

Kim (NJ)	Omar	Slotkin
Krishnamoorthi	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Landsman	Panetta	Sorensen
Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Soto
Lee (CA)	Payne	Spanberger
Lee (PA)	Pelosi	Stansbury
Leger Fernandez	Peltola	Stanton
Levin	Perez	Stevens
Lieu	Peters	Strickland
Lofgren	Petterson	Swalwell
Lynch	Phillips	Sykes
Magaziner	Pingree	Takano
Manning	Porter	Thanedar
Matsui	Pressley	Thompson (CA)
McBath	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
McCollum	Ramirez	Tlaib
McGarvey	Raskin	Tokuda
McGovern	Ross	Tonko
Meeks	Ruiz	Torres (CA)
Menendez	Ruppersberger	Torres (NY)
Meng	Ryan	Trahan
Mfume	Salinas	Trone
Moore (WI)	Sánchez	Underwood
Morelle	Sarbanes	Vargas
Moskowitz	Scanlon	Vasquez
Moulton	Schakowsky	Veasey
Mrvan	Schiff	Velázquez
Mullin	Schneider	Wasserman
Nadler	Scholten	Schultz
Napolitano	Schrier	Waters
Neal	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Neguse	Scott, David	Wexton
Nickel	Sewell	Wild
Norcross	Sherman	Williams (GA)
Ocasio-Cortez	Sherrill	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Garcia (IL)	Kuster	Pocan
Hunt	Larson (CT)	Steube

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1655

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 8, 2023.

TO SPEAKER KEVIN MCCARTHY: With my appointment with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I must regretfully withdraw from the House Foreign Affairs Committee for the 118th Congress. It is my intent to return to this Committee at the next opportunity. This is effective immediately.

Sincerely,

Rep. CHRISSY HOULAHAN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY:

Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY, Following my appointment to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I hereby resign from the House Foreign Affairs Committee, effective today.

Sincerely,

ABIGAIL D. SPANBERGER,
Member of Congress, VA-07.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

□ 1700

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 102

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Higgins of New York, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Peters, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Doggett, Ms. Wexton, Ms. Jackson Lee, Ms. Omar, Mr. Trone, Ms. Balint, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Panetta.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Costa, Mr. Crow.

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 103

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Norman, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Grothman, Mr. Smucker, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Carter of Georgia, Mr. Cline, Mr. Good of Virginia, Mr. Bergman, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Roy, Mr. Moore of Utah, Mr. Valadao, Mr. Estes, Mrs. Bice, Mrs. McClain, Mrs. Fischbach, Mr. Yakym, Mr. Brecheen, Mr. Edwards.

Ms. STEFANIK (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, February 9, 2023.

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

There was no objection.

DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE LOCAL RESIDENT VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 97, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 24) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 97, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 24

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress disapproves of the action of the District of Columbia Council described as follows: The Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Act 24-640), enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia on November 21, 2022, and transmitted to Congress pursuant to section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act on January 10, 2023.

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

The gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 24, disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022, introduced by the chairman of the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability, JAMES COMER of Kentucky.

Our Nation's Capital City is in crisis. Crime is rampant. Students in D.C. Public Schools suffered historic learning loss because Democrats kept schools closed. Buildings are sitting empty while Federal workers continue to work from home.

The D.C. Council has prioritized a bill to allow noncitizens, including illegal immigrants and foreign employees at embassies openly hostile to the United States to vote in local elections.

This move by the D.C. Council dilutes the votes of American citizens, including the many residents of the District who struggled and sacrificed to obtain legal citizenship the right way.

Voting is a pillar of American democracy and a constitutional right that must be protected and preserved for citizens of our country. Voting is how Americans exert their will upon their government.

Voting ultimately determines how laws are written and enforced so that citizens can shape the rules under which they can earn a living and be protected from harm.

Voting is an essential privilege and responsibility established at great cost throughout our Nation's history.

To quote one of our Founding Fathers, Samuel Adams: "Let each citizen remember at the moment he is offering his vote . . . that he is executing one of the most solemn trusts in human society."

On November 21, 2022, the D.C. Council chose to trash this solemn trust by granting this sacred right of voting to anyone residing in the District, including those here illegally and other non-citizens.

Just think about the immediate implications of this law. Our Nation's Capital City plays host to virtually hundreds of foreign organizations and embassies. Many of these foreign nationals have interests directly opposed to those of the United States, and they make no claim otherwise.

D.C.'s law makes zero exceptions for such individuals whose role may be to disrupt or destroy the American way of life and principles our Nation stands upon.

For years, Democrats in Washington denied potential foreign influence in our electoral process, but D.C.'s new law potentially allows foreign agents from China, Russia, and other adversaries to participate in local elections held within this Nation's Capital City.

It is no secret that President Biden's policies have created the worst border

crisis in American history, bar none. Just this week, the Committee on Oversight and Accountability heard from the U.S. Border Patrol about how the Biden administration's policies are undermining their ability to secure our southern border. Now, D.C. Democrats are providing another magnet for illegal immigration.

This law is so bad that the D.C. Council even lost the support of The Washington Post's editorial board. In October of last year, The Washington Post editorial board announced it opposed the bill declaring that "voting is a foundational right of citizenship."

