

We are seeing people like Riley Gaines standing up. We are seeing people like Chloe Cole stand up against the madness, as well as Scott Smith in Loudoun County.

We are seeing the people around this country stand up and make their voices be heard, the parents who have taken their schools back, the parents who stood up in Texas and just had a strong election to try to force that State to stand up for universal school choice, to empower parents rather than bureaucrats, to stand up for our kids.

I believe that the American people are right now going through a great awakening, and it is time for the people in this body to catch up to the people.

It is time for the people in this body to stand up and do our part to make sure we restore that constitutional order and the very premise outlined in the Declaration of Independence for the pursuit of happiness so that in July 2026, we can say that our people live in a free country and that we have, in fact, kept the Republic, to quote Franklin after the Constitutional Convention.

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

#### FALSE AND MISLEADING STATEMENTS IN STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

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

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, last week, President Biden presented his State of the Union Address, and the reviews from the public show it to be the most poorly received of any that has ever been measured, since the State of the Union has appeared on television. It is no secret why.

The President's tone and his general approach to the address really encapsulated why a lot of people are so turned off by politics and the work of our government these days.

The partisanship and the eagerness to cast blame and to scapegoat rather than to seek common ground and find solutions is exactly why so many people are so frustrated with the direction of our country.

On top of that, the President said a lot of things that just simply didn't accord with reality, so today, I want to present the 10 most false and misleading statements from President Biden's State of the Union address.

First, near the beginning of his speech, President Biden said not since President Lincoln and the Civil War have freedom and democracy been under assault here at home as they are today. I am afraid that President Biden has a very short memory because we all just lived through the COVID era.

Starting in March 2020, the most basic freedoms and tenets of democracy were not just assaulted in this

country, but they vanished entirely in many places.

Governors like Gavin Newsom in California declared the legislative branch abolished and barricaded Capitol buildings—this Capitol itself was barricaded—ruling by executive decrees, even threatening to declare martial law.

Citizens were not allowed to leave their homes. Businesses were not allowed to open their doors. Children were not allowed to go to school or play sports.

People of faith were not allowed to worship or even gather for Bible study. Beaches were declared off-limits. Curfews were imposed even for adults having dinner with one other couple in a private residence.

Pedestrians were tackled literally for not wearing masks while walking around outdoors. Employees were fired from their jobs. Kids were expelled from school. Consumers were banned from coffee shops over their personal medical decisions.

Social media users were suspended for deviating from the government-approved narrative, even if they happened to present true information.

It is understandable why Biden would like to pretend that none of this ever happened, but we all lived through it, and the scars will be with our country for a very long time.

A second related statement that the President made is that the pandemic no longer controls our lives. The truth is, the pandemic never controlled our lives. It was government actions in response to the pandemic that controlled our lives.

If you look at the data now where you had different States that took very different approaches in dealing with COVID, what we have learned is that States like California, which had by far the worst lockdowns and restrictions on personal freedoms, where people's lives were controlled far more than any other State, actually had among the worst public health outcomes as well.

What you see on the part of many and, in particular, the Biden administration is that it is very clear that this was, in many ways, the worst set of policy decisions our country has seen in modern times.

Restrictions on personal liberty, damage to our economy, and damage to our children was done for absolutely no reason.

There is an attempt to pretend that none of this ever even occurred, which is what the President's remarks in his State of the Union is an example of, but even more so, look at the testimony of members of this administration before Congress this term.

You had Education Secretary Miguel Cardona give false testimony to the Education and the Workforce Committee when he claimed that he never encouraged States to adopt student vaccine mandates when he did precisely that.

You had Health and Human Services Secretary Becerra claim in testimony

before our committee that he never forced anyone to do anything and didn't impose a toddler mask mandate when, in fact, Head Start, which is under his jurisdiction, did have a mask mandate for 2-year-olds and up, which flew in the face of even the policy of the European counterparts of the CDC and the World Health Organization. Mr. Becerra, by the way, could not point to one public health benefit of that policy.

You also had Douglas Parker, who is the head of OSHA, in testimony before my subcommittee claim that the Biden administration never tried to do an employer vaccine mandate when, in fact, they tried to do just that, which would have applied to tens of millions of Americans if the United States Supreme Court had not struck it down.

The third statement from President Biden was a statement that he has already cut the Federal deficit by over \$1 trillion. This is just plainly numerically false.

When President Biden took office, the national debt was \$27.8 trillion. Today, it is \$34.2 trillion. In just a few years, it has gone from \$27.8 trillion to \$34.2 trillion.

