the PRO Act passes because the model for these policies comes from our State, a law called AB 5 that passed the supermajority legislature in 2019 and has been ruthlessly enforced by Governor Gavin Newsom ever since.

AB 5 has been absolutely devastating for countless independent professionals in California. You don't need to take my word for it. Governor Newsom's own former deputy chief of staff, Yoshar Ali, called it ''one of the most destructive pieces of legislation in the past 20 years,'' adding, ''It's truly horrific how many people are negatively impacted by it.''

Newsom's political mentor, the former mayor of San Francisco and former speaker of the State Assembly, Willie Brown, said that the law made him want to ''picket'' against the ''bastards'' at the Capitol and the special interests that ''took advantage'' of them.

□ 1230

Andrew Cuomo rejected a similar law in New York, saying he didn't want to ''make the same mistake'' as California.

The liberal Daily Kos likewise warned other States: Don't make the same mistake California's Gavin Newsom did—with the site's founder calling the law disastrous and asinine and its supporters shameful.

The NAACP assailed it as a ''terrible law'' and a ''gut punch to our community.''

The CEO of the Black Chamber of Commerce called it a catastrophe responsible for enabling, defending, and propagating systemic racism.

Mr. Speaker, 200 Ph.D. economists, including a Nobel Laureate, reported that the law is doing substantial and avoidable harm to the very people who now have the fewest resources and the worst alternatives available to them. One commentator called it ''the most malicious and harmful law ever passed in California.''

AB5 effectively bans independent work of any kind, being your own boss. With a single stroke of his pen, Governor Gavin Newsom rendered countless Californians, spanning hundreds of professions, unable to earn a living in our State—videographers and caricaturists, transcriptionists and interpreters, technicians and engineers, analysts and consultants, musicians and conductors, artists and dancers, writers and editors, coaches and trainers, teachers and tutors, nurses and doulas, the list goes on.

Many national companies now explicitly disclaim on their applications that they can no longer work with California freelancers. Hardly an industry or trade is unscathed.

Most devastated by AB5 have been our most vulnerable: seniors, caregivers, students, reformed convicts, single mothers, people with disabilities or health issues or mental health needs, all of whom rely on independent contracting.

Many of my own constituents have been ensnared by the law. Right here, you see a photo of Ildiko Santana, an immigrant, a naturalized citizen, who worked as a freelance translator for over 20 years in Loomis. It took decades for her to build up her clientele, and then she had a single law cause her to lose it all. After AB5 went into effect, not a single one of the over 50 agencies she did business with will hire her unless she incorporates or leaves California.

Across the State, thousands of hardworking people are in exactly the same position. Take, for example, Heather Mason, who said: ''I am a conference producer. I had to move; went to Utah. I can't hire many of our freelance folks back in California either.'' She said: ''I am heartbroken to leave LA.''

Elizabeth Adger said: ''AB5 is why I had to pack up my very ill husband with stage IV cancer and autistic son and leave the State. There is no way I can take care of our family and work a 'traditional'-type job. I have always worked for myself and paid my taxes. I was terrified of becoming homeless. Now I am moving to Florida, where my business is welcome.''

Here is the thing. That just isn't going to be an option if the PRO Act or this proposed rule from the Department of Labor goes into effect because this suffering will be taken nationwide.

It is estimated that the PRO Act would cost over 350,000 freelance workers their ability to earn a living, and even just the Department of Labor rule in and of itself would cause significant losses.

Unlike State laws, independent businesspeople will have nowhere to turn if these policies go into effect. What is going to happen to folks like Ildiko and Heather and Elizabeth? In fact, Ildiko will be forced to leave the United States and return to her home country in order to make a living.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling on President Biden to see the reality, to see the harm that these policies are causing. I am calling on President Biden to rescind his proposed rule and to stop supporting the PRO Act, to listen to independent contractors and freelancers whose lives have been upended in California, to have compassion and to stop advocating for policy changes that would inflict this suffering nationwide.

As chair of the House Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I will promise you this. I am going to work in every way possible to defeat the PRO Act. Our committee will fight for workers. There is an agenda out there that is working against workers. We are going to fight for workers, for small businesses, and for economic freedom.

If the proposed Department of Labor rule does take effect, I will immediately act to pass legislation to repeal it. More than that, I will use the gavel of this subcommittee to shine light on the unparalleled damage that has been wrought by AB5, and I certainly will make sure that the freelancers who have lost everything in California are not forgotten.