The Post went on to note that allowing an estimated 50,000 noncitizen D.C. residents to vote is just simply a bridge too far. I think most of us can agree on that, and I think most of the American people would certainly agree with that.

Even D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser agrees with us. She chose to withhold her own signature from this legislation. While the bill was ultimately enacted without her support, it is shocking that even the progressive Democrat Mayor of D.C. does not support the actions of this out-of-control D.C. Council. If a bill goes too far for Mayor Bowser, then the alarm bells should be ringing in every State and locality across the Nation.

Our free and fair elections are the hallmark of a healthy democracy, and we must protect them. The D.C. Council's law intends to do the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge you to support the resolution of disapproval to stop this radical reform in its tracks.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 24, which seeks to nullify the duly enacted laws of the District of Columbia and violates the principle of local, democratic self-government, which is at the heart of the home rule charter for Washington, D.C., and also violates the equal protection and democratic principles that animate our Constitution.

I would like to begin just by observing a striking juxtaposition in contrast between the address we heard last night, the State of the Union Address from the President, and the lecture that we just received now from the floor leader.

President Biden appeared here with a message of unity under the powerful economic growth that we are experiencing as a country—12 million new jobs added, record progress that we are making on climate change, massive investment in the American people in the Inflation Reduction Act and the Infrastructure Act, the \$1.2 trillion investment in the roads, highways, bridges, ports, and airports.

We are dramatically reducing healthcare costs for people in the Medicare program, reducing to \$35 a month what diabetics have to pay for their insulin shots.

We are making progress for America. So, what do our good friends across the aisle come back with today, the day after this great statement of national purpose and progress? They want us to become the supercouncil for the District of Columbia and begin to micro-manage the bills that are being passed by the representatives locally of 713,000 people.

With no national agenda, with no plans for getting on board with American progress, what do they have? Well, they are going to bring us a whole series of these disapproval resolutions for the people of Washington, D.C.

They don't want to vote in Washington, D.C. They don't want to live in D.C. They can move to D.C. and run for D.C. Council if that is their interest, but no, they just want to lord it over the people of Washington.

They don't like the District of Columbia's voting rules, and they don't like the criminal justice reform they just engaged in for a period of a decade with judges and lawyers, the D.C. Bar, and the people participating. They don't have a hearing on any of it. They just want to decree that they are going to strike it down.

Just you wait, they will be coming back with gun safety laws that will appear in Congress from the people in D.C. because there is that part of the home rule charter that gives us this opportunity if we want to micro-manage their policies.

We will see gun safety laws; we will see abortion legislation; we will see equal rights for the LGBTQ population—all of these things the Republican minority used to do a long time ago. They have brought back the worst possible instincts.

They don't want to have a hearing on it. We didn't have a single hearing in the Oversight and Accountability Committee about any of this legislation. None of it.

Did they go to the D.C. Council when it was debated? No, they didn't do that.

Did they invite the Mayor or the D.C. Council to come here? No, they didn't do that.

They just decided they are going to slap around the local population. None of us would accept it for the localities that we represent.

Now, it so happens that people in Washington, D.C., are not just a locality and municipality. The people in Washington are involved right now in a petition for statehood admission to the Union.

In fact, in the 116th Congress and the 117th Congress, this body voted to approve their petition for statehood, but our friends across the aisle opposed that.

It passed the House. If the Senate had approved it, well, then the people of D.C., or whatever their local system is, would be able to decide these things on their own, just like the people in New York City or Albany or any other town in New York would be able to decide for themselves.

I thought that our friends over there were interested in local self-government. I thought they supported home rule, but apparently not when it comes to the people of Washington, D.C.

We reject this throwback attempt at micromanaging the affairs of the people of Washington. They don't need lectures about voting rights. They need voting rights. They are the only population of taxpaying, draftable American citizens in the country who don't have equal voting rights in Congress.

When January 6 came and people stormed this Chamber and waged violence against the Capitol Police, against the Metropolitan Police Department, against hundreds of people who live in Washington, as well as in Maryland and Virginia, the people of Washington stood with democracy. They stood with Congress.

They have a legitimate grievance, not a phony, counterfeit grievance. They are not claiming to have won an election they didn't win. All they are asking for is equal rights.

Let's grant them their statehood. If you can't stomach the idea that they would be a State, at least allow them their home rule rights to decide for themselves who is going to vote in Washington, D.C., what their criminal laws are going to be, what their laws on abortion are going to be, and what their civil rights and civil liberties practices are going to be in the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Chairman COMER's resolution disapproving of the D.C. Council's recent action to allow noncitizens, including illegal immigrants, to vote in local elections. The council's actions undermine voter confidence, faith in our elections, and, ultimately, the sovereignty of the United States.

Voting is a sacred right reserved only for American citizens. That is why Federal law and the Constitution prohibit noncitizens from voting in Federal elections.

In order to further promote integrity in our elections, many States have also prohibited noncitizens from voting in their State and local elections. Our Nation's Capital should be a model for the rest of the country, but for years, the District has run poor elections. Now, the council wants to take it even further by allowing noncitizens to vote.