The reason is no mystery. The President went on a massive spending spree with bills passed that included multiple trillion-dollar increases in spending, which, of course, has not only increased the debt beyond anything that we have ever seen but is what triggered this inflation crisis that is still causing so many American families to struggle.

That brings me to the next statement of the President during the State of the Union, which is that now our economy is the envy of the world. Far from being the envy of the world, our economy is a source of great dissatisfaction from the folks who live in our country.

A recent New York Times poll asked: Do you think the economy is better or worse than it was 4 years ago, or is it about the same?

Mr. Speaker, 21 percent said it is better; 63 percent said it is worse. Three times as many people said the economy is worse today than it was 4 years ago.

The Times poll also asked: Thinking about the Nation's economy, how would you rate economic conditions today? Mr. Speaker, 28 percent said either excellent or good, and 72 percent said only fair or poor—28 percent to 72 percent.

A related statement from the President's State of the Union was that wages keep going up, and inflation keeps coming down. Both are demonstrably false.

In fact, since President Biden took office, real wages and take-home pay have decreased in some sense because folks are not getting the same number of hours that they used to be getting. When it comes to inflation, here are just a few statistics for you. Prices today at this point compared to 3 years ago, the price of gasoline has gone up by over 33 percent, the price of hotel

rooms by 31 percent, the price of household energy by 29 percent, the price of transportation by 27 percent, the price of airfare by 23 percent, the price of groceries by 21 percent, the price of restaurant meals by 20 percent, the price of used vehicles, new vehicles, housing, rent, overall inflation, personal care, furniture, all in the high teens. The list goes on.

Here is the thing: The President's statement that inflation is coming down, that is not any source of great personal satisfaction or encouragement for folks who are having to deal with these prices.

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Jerome Powell, recently noted we don't expect to see a decline in the overall price level. That doesn't tend to happen in economies.

We don't expect to see a decline in the overall price level. It has not happened yet, and it is not going to happen, according to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

The irresponsible spending policies of this administration have unleashed inflation and a rise in prices that is not going away for American families.

In President Biden's State of the Union, he also said that to remain the strongest economy in the world, we need the best education system in the world. The problem is that this President's policies have made it more difficult for us to have a good education system, let alone the best education system in the world.

Last week, we held a hearing in the Education and the Workforce Committee on charter schools, which have been shown across the board to produce tremendous results in expanding opportunity, lowering achievement gaps, and increasing student achievement across the board. Yet, one of the first things that the Biden administration did as soon as he took office is to go after charter schools and cut charter school grants, not to mention the school shutdowns that were enacted across this country in States like California. This President never came out and did a single thing to get Governors like Gavin Newsom to let kids go back to school.

We are going to be dealing with the harms from these school shutdowns for a very long time. If we look at all the mistakes during COVID, perhaps there was no bigger one than the school shutdown that did so much harm to so many kids.

□ 1845

President Biden also stated: “. . . on my first day in office, I introduced a comprehensive plan to fix our immigration system, secure the border. . . .”

He did no such thing. He did quite the contrary on his very first day in office and his first days in office with dozens of executive actions that made the border less secure. The results were utterly predictable.

We now have had 8 million illegal border crossings since the President took office.

He set the all-time record in his first year. He broke that record in his second year, and he broke that record in his third year.

For several years, going back to 2014 before he took office, there had only been 5 months, a handful of months, out of all of those months and all of those years, where there were more than 100,000 people that crossed the border illegally. That figure has been met each and every month since President Biden took office.

You can look at exactly what he did and trace these consequences to that change in policy, those unilateral changes in policy, where he ended the migrant protection protocols, remain in Mexico; he instituted catch and release; he ended title 42; he ended the border emergency. He completely distorted and warped the parole and asylum systems to let tens of thousands of people into the country.

These are the things that he did when he took office. The idea that he came into office and proposed fixing our system and securing the border could not be more out of touch with reality.

The President also stated that he is ready to fix it, referring to the border. That is what he said: I am ready to fix it.

If he was ready to fix it, he would have fixed it. He would have reversed the unilateral actions that he took when he became President that have caused this unprecedented number of people to come across the border.

What is more, he could provide encouragement for the Senate to pass the Secure the Border Act, H.R. 2, which we passed in the House toward the very beginning of last year. It has been gathering dust over in the Senate. The President hasn't done that.

If he was truly ready to fix it, if he was ready to fix the crisis at our border, he would have done so.

The ninth false and misleading statement from the President's remarks are that violent crime has fallen to its lowest offense level the last 50 years.

In reality, violent crime still has not gone back to what it was before COVID. What is more, property crime has skyrocketed across the country, including a huge increase in vehicle thefts.