In a broader sense, AB5 is truly a case study in the decline of the State of California. We used to be the State where anyone could get ahead. Now, we are the State that so many can't wait to leave behind.

We are the Golden State and have always served as a beacon of opportunity for well over a century. We have attracted innovators and adventurers.

We are a State that has so many blessings, endowed with unbelievable natural beauty. Yet, somehow, we have gotten to the point where California just achieved a historic three-peat, where for the third straight year, we led the Nation in one-way U-Haul rentals.

In fact, with the recent redistricting, we lost a seat in Congress, and if the lines were redrawn today, we would lose another seat. It is precisely because of policies like AB5.

California's Governor is saying again and again that our State is a model for the Nation. President Biden has been all too quick to believe him by supporting policies like AB5 and the PRO Act.

The sad reality is that, in many ways, our State is not a model for the Nation but a warning to the Nation about what happens when humanist values give way to brute political force.

Today, I am urging the President and my colleagues in Congress to heed that warning.

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

STATE OF OUR UNION

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to be the last Congressman to speak in this historic State of the Union week here in Congress.

There are several comments that have to be made about the State of the Union because if you are just going to listen to what President Biden had to say, you would have a very warped and distorted view of what is going on in America today.

I think the most harmful thing he said is he one more time talked about the talk and implied that America's police force is a racist police force and a stain on America's reputation. That is a lie. It is a lie. It has been disproven year after year, study after study.

Nevertheless, President Biden, I think in an effort to scare Black Americans into voting for him, claims that we have a horrible racist society in general and a racist police problem in particular.

I will mention two articles which came out right after the unfortunate

events, the tragic events, the horrific events that happened in Minneapolis 2 years ago, for those of you back home to google. One article is by a very perceptive gal by the name of Heather Mac Donald, appearing in The Wall Street Journal, and one is by a gentleman, who happens to be Black, appearing in the City Journal at that time.

They both looked not at the number of people who died across the board but looked at a percent of people who committed felonies, a percent of people who committed crimes who wound up in a confrontation with police and wound up passing away. In both instances, they found that, if anything, Black Americans were less likely to die in a confrontation with police.

Again, I will mention these articles, ''The Myth of Systemic Police Racism,'' Heather Mac Donald in The Wall Street Journal in June 2020, and ''Stories and Data,'' Coleman Hughes, in the City Journal of June 2020.

This is something that is a stain on America. Joe Biden is doing all he can to divide America by using his State of the Union Address to claim that the police are racists.

Does this have an effect? It has an effect. It has an effect twice.

First of all, I think it has an effect in that it causes some people to believe him. After all, we have a White President. Why would he be lying and telling us we have all these racist police if we don't? And the effect is that it is causing, sadly, some anger in the Black community, which is resulting in more and more deaths of police.

I thought of this when, earlier this week, I think maybe on the exact day that we had the State of the Union, if not the day earlier, one more policeman, who happened to be White, was murdered in Milwaukee.

Is this myth that is going out there, talking about racist police, racist police, racist police, causing more police to die? I don't know, but it is something to look at.

I think it also causes the police, understandably, to be less aggressive and less effective because they are always afraid of being called out for being racist.

If President Biden is lying and telling everybody that we have all these racist police, it is surprising that the police themselves are a little more afraid to be aggressive or engage in I guess what I will call traditional policing.

Last year, in Milwaukee, a city which is just adjacent to my district, the number of murders went up I think about 25, to an all-time high. It was the third year in a row that we had an all-time high number of murders in Milwaukee, and that is despite the fact that the population is drifting down. Why are we at an all-time high number of murders in Milwaukee?

Generally, I think the police, first of all, are not adequately funded. To a certain extent, they are not adequately funded because politicians like Joe Biden get out there and tell us how horrible and racist the police are. Is it any surprise that the Milwaukee City Council would not want to hire many police?

Secondly, the Milwaukee police are afraid to go into certain neighborhoods, sometimes high-crime neighborhoods where they are especially used because they are afraid if they do confront the criminal element, they will get labeled as racist. Rather than worry about some cheap politician like Joe Biden calling them racist over time, why not just stand back, not be aggressive, and not get labeled?

In any event, I felt of all the lies of President Biden, his drumbeat of racism in society in general and racism with regard to police is the most damaging.

Mr. Speaker, the next thing that I thought was very scary for the country as a whole, I think probably the biggest crisis that has developed in the last 2 years, is the crisis at the border. Admittedly, if you don't live in Arizona or don't live in Texas, you might not see the full import of the crisis.