At a time when communities across our Nation are dealing with the consequences of an unprecedented number of criminals, human smugglers, and deadly fentanyl pouring across our borders, it is unthinkable that the D.C. Council wants to reward those who have broken the law.

Further, this would let diplomats vote in D.C. elections, some of whom can be agents of our adversaries, like

China and Russia. That is why several of my colleagues on the House Administration and Oversight and Accountability Committees last Congress, including Chairman STEIL and Mr. COMER, sent a letter to D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser, criticizing the measure and calling on her to reject it.

Congress can and should exercise its constitutional responsibility over D.C. and stop this law with this joint resolution of disapproval.

I commend Chairman COMER for leading this commonsense measure and taking steps to restore voter confidence.

We have seen that in States like Georgia and Florida, when you implement key election integrity tools that make it easier to vote and harder to cheat, we can boost voter confidence, which in turn boosts voter turnout.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we need more election integrity, not less. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of corrections.

First of all, the D.C. legislation that would be disapproved by this resolution allows only for voting in local elections—school board elections, Advisory Neighborhood Commission elections, council elections. It does not allow voting in Federal elections for noncitizens.

□ 1715

The Constitution, contrary to what the gentlewoman said, permits noncitizen voting at the local level, and there are a number of jurisdictions that do that.

Mr. Speaker, yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I strongly oppose this undemocratic, paternalistic resolution. There is only one question before this House. The question is: Do you believe in democracy?

More specifically: Should the District of Columbia's local legislature, whose members are elected by D.C. residents, make the laws for D.C., or should Congress, whose voting Members are elected by the residents of the several States, make laws for D.C.?

What is democracy?

The dictionary defines it as a "government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections."

Perhaps President Lincoln described democracy best in the Gettysburg Address when he said that it is govern-

ment of the people, by the people, for the people.

D.C.'s local legislature, the D.C. Council, has 13 members. The members are elected by D.C. residents. Eight members are elected by geographical area, and five members are elected at-large. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, then they can vote them out of office.

Congress has 535 voting Members. The Members are elected by residents of the several States. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the Members vote, even on legislation that applies only to D.C., they can only ask politely for the residents of the several States to vote them out of office.

The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation. Yet, the nearly 700,000 D.C. residents cannot consent to any action taken by Congress, whether on national or D.C. matters, and they pay full Federal taxes. Indeed, D.C. residents pay more Federal taxes per capita than any State in the Union and more total Federal taxes than 23 States.

The legislative history and merits of this legislation enacted by the D.C. Council that is the subject matter of this resolution are irrelevant to the question before the House, but I do want to set the record straight.

The D.C. Council passed the legislation on two separate occasions, as required by Congress, by votes of 12-1 and 12-0 after holding a hearing. The legislation is not unprecedented. Indeed, there is a long history in the United States of noncitizens being allowed to vote in local, State, territorial, and Federal elections.

I will close with two final thoughts. D.C. residents, a majority of whom are Black and Brown, are worthy and capable of governing themselves. It is true Congress has absolute power over D.C., but might does not make right.

Mr. Speaker, if you believe in democracy, you will vote "no" on this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is talk about how people are accountable to different levels of government.

But how are you accountable when there is no protection articulated in this legislation for the voters on keeping two sets of voter lists?

D.C. residents are entitled to vote for the Presidency and for Federal offices.

I need to ask the question out loud: Are Members of Congress okay with members of the CCP who work at the Chinese Embassy voting in U.S. elections?

Are you comfortable with employees and members of Putin's regime who work at the Russian Federation Embassy voting in D.C. elections?

These are questions that this body must ask itself when considering this legislation. And make no mistake, Mr.

Speaker, two sets of books aren't going to work in any board of elections in America. You are entitled to vote in this election but not that. There is going to be commingling, and the volunteers who work the polls are not going to have all of the tools necessary to stop people from intermingling in those elections.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Chairman COMER's resolution.

If free flights, free phones, free healthcare, free education, free lawyers, and other freebies being offered to illegal aliens weren't already enough, the D.C. Council decided to now give illegal aliens the right to vote—a right that more than 1.1 million American military servicemembers have given their lives for.

Giving this right to illegal aliens is as if our government were "The Oprah Winfrey Show." You get a vote, you get a vote, you get a vote.

It makes a mockery of our constitutional Republic that our brave heroes have fought for and died to defend.

The right to vote is the most sacred right in our constitutional Republic. Giving the right to vote to noncitizens cheapens this sacred right by discounting the value of citizens' votes. It also cheapens the value of American citizenship and cheapens our standing around the world as we incentivize the invasion of our own country.

Under Biden's watch, over 4.6 million illegal aliens—and those are just the ones whom we know of—have already crossed our wide-open southern border that Secretary Mayorkas and Joe Biden refused to secure, and about which Democrats could have done something for the past 2 years when they held all levels of power and refused to do so.

By the end of the year, Biden will have let in more illegal aliens than the entire population of my State of Colorado.

Instead of trying to secure the border, Democrats are more focused on giving illegal aliens more handouts and privileges, including giving them the right—the sacred right—to vote. These illegal aliens are even treated often-times better than our veterans who are struggling to have their healthcare needs met and to get the services that we promised them for their great service, but it is immediately given to those who come across our southern border illegally.