The Judiciary Committee has held field hearings in Manhattan, in Chicago, right here in Washington, D.C., where we have seen the absolute horrifying amounts of violent crime and the number of victims that are being created as a result.

We see cities in California, like Los Angeles and San Francisco and Oakland, where they are literally collapsing.

In Oakland, Governor Newsom just sent in extra law enforcement because the crime there is so out of control.

In Los Angeles, the police will tell you not to go outside wearing jewelry to avoid getting mugged.

In Oakland, the In-and-Out just closed its first-ever restaurant because

it wasn't safe for their customers and their consumers.

In Oakland, Taco Bell just announced that its four restaurants are no longer going to have indoor dining and they are no longer going to accept cash.

In San Francisco, we see more and more businesses leaving each and every day. Even the store that inspired “Toy Story” that has been there for decades recently closed, as well.

Madam Speaker, the final truly misleading statement from the President that for many, many Americans could not be more false, is when he said that, “tonight we can proudly say the state of our Union is strong.”

Americans overwhelmingly disagree with that statement. They are overwhelmingly dissatisfied with the direction of the country.

It is time for change. It is time for a new direction. My hope is that the President would have recognized that, would have acknowledged his mistakes when it comes to the economy, when it comes to the border, when it comes to public safety, and proposed a new direction, proposed turning the page.

I would have been very happy to work with him if he had done that. I am still happy to work with him in any way possible, if it is going to change his approach to the economy, to immigration, to crime, and to several other areas.

Unfortunately, we have not seen that yet. As someone who comes from California, I can tell you where we are going, because we have already seen it play out in California.

This President continues to copy California's failed policies. He believes Gavin Newsome when Newsome says that California is a model for the Nation. In fact, California is losing people each and every day. It is very sad.

What used to be the State where anyone can get ahead, it has now become the State so many can't wait to leave behind. For the fourth straight year, we have led the Nation in one-way U-Haul rentals.

If Joe Biden's administration continues to copy California's policies, we are going to see similar results for the entire country.

#### INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR RULE

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I think yesterday will be remembered as a very important and notorious day in the history of the United States workforce for two reasons.

First of all, it was the 1-year anniversary of Julie Su being installed as Acting Secretary of Labor.

Ms. Su was the Labor Secretary in California for Gavin Newsome. During her tenure, California had the worst unemployment in the country. Californians had the highest poverty rate and the lowest level of wage growth in the country. She was responsible for \$31 billion in fraud of the State's unemployment department, and she was the architect of one of the worst laws in our State, or truly our country's history, known as AB5.

Unfortunately, President Biden thought that this was a good resume to be the new Secretary of Labor, so he nominated her last year.

The administration set up a war room inside of the White House to get her confirmed. It was a very, very aggressive campaign to convince Senators to confirm her. Yet, all of that, the Senate rejected her nomination. It was never brought to the floor for a vote. There was bipartisan opposition. At the end of the year, the Senate returned the nomination to President Biden, not having confirmed Ms. Su. Yet, she remains as Acting Secretary of Labor, and has just passed her 1-year anniversary.

This is truly a lawless situation, an end run around the advice and consent process in the United States Constitution. The fact that Ms. Su has been there for a year despite the Senate rejecting her nomination, despite the White House doing everything they possibly could to get her confirmed, and the Senate still refusing to confirm her, is an insult to our Constitution, to our workers, and to the American people.

But it just so happened that on the very day that Ms. Su marked her 1-year anniversary as the unconfirmed Acting Secretary of Labor, the new rule that her department has proposed, the independent contractor rule which is modeled on Gavin Newsome and Julie Su's AB5 law from California, went into effect.

Now, AB5 has been a complete and utter disaster for our State. It has caused folks in over 600 different professions to lose their livelihood, their ability to make a living. What the new rule does, like AB5, is significantly restrict one's ability to be an independent contractor, to work on your own terms, to be your own boss, or to be able to set your own schedule.

In many industries and for many people, if you don't have that ability, then your entire enterprise or business model becomes nonviable, which is exactly what happened in California.

Before AB5 went into effect, in late 2019, early 2020, you had all kinds of people that suddenly had lost their ability to earn a living.

Now a few years later, we recently got some empirical evidence for this as well out of George Mason University, which studied the employment effects in California, specifically of AB5. What the study found is that it decreased self-employment by 10 percent and decreased overall employment by 4 percent, which might be one reason why just today, with the new job numbers out, California's unemployment rate has ticked up again. It is 5.2 percent. It is the second highest unemployment rate in the entire country.

