House.

We can and we must do better.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SANTOS).

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. SELF

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in part B of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 435. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the Equity Action Plan of the Department of Housing and Urban Development established pursuant to Executive Order 13985 entitled "Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which would prohibit funds from going toward implementing, administering, or enforcing the equity action plan of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This plan clearly violates the Federal civil rights law that has been in place since the 1960s. The intent of the Fair Housing Act is clear: to prevent "discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of dwellings based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status, and disability."

In other words, individuals with the financial means to rent or purchase a home cannot be discriminated against.

Unfortunately, the executive order signed by President Biden, and the equity action plan laid out by the Department of Housing and Urban Development stretches the definition of "fair housing" far beyond the original intent of Congress.

This administration has twisted the definition of the word "equity" to mean the exact opposite of fair and impartial treatment under the law.

Equity is the administration's way of manipulating the rule of law to offer preferential treatment to various constituency groups.

Rather than addressing the merits of those in need, the administration is conjuring up groups of individuals who have been assigned a predetermined victimhood status.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, again, it has to be pointed that there is a level of being completely ridiculous that two straight White men are debating all the issues of equality and equity as if we have faced them all our lives. We can't be the judge or the jury in this country on who should be served by the Federal Government.

While we are probably not the best people to speak on the issue, let's try to make clear what I think my colleagues are really saying. What they are really saying is they don't like diversity, and they absolutely don't like inclusion. They don't want to address discrimination against people of color, LGBTQ people, people with disabilities.

They don't want to build a Nation that supports people at the greatest risk of homelessness. Not caring allows them to ignore this insurmountable problem, but it doesn't make it less real.

It is not radical to want to build a country that is welcoming to all people from different backgrounds, but they do want you to believe that our country has reckoned with its history of discrimination.

They want you to believe that these issues are things in the distant past. They are wrong. They are attempting to legislate away those who look, think, or feel differently. That is not American. That is authoritarianism.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my deep concern about the Biden administration's equity action plan at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

We must ensure that American tax dollars allocated to HUD are spent based on financial need and readiness, not the Democrats' divisive social justice agenda.

These equity action plans direct the department to give special attention to individuals based on their race or if they identify as transgender or gender nonconforming. These criteria have no place in providing affordable housing and ending homelessness.

Helping Americans out of homelessness or helping them to buy their first home should be based on only preparedness and creditworthiness.

Anything else does them a disservice in the long run, as evidenced by the housing collapse of 2008, which was the result of unscrupulous promotion of subprime loans.

It is a fundamental tenet of our Republic that we treat all Americans equally, regardless of their race or creed. If any American is struggling, they should have equal access to assistance.

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

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ROSENDALE. The Department of Housing and Urban Development should support those who are in need and ready to receive or help—no need for equity action plans.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support Congressman SELF's amendment.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chair, when considering the mission of this equity action plan, it becomes clear that instead of rewarding people based on their merits, the government is attempting to pick winners and losers.

This policy would negatively impact Americans by creating the potential of another housing crisis, as my good friend mentioned, and exacerbating existing problems embedded in our economy.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, again, in a moment of self-awareness, we are a bunch of straight White guys talking about social justice.

When did a social justice agenda become a bad thing? Again, who am I to say, but weren't the leaders of the civil rights movement leading a social justice agenda?

Does anyone imagine that that notion that we read about, as you go down to the archives, toward a more perfect union, does anyone think that we have met that and that housing and transportation have to be fundamental toward the ends of that agenda that we talked about?

In the end, wasn't Lincoln saying that 87 years ago—every once in a while, we have to ask ourselves did we really mean it when we said that we were all created equal?

We have to ask ourselves that today. We still have a long way to go, and it runs through all our systems, including our transportation and our housing systems. It is not a bad word.

Someone needs to stand up to you when you do this. It is wrong. This amendment is wrong. This bill is horrible because of these things.

I oppose it, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

□ 2000

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chairman, let me be very clear. We are discussing an executive order here.

Mr. Chair, if this is so important, bring a bill to the floor of the House. Do not give us an executive order. It is clear that this executive action plan will be rejected by the courts because it is in violation of the 14th Amendment.

This administration is clearly attempting to hide under layers of bureaucratic red tape and, in the process, grow the administrative state and

erode the power that voters have invested in this body. This action plan is, in fact, so radical that it won the endorsement of Marxists, who openly proclaim: "Keep dismantling the organizing principle of this society."

We should not fund this initiative. It is time for Congress to do its job by directing taxpayer dollars to priorities that affect all of our constituents.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SELF) having assumed the chair, Mr. SMUCKER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4820) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

---

#### APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE AMERICAN FOLKLIFE CENTER IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 2103(b), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress on the part of the House for a term of 6 years:

Ms. Amy Kitchener, Fresno, California

---

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7455(a), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. BISHOP, Georgia