President Biden implied that this is, at best, something that just miraculously happened out of nowhere and, at worst, was happening because the Republicans aren't doing enough to help him close the border.

I would like to leave America with some numbers. These are both numbers from December. In December 2020, a grand total of 21,000 people crossed the border. In December 2022, 2 years into the Biden Presidency, 238,000 people crossed the border, an increase of 11 times.

This is not something that just happened. It was a problem when we had 28,000 people crossing the border under the Trump administration. When it goes up by a factor of 11, it is not because the Republicans aren't negotiating. There are all sorts of things we negotiate whenever we put together the annual budget, and a given number of Republicans vote for it.

No, it is because Joe Biden changed the policy at the border. He is making it much easier for immigrants to cross the border. For whatever reason, he wants to apparently change America by entering in the people who receive no instruction, no education on our Constitution and the values that you are supposed to adapt if you are an American citizen. As a result, we are over 11 times as many people crossing the border as 2 years ago.

□ 1245

He didn't mention at all the number of people that are deported for committing crimes. The number of people we are deporting right now is about one quarter the number of people who were deported when President Trump was in office, as well.

Now, President Trump wasn't a perfect man, but I will tell you, even at the time, a lot of people were not being deported. What we have is, we have a President who, even after people prove themselves unfit to become Americans by committing crimes, they are not deported.

I want the American public to ponder those numbers. We have gone from 20,000 a month to 238,000 a month.

I also want to point out the huge number of unaccompanied minors coming across the border. There was a time when the mainstream media felt it was horrific if, even for a few days while their parents were being processed, children were without their parents.

We have gone in the last 2 years from around 2,000 to around 8,000 every month of unaccompanied minors crossing into our border.

Where are their parents?

We apparently don't care. We are told: we find sponsors for these young people.

I am told by the Border Patrol that particularly the Central American countries do not like the current policy of the United States of taking in unaccompanied minors here. After all, they believe that is the future of their countries. They do not like us grabbing all their minors.

Where are the advocates?

We let over 8,000 young children into the country every year and we may have no idea whatsoever where their parents are.

Do their parents know where the new sponsors are?

Do we know if these children are being human trafficked?

What do we know? Nothing.

There are 8,000 children, not without their parents for 2 or 3 days, but could be without their parents for the rest of their lives.

I hope America takes away the moral stain on our Nation of allowing the separation of 8,000 or 9,000 minors every month from their parents. I hope the American public does not fawn to the idea that somehow the reason we have 230,000 people every month crossing the border is because of Republican inaction.

Good grief, in the last 2 years, we didn't have the House, we didn't have the Senate, and we sure didn't have the Presidency. The reason for that is because he has changed policy from what it was 2 years ago.

It is not rocket science to get back down to 20,000. You just have to go back to what the laws were 2 years ago, but President Biden clearly doesn't want to do that. He wants as many people coming here as possible. Like I said, the clearest evidence of that is not only letting everybody here, but he is not even deporting people who break the law.

In any event, that is, I think, what we have to look at when we look at the southern border and the policies that are going on down there.

The next thing that I don't think he spent anywhere near enough time on—but it should be required to be addressed by, quite frankly, every politician, in part, because of his inaction at

the southern border and, in part, because of his hatred of the police or as labeling police as racist—we now have over 100,000 fentanyl deaths in this country every month. As I have said before, we have more people dying of illegal drug use in this country every month, twice as many people as died in the Vietnam war collectively.

Now, I am old enough to remember the Vietnam war. I remember the media pounding, pounding, pounding that we had to get out of Vietnam because, by the time it was over, 57,000 Americans had lost their lives.

We are now at 180,000 deaths from illegal drugs each year and what do we get?

We get less focused on the border than ever before, we get attacks on the police for fear of being called racist, and, as a result, that number keeps going up and up and up.

When I think of all the parents who have lost children, people who have lost their siblings, people who have lost their parents because of these drug overdoses—frequently people who are taking drugs don't know fentanyl is in the drugs—I think, why isn't the government doing anything?

To be honest, it kind of stumps me.

Why does the Biden administration not care that over 100,00 people are dying?

Why doesn't the news media make that a banner headline? Wouldn't you think?

Over 9,000 people are dying every month of illegal drug overdose, most of it fentanyl, the press doesn't report about it.

I am more than appalled that President Biden didn't spend more time talking about the huge drug problems we have in America and the huge number of deaths rather than focusing on, what I would consider in some cases, rather minor issues.