Let's put American citizens first and not cheapen their votes. Let's pass this legislation and ensure the voice of the American people is heard without interference from foreign nationals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I was just reviewing some materials that showed that both the States that the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman from New York represent had noncitizen voting in the 18th, 19th, and, in the case of Colorado, up to the 20th century. So I think if they are talking about giving away the sacred right to vote, their States have done that before.

It has got a kind of interesting history to it. To me, it is basically irrelevant because it is not our decision to be making. It is up to the people of D.C., just like it is up to the voters of Colorado and it is up to the voters in New York.

But the history of it is intriguing because when the country started—as I am sure the gentlewoman is aware—there were race qualifications for voting and there were gender qualifications for voting. It was only through social struggle that these were removed. But at the beginning of the Republic, all that mattered was the property qualification—the wealth and property qualification—for White men. If you were a White man, regardless of your citizenship status, you had the right to vote.

That lasted basically up to the Civil War. But it became a bone of contention between the North and the South because the Northern States were continuing to defend alien suffrage and the Southern States opposed it. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you look at Article I of the Confederate Constitution, the very first thing it does, it says that you must be a citizen of the Confederacy in order to vote there.

They didn't want noncitizens voting. Why?

Because the immigrants were overwhelmingly antislavery.

It was very clear in the debates in Congress about this that the Southern States wanted to get rid of it, which is why the Confederacy banned it. After the Civil War, noncitizen voting spread around the country.

But the point is that when we are talking about local noncitizen voting—who is going to vote in your school board or town council elections—that should be decided locally.

My colleagues who are the ones determined not to make the District of Columbia a State should be the first ones to say that if it is just a local government, then let them decide on who is going to vote on matters of garbage collection and who their teachers are going to be. The jurisdictions that have done this, like Los Angeles, have wanted to make sure that parents in local public schools get the right to vote regardless of their citizenship status.

Most of the noncitizens, of course, are lawful residents, people with green cards, and permanent residents, and they want them to be engaged and involved.

In any event, if my friends really support home rule and local self-determination, they will allow the people of Washington, D.C., to decide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and my colleague from Maryland for yielding.

It is so rich to hear the other side discuss the sacred right of voting, discuss what our veterans and our servicemembers fought for, and the sacred right of voting while defending and continuing to defend the disenfranchisement of American citizens in D.C. for their right to vote.

They don't believe in statehood. They don't believe in the actual enfranchisement and voting rights for D.C. residents who are U.S. citizens.

Yet, they have the audacity and the gall to not just continue in that position and claim they believe in the sacred right to vote while denying that right to vote to an overwhelmingly Black city, but then expanding their position—expanding their position—so that, in direct contradiction of their "conservative" values of small government and defending freedom, they have decided to expand the jurisdiction of this body to meddle into the business of D.C. residents.

□ 1730

The D.C. Council has the right to determine its policies for D.C. residents. If any Member of this body does not like that, they can feel free to change their registration, resign their post, and run for D.C. Council.

For those who are residents here of Washington, D.C., they could have gone, as the ranking member stated, to any one of the many hearings on this issue.

I understand that there may be disagreement. I understand that Republicans may not be happy with what the D.C. Council is doing, but when cities in Vermont pass the same provisions, when San Francisco, when nine Maryland cities brought up this provision, did the Republican Party corral all of Congress and bring this issue down to the floor for a vote?

No, they did not.

They are singling out the residents of the District of Columbia and expanding in the history of disenfranchisement that goes all the way back to the legacy of slavery, and they are bringing it right here to this floor. Because why? They don't have any real bills to debate. We are not here to talk about healthcare; we are not here to talk about abortion; we are not here to talk about voting rights. We are here to talk about the expansion and the continued subjugation and disenfranchisement of the people of the District of Columbia. Let them govern themselves.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Chairman COMER's resolution. The radical D.C. Council is literally putting the integrity of our election system at risk.

They have passed a bill to allow illegal immigrants, Chinese and Russian agents, foreign exchange students, and quite literally anyone else who finds themselves on the streets of D.C. in our Nation's Capital for longer than 30 days the ability to vote in elections.

This should not be a partisan issue, and you don't have to be a Republican to understand why this is wrong.

Voting is a sacred right, regardless of what was just said. Voting is a sacred right. This ridiculous measure disenfranchises millions of legal American citizens and opens up our election system to a host of security issues. In fact, the Mayor of D.C. didn't even sign this.

Congress must pass this resolution today, but we should also move to pass my bill, H.R. 192, to make it clear to D.C. that they cannot ever allow noncitizens to influence our Nation's Capital. We are putting every single Member, both Republican and Democrat, on the record about whether they support noncitizens voting.

Of course, I urge my colleagues in the House and the Senate and President Biden to pass our bill, to pass this measure, to sign it into law immediately.

Let me just say one thing in response to my colleague on the other side of the aisle who a few moments ago said, "We brought back our worst possible instincts," I think when referencing the Republican Party. This tells you everything you need to know. It tells you everything you need to know about Americans. Please listen up, this tells you everything you need to know, that the radicals want you to think that this is normal, and it is not.

Americans deserve confidence in our election system and confidence in knowing that only legal American citizens are casting their vote in elections here in this country.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to respond to the gentleman before he goes, perhaps.