Now, Ms. Su's independent contractor rule is modeled on AB5 in California. President Biden cited AB5 as his model for labor relations nationwide. It is worth noting, by the way, that AB5 has become so toxic, so infa-

mous, that when I asked Ms. Su about it in committee, she wouldn't even say or opine on whether it was a good law. She said she didn't know, had no opinion on the matter. She was the architect and lead enforcer of that very law.

But the new independent contractor rule that the administration is proposing is also creating an extraordinary amount of uncertainty. It has six different factors—in fact, more than that. It places an extraordinary amount of discretion in the enforcers; that is, in Ms. Su, the very architect of AB5.

By the way, AB5 was so bad in California that over 100 different professions were exempted and they are not exempted in this new independent contractor rule from the Department of Labor.

So when I asked the head of the Wage and Hour Division in a recent hearing: Does this apply to various different professions? She could not give an answer to any of them.

I asked her about realtors, a couple million realtors in this country: Can they be considered independent contractors? She couldn't say.

This new rule is about to throw our entire workforce into chaos. Fortunately, it has already invited four different lawsuits that are proceeding in different parts of the country.

On account of those legal challenges, I wrote a letter to Ms. Su yesterday saying, at the very least—obviously, she should withdraw the rule—but at the very least, given the pendency of this legislation, she ought to put the rule on hold until the matter is litigated—until these challenges, which are based on the process, which are based on statute, which are based on the Constitution and due process—until they can be heard, so that the affected individuals will not be in this whiplash, depending on what the courts do and what the Department decides to do from that moment forward.

I wrote that letter to Ms. Su yesterday with it being the effective date of the new rule.

But beyond that, I have also introduced legislation under the Congressional Review Act. The Congressional Review Act allows for a fast-tracked piece of legislation to nullify a rule or regulation that has been put out by a department or agency like this one.

So my Congressional Review Act resolution simply nullifies and stops this new rule propounded by the Department of Labor.

We already have 54 cosponsors for this legislation, and it will be marked up in committee very soon. I am strongly urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in passing this legislation to take back Congress' rightful authority over this area and to prevent our workforce from being thrown into chaos at a time when the American economy simply cannot afford it.

AMICUS BRIEF CASE OF CITY OF GRANTS PASS,  
OREGON V. GLORIA JOHNSON

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, earlier this week I filed an amicus brief with the United States Supreme Court in the case of City of Grants Pass, Oregon v. Gloria Johnson. This is challenging a Ninth Circuit decision.

It has been agreed to be heard by the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, oral argument will be taking place next month, and we expect a decision later this year.

Several of my colleagues here in the House who serve and represent districts in California and on the West Coast have joined me and signed onto the amicus brief.

Madam Speaker, we are urging the Supreme Court to overturn a line of Ninth Circuit cases that started what is known as the Boise decision and that has contributed to the explosion of homelessness and crime in California.

California's homelessness situation has continued to get worst and worst, even as homelessness has gone down in many other parts of the country.

As a matter of fact, right now, about half of the unsheltered homeless in the United States, in the entire country, are in California. The Boise decision is one reason why.

What this decision and its progeny have done is handcuffed cities and counties and municipalities from being able to enforce camping bans or otherwise clear out homeless encampments in public spaces.

This has made it extremely difficult for cities that even want to take a smart and compassionate and pro-public safety approach from being able to do so for fear that they will immediately get sued.

So this is an opportunity for the U.S. Supreme Court to weigh in in a way that will reverse a legal error that was made by the Ninth Circuit that has created many different social problems. I am very encouraged by this opportunity, because if we can re-empower local jurisdictions to take accountability and ownership of this issue and give them the tools that they need to stop this disorder from playing out in our public spaces, then that is going to go a long way toward fighting the crisis of homelessness, toward combating crime, toward getting help to folks who need it who are suffering or abusing drugs or who otherwise have issues related to mental illness, then we can get the homelessness problem in California under control.

□ 1900

It happens to be coming at the same time as the citizens of California are working to place an initiative on the ballot to substantially reverse what is known as Proposition 47.

Proposition 47 decriminalized huge swaths of behavior in California when it came to retail theft and open drug use. By taking tools away from law enforcement and releasing many people from our jails and prisons early, it has

also contributed to the crises of the growing problem of homelessness and crime in California.

For folks in our State who look at the growing problems that we face, the disorder in places especially like Oakland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and far too many communities, there may be hope on the horizon. There may be a path to sanity.

If the United States Supreme Court follows our advice in this amicus brief and if the voters pass the initiative to reverse Proposition 47, then we can bring some sanity back