The final thing to talk about is President Biden mentioned Ukraine. He did not talk about what we are going to do to end that war. And as more people die over there, admittedly not Americans, but as more people die, one would hope that the Western nations, and the United States in particular—who didn't seem that concerned when the war began, after all, it was predicted that next month Russia is going to invade, blah, blah, blah—but President Biden didn't seem to care that the war was starting.

Then the war started, and we really haven't made much of an effort to end the war. At the end of every war, unless there is complete victory on one side or the other, usually every side gets something and loses something, and has to sell the fact that all these people died for a reason or for a purpose.

The United States is not, from what I can see, making an effort to end this war. Again, we are told thousands of soldiers are dying every month. We know Russia is a very powerful country with regard to nuclear weapons, but also tactical nuclear weapons, the ability to shut down electricity, the ability to use hypersonic missiles.

Nevertheless, it seems as though the Biden administration would be perfectly happy if this war were going on another 2 years from now. That is just intolerable.

As I said, it is a human disaster for Russia and Ukraine, and the possibility that this war will bleed into the United States—or, even more likely, bleed into Poland and bleed into Germany—is something that should concern us all.

But for whatever motivation—and one can only guess at motivations, this is where conspiracy theories come in—the powers that be in the United States—the one-world-government types—don't seem to be bothered by this war at all.

It is something that demands more speculation, and the next time President Biden wanders into some microphones, he should be asked a little bit more: Do you have a plan for wrapping this up?

The answer to which appears to me right now is that, no, he does not.

There are a few issues that I think we should have spent more time on addressing, or that President Biden should have spent more time on addressing. I hope just because it is not a State of the Union Address doesn't mean he can't give speeches. He runs around the country.

First of all, I would call upon President Biden to apologize to the police of the country and admit that the studies that are out here in The Wall Street Journal and in the City Journal are accurate and the police are not racist.

Please, President Biden, stop lying to the American public and tell the American public that Black people are not disproportionately being harmed by the police.

I hope President Biden does something on the border. Above all, he has got to change his policy and send more people back to Mexico, although more Border Patrol agents wouldn't hurt. If he cared about drugs, more drug-sniffing dogs wouldn't hurt.

But, please, President Biden, pay a little attention to what is going on at the border before we lose this country.

I ask you to spend a little time seriously focusing on the fentanyl crisis. We should not be losing over 100,000 citizens every month.

Please, I realize we can't do it, but you can allow Israel or Turkey or France—push them a little bit—to work towards some sort of final agreement with Russia. I think it is obvious Russia probably regrets invading Ukraine given the huge number of people whom they have had die. I can't help but think Ukraine, being the smaller country, the number of people who die is a bigger proportion of their population. Plus I believe they have had tens of millions—or at least they claim—a significant number of civilians who have died in the war.

I think economically it is going to take both Russia and, in particular, Ukraine quite a while to recover from this. It would be nice if President Biden displayed a little bit of humanity. He didn't try to stop the war right before it started. His intelligence agencies predicted it. There were things he could have done. He didn't do them, but I wish now he would step forward and display a little humanity there.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this time to speak, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President. Members are further reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not a perceived viewing audience.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE FOR THE 118TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, February 9, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to submit for printing in the Congressional Record, pursuant to Rule Xl, clause 2 (a)(2) of the Rules of the House, a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on Agriculture on February 8, 2023.

Appendix A of the Committee Rules will include excerpts from the Rules of the House relevant to the operation of the Committee. Appendix B will include relevant excerpts from the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In the interest of minimizing printing costs, Appendices A and B are omitted from this submission.

Sincerely,

GLENN THOMPSON,
Chairman.

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) Applicability of House Rules.—(1) The Rules of the House shall govern the procedure of the Committee and its subcommittees, and the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture so far as applicable shall be interpreted in accordance with the Rules of the House, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondebatable privileged motions in the Committee and its subcommittees. (See Appendix A for the applicable Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.)

(2) As provided in clause 1(a)(1) of House Rule XI, each Subcommittee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and its Rules so far as applicable. (See also Committee Rules III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII and XI, infra.)

(b) Authority to Conduct Investigations.—The Committee and its subcommittees, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, may conduct such investigations and studies as they may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of their responsibilities under Rule X of the Rules of the House and in accordance with clause 2(m) of House Rule XI.

(c) Authority to Print.—The Committee is authorized by the Rules of the House to have