When I said that they were returning to their worst possible instincts, that was actually a bipartisan comment because in the old days it was Democrats, racist Dixiecrats on the House District Committee who lorded over the District of Columbia and denied the people of Washington their rights. They are returning us to those days where Congress will micromanage the affairs of Washington, D.C., and not allow the people their own self-government.

He said you don't need to be a Republican or a Democrat to understand the issue. It would actually help to know

your Abraham Lincoln because, of course, Lincoln was a major defender of noncitizen voting to the extent you guys want to act like a super D.C. Council and get into the merits of it.

In fact, when he was elected, his Southern opponents said he was elected on the strength of the noncitizen vote in New York, as a matter of fact, and in Illinois and other States where they had so-called declarant alien suffrage, which means if you are on the pathway to citizenship you are allowed to vote, which is a policy that makes a lot of sense, but different jurisdictions have different policies according to home rule and self-government.

When Lincoln was here, his major legislative initiative, interestingly enough, was to abolish the slave traffic in the District of Columbia because he felt that freedom and democracy should obtain in the Nation's Capital. That is something that our colleagues should also think about in terms of defining an agenda of their party. I know they are careening from this issue to that issue, but if you are thinking about D.C., think about what Abraham Lincoln did.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his leadership and of course Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for her continued consistency in refuting and rebutting wrongheaded and misdirected policies that seem to come year after year.

Let me read breaking news from one of the historic newspapers in this month that we begin to focus on Black history. From "The Washington Informer," the headline says, "D.C. Council Blasts House GOP Interference in City Law."

"D.C. Council members have lashed out at Republicans on Capitol Hill for seeking to meddle in city affairs."

For some reason, Ranking Member RASKIN, there was some thought that our friends were riding in on a white horse because there was some disagreement on the Council. That disagreement, as you have so effectively said, with the Congresswoman as well, is that they want to handle their own matters.

Let the record be clear: The United States Constitution does not forbid noncitizens from casting a vote in local, State, and other elections. At least 15 cities currently allow noncitizens to cast ballots in local elections, and particularly noncitizens were occasionally permitted to cast ballots in local, State, and Federal elections in 40 States from the time of the Nation's inception until 1926.

We have had a history of local decisions being made by local voters. In this instance, local voters voted and made a decision. Whatever modifications they desire to make, they are not asking this place to implode their work.

As we begin to think about voting rights, I would ask my colleagues to help join us in supporting the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act that Democrats have tried to pass here in this Congress for a long, long time.

I would ask them to help us in the redistricting that skewed and denied Democrats in Texas two districts that were legitimately, based upon the Census, in fact, created by Hispanics and African Americans.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. In redistricting across the Nation, North Carolina, Georgia, Texas were States in which voting rights were directly undermined. Some of the restrictive legislation that was passed in Georgia and Texas is evidence of the oppression of many in the party of my friends across the aisle's States to deny people of color their right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, it looks as if we have an opportunity here. For champions of voting rights that seem to be evidenced across the aisle, join me in the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act. At this time in this month, we ask that you allow the citizens of Washington, D.C., one, at some point to have statehood, but, more importantly, in this instance to stay out of home rule decisions or to stay out of decisions granted to them. Those decisions are granted to them.

For that reason, I am enthusiastically in opposition to H.J. Res. 24 because this legislation goes beyond the boundaries of the responsibilities, duties, and rights of this body. Leave the Government of Washington, D.C., to the people of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 24—Disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022.

H.J. Res. 24 will overturn the Local Resident Voting Act of 2022, a measure passed by will of the people in the District of Columbia Council.

This overreaching resolution seeks to overturn the will of Washington, D.C. people, who voted to support the rights of noncitizens who fulfill residency and other requirements to vote in district local elections under the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022.

Let the record be clear, Mr. Speaker, the United States Constitution does not forbid noncitizens from casting their vote in local, state, or federal elections.

At least 15 cities currently allow non-citizens to cast ballots in local elections.

While voting in federal elections was made illegal for noncitizens in 1996, the legal voting of noncitizens in American elections has a long history in this nation.

Noncitizens were occasionally permitted to cast ballots in local, state, and federal elections in 40 states from the time of the nation's inception until 1926.

During the early years, the District of Columbia Organic Act of 1801 granted Congress

sole power over the district's boundaries, depriving its citizens of the voting privileges they had previously enjoyed as residents of Maryland and Virginia.

Due to its treatment as a U.S. territory rather than a state, the District of Columbia has no voting representation in Congress and is certainly not given its fair amount of federal funding—despite the fact that Washington, D.C. residents pay more federal taxes per person than citizens of any other state, and more than residents of 22 states combined.

It is no secret that when politicians seek to suppress voting rights, the feared component of increased racial political power rears its ugly head in driving and motivating shifts in laws that will eliminate or stunt the political growth of minority populations in America.

As we stand here today, marking the first week of Black History Month, we must acknowledge that we are standing in a building built by the hands of slaves, and we are standing in a city that is not only one of the most diverse cities in the country, but is also home to one of the largest Black populations—yes, Washington DC—our nation's capital.

The underrepresentation of Blacks and minorities in our nation's capital and in our national democratic systems is a shameful stain on our morals and values as Americans.

We must put an end to current and historical voter suppression and we must stop pushing oppressive and systemically racist policies if we are ever to truly be a nation united by our democratic pillars and principles.

The nearly 700,000 D.C. residents, a majority of whom are Black and Brown, are worthy and capable of self-government.

And Congress, which is not accountable to D.C. residents, should not interfere with legislation duly enacted by the duly elected D.C. government.

Members of Congress should not substitute their policy judgment for the judgment of D.C.'s elected officials.

Quite simply, Congress should keep its hands off D.C.

The legislative history and merits of the two bills enacted by D.C. that are the subject of the disapproval resolutions—the Revised Criminal Code Act and the Local Resident Voting Amendment Act—should be irrelevant to the consideration of these disapproval resolutions, since there is never justification for Congress nullifying legislation enacted by D.C.

That being said, we need to set the record straight on these two bills enacted by D.C.

Under the D.C. Home Rule Act, which was passed by Congress, D.C.'s legislature, the 13-member D.C. Council, is required to pass legislation twice, with at least 13 intervening days between each vote, to enact legislation.

Legislation passed by the Council and signed by the D.C. mayor—or with a veto override or without the mayor's signatures—is transmitted to Congress for a review period.

The legislation takes effect at the expiration of a review period, unless a resolution of disapproval is enacted into law during the review period.

And yet, the House did not hold a hearing or markup on either disapproval resolution.

This resolution cannot stand as a serious policy measure to be respected on the floors of this chamber, and must be opposed.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in response to some of the opposition that I have heard to this legislation.

First of all, we have heard about slave trade multiple times this evening. If we are concerned about slave trade, then let's secure the southern border because that is where the human trafficking is taking place. Millions of people are being trafficked, and women and children are being sexually assaulted and abused. Young girls are taking Plan B pills at the start of their journey because they anticipate being sexually assaulted on their journey.

If this is something that you are that concerned about, then let's work together to secure the southern border and stop the human trafficking and the slave trade that is happening there.

There is slavery that is taking place in China in the cobalt mines that these climate extremists are pushing. There is child enslaved labor there. That is where we are extracting our rare earth minerals, from China-owned mines in the Congo. So let's talk together about American energy.

You say that this is just for local elections. Are there two registries? How is that going to work if there are two registries? I don't think it is going to stop there because every time we give in and give an inch, well, they take 7 miles.

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle mentioned that in Colorado illegal aliens are voting. Well, illegal aliens are voting, but no State has actually allowed that since 1926 in America. There are loopholes that are allowing illegals to vote in our elections. This is election interference, allowing noncitizens to vote in our elections.

In fact, this is why the crime rate is up in Colorado. We are encouraging illegal aliens to come to Colorado. We are number one in the Nation for bank robberies, number one in the Nation for auto thefts, number two in the Nation for fentanyl poisoning. We have a Department of New Americans. If you go to the Colorado State website, it says, well, what is a new American? A new American is a Coloradan.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. What is a new American? A new American is a Coloradan, an immigrant seeking asylum, a refugee, asylee, a DACA recipient, an SIV holder, and all other forms of immigrants seeking safety, opportunity, reunification of family. Chain migration is being encouraged in my State where noncitizens are voting and making a difference in our elections.

Now, if there is a better way to do so, then let's let the D.C. Council reevaluat

ate this. That is why we are sending it back to them. I would say that statehood is a matter that Congress has to consider on behalf of the entire Nation and pursue a constitutional amendment if so desired. Congress dealt with this issue in both the 116th and 117th Congresses and rejected the idea.

Congress has jurisdiction over D.C., and we need to ensure a vibrant capital city. This act does the opposite. I would again encourage opposition to this bill.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado boasts that her State is number one in auto thefts, number one in bank robberies, and number two in fentanyl, as I understand it. It sounds like they have got their hands full with their own problems, and I don't know that they should be spending their time dictating to the people of Washington, D.C., what their voting rights policy is going to be.

Now both the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman from New York invite the question of would it actually be administratively possible for a jurisdiction to have two separate voting lists for those who are eligible to vote just in local elections and those who are eligible to vote in both local and Federal elections?

Well, that is a great question that you could have posed at a hearing within the Oversight Committee if we had one, but we didn't have it. I actually happen to have researched this question, and there are a number of jurisdictions around the country which permit noncitizen voting at the local level, and they have one list for that. If you are a noncitizen when you enter, your name is checked off that list, and you get one ballot which is just for your school board elections and the local elections. Then if you are a citizen, you get a complete ballot that includes local, State, and Federal elections, so there actually is an answer, and it is working in multiple jurisdictions around the country, including several in my home State of Maryland. I think the same thing used to be able to work in New York State as well; so that is something that would be easily researchable, and it is something also that we could have answered if we had followed regular order and actually had so much as one hearing on this subject before deciding to jump in like King Kong and squash the people of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, (Ms. NORTON), the distinguished nonvoting Delegate.

□ 1745

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding the time because I have something important to say and to put into the RECORD.

Forty States have permitted noncitizens to vote at various points. One of them is the State of the gentlewoman who has just spoken, Colorado. The

other States are: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington State, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

At least 14 municipalities permit noncitizens to vote today. Eleven in Maryland: Barnesville, Cheverly, Chevy Chase section 3, Garrett Park, Glen Echo, Hyattsville, Martin's Additions, Mount Rainier, Riverdale Park, Somerset, and Takoma Park.

Two in Vermont: Montpelier and Winooski.

One in California. San Francisco allows voting for noncitizens who are a parent or legal guardian of a child living in San Francisco to vote in local school board elections.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I should say that none of those jurisdictions have been overrun with fentanyl or illegal aliens. All of those jurisdictions are functioning democratic self-governmental units, just as the jurisdictions in New York and Colorado that had the same practice were.

This really isn't about noncitizen voting, Mr. Speaker. This is about democratic self-government and allowing local jurisdictions to make home rule decisions for themselves because this isn't the end of it. It is just the beginning.

Tomorrow, I think we are going to be considering a resolution of disapproval for the District of Columbia's criminal justice reform that they have engaged in over the last 9 or 10 years involving Federal judges, local judges, council members, the D.C. Bar, and so on. We didn't know anything about that. We didn't have a hearing. Yet, someone is going to pick something out.

What the good chairman of our committee talked about in the Rules Committee was a carjacking law where I guess the minimum sentence changed. Well, we looked up Kentucky. Kentucky doesn't even have a carjacking law. You would have to use armed robbery, which can only get you 20 years. The District of Columbia would treat carjacking with up to a 24-year sentence.

These are the kinds of measurements we are going to have to go through with everybody's State and everybody's jurisdiction if we are really going to turn ourselves into the super-D.C. Council and try to get to know the people of Washington and what their concerns are and what they are into.

The whole reason we went to home rule in 1973 was so that Congress could spend its time on national policy issues, the kind that President Biden

was talking about last night. We just added 12 million new jobs to the American economy. We passed a \$1.2 trillion infrastructure plan to invest in the ports, airports, bridges, roads, and highways all across America, not just in the District of Columbia, no insult intended. That is a very tiny part of the jurisdiction of Congress, and they want to turn us basically into an appellate legislative division over the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further speakers. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This legislation promises to be the first of many. I think tomorrow criminal justice reform comes up. I know that the MAGA wing of the Republican Party doesn't like Medicaid-funded abortions in Washington, D.C. They don't like the stricter gun safety laws that the people of Washington, D.C., have passed. They don't like their progressive legislation protective of the LGBTQ community and so on.

We are headed now for a mini culture war between the dominant MAGA wing of the Republican Conference today and the people of the District of Columbia, who find themselves in an odd situation because they want to be admitted to the Union the way 37 States have been admitted to the Union after the original 13 were.

That means, by the way, that three-quarters of the States, nearly 75 percent of the States, came in after the original 13. They appealed to Congress to use our powers under Article IV of the Constitution to admit new States. They had exercised their powers under the First Amendment, under the Ninth Amendment, and under the 10th Amendment to organize a new statehood constitution and to petition for admission to the Union.

Our muscle memory is weak here because it hasn't happened since Hawaii and Alaska, but Thomas Jefferson thought that this was the destiny of communities under the United States of America. We would not be a colonial power that would continue to lord over people perpetually. On the contrary, when he talked about the Northwest Ordinance, he said as sufficient population formed and as commitment to democratic principles were realized, these new communities would be admitted as States.

I think, as a matter of basic civic respect and self-respect, we owe the people of Washington our attention when they are asking for admission to the Union. These are people who pay more per capita in Federal taxes than anybody in the country, more in hard dollars, I believe, than the people of 18 or 20 States. They have served in every war that America has ever fought. They are subject to the military draft.

It is just that when ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the distinguished professor of

constitutional law from Georgetown University, comes to this floor, she comes as a nonvoting Delegate. There is no representation and no voice over in the Senate. That is an offense to basic democratic principles that we teach children in second grade.

We should be passing statehood again in the 118th Congress the way we passed it in the 117th, the way we passed it in the 116th, and we should get the Senate to focus on it. Short of that, the very last thing we should be doing is rolling back the limited rights the people of Washington have to exercise home rule powers.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The D.C. Council has once again put its radical agenda ahead of the American people. This time, the District's progressive D.C. Council is directly disenfranchising American citizens.

In this day and age, it is often the case that the only factor differentiating the privileges of American citizens from noncitizens is the right to vote. The D.C. Council wants to erase that distinction.

The United States Congress must exercise its constitutional oversight role over the District of Columbia, the seat of our Nation's Capital, and reject this offensive local legislation.

In a time when our democratic institutions must be protected more than ever, it is imperative that the United States House of Representatives, the people's House, unite in opposition to the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act. We must reject the D.C. Council's misguided efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the sacred rights of the American citizenry by voting for Representative JAMES COMER of Kentucky's resolution of disapproval.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 97, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. 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 will be postponed.

SPEAKING OUT AGAINST GUN
VIOLENCE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the ongoing epidemic of gun violence in our cities and towns.

There is no gun violence without guns. From the countless calls I receive from my constituents to the majority of Americans who have voiced their support for gun control reform, something must be done by Congress.

So many Americans are haunted by the gun violence that has taken their loved ones, and that is why we should all be in favor of stronger gun laws to keep these weapons out of dangerous hands.

Too many lives have been stolen. Too many children have been killed.

For this reason, I will be introducing the Safer Neighborhoods Gun Buyback Act of 2023. My bill would provide Federal grants to States, local governments, and gun dealers to conduct gun buyback programs across the country.

We need a national program to give all towns and cities the funds to get guns off our streets. This is common-sense legislation, and if made into public law, it would benefit our Nation greatly.

RESPONDING TO STATE OF THE
UNION ADDRESS

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

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in response to Biden's State of the Union Address.

As a reminder, I do not wish failure upon any sitting President. Whether it is a Republican or Democrat, their success is our success, and when we wish for their failure, then the Nation fails.

We have had 2 years of one-party rule in the White House, in the Senate, and in the House. In those 2 very short years, we watched our thriving economy steer in the opposite direction.

American households cannot afford food and gas. Our wages are failing to keep up with inflation that continues to increase.

Since the President took office, we as a Nation watched the average gas price go from \$2.39 to our current average of \$3.45. However, on day one of Biden's Presidency, he killed the Keystone XL pipeline, which could have been supplying 830,000 barrels per day from Canada to U.S. refineries, and depleted our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to its lowest level since 1984.

Another item that President Biden failed to address was the catastrophic withdrawal from Afghanistan. As a result, 13 brave servicemembers lost their lives, and the Taliban have now taken back control of Afghanistan.

RECOGNIZING SUE DAUGHERTY'S
LIFETIME OF WORK

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, during this week of the State of the Union Address, I rise today to recognize the lifetime of work of Sue Daugherty, a champion for seniors across Ohio.

Sue and I are cheering the 8.7 percent cost of living increase for seniors under Social Security and a cap on insulin costs for seniors at \$35 per month.

Sue serves as the founding executive director of Serving Our Seniors, a non-profit organization located in Sandusky, Ohio, that supports Erie County seniors as they progress in life.

Ms. Daugherty's passion for gerontology was born out of her experience as a nursing assistant in the summer following her freshman year at Ohio University. She went on to receive her bachelor's degree from Ohio University and earned her master of public administration from Cleveland State University.

Sue has utilized her knowledge and experience to create an excellent and friendly network for aging Ohioans to receive better treatment and resources as they age. She helped establish a system for seniors to seek proactive care instead of reactive care.

Ms. Daugherty has received nearly a dozen community service awards of excellence throughout her career, including the 2002 Acts of Caring Award from the National Association of Counties.

I am honored to honor her lifetime of achievement and her work. Today, all of America salutes Ohioan Sue Daugherty. I thank her so much for her service to America.

□ 1800

DANGERS OF E-CIGARETTES

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

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to emphasize the importance of closing the disposable e-cigarette loophole to continue our progress in reducing youth e-cigarette use.

The danger disposable e-cigarettes pose to our young people cannot be underestimated. Currently, it is estimated that more than 700,000 middle and high school students vape on a daily basis—more than 700,000.

Use of disposable e-cigarettes by our youth has increased by more than 2,000 percent since 2019. Although disguised with flavors like apple and strawberry, the truth is that a single e-cigarette can have the same amount of nicotine as an entire pack of cigarettes.

A loophole left by the previous administration excludes e-cigarettes and disposable e-cigarette products from the tobacco flavoring guidelines, which are at the heart of this epidemic.

Closing the Trump-era loophole will ensure the flavor ban applies to disposable e-cigarettes. Keeping America's youth safe and healthy depends on it.

IMPERIAL SUGAR REFINERY
EXPLOSION OF 2008

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the Imperial Sugar Refinery explosion in my hometown of Port Wentworth, Georgia, in 2008.

Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, 14 lives were tragically taken, and several others were severely injured. I want to honor the victims of this tragedy, as well as the first responders and doctors who worked bravely to save lives.

After the explosion, emergency vehicles quickly lined the access road leading out to the refinery. In total, there were around 60 first responders on the scene after the accident, working around the clock.

After survivors were transferred to the Burn Center in Augusta, doctors worked diligently to save lives. Some patients were covered with burns on upwards of 90 percent of their bodies.

If it had not been for the heroic work of everyone involved, the death toll could have been much higher. Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the families of those whom we lost and with those who were injured.

Thank you to our first responders and medical experts for this lifesaving care they gave to all of those involved.

HONORING LEBRON JAMES

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate a philanthropist, a community activist, a constituent of Ohio's 13th Congressional District, the birthplace of champions, and the greatest basketball player of all time, LeBron James, but we know him as just a kid from Akron, the GOAT, or King James.

Yesterday, LeBron broke the NBA's scoring record previously set by Kareem Abdul-Jabbar with 38,390 points. It was a feat that once seemed almost impossible for anyone except for LeBron, but James has become known for making the improbable part of his routine, including four NBA championships and numerous MVP titles.

Mr. Speaker, LeBron James has scored 38,390 points in his career, making history on the 38th day of the year of his 38th year of life with 38 points.

LeBron, we celebrate you and all of your accomplishments. You have, indeed, earned the title of greatest of all time and cemented Ohio's 13th Congressional District as the birthplace of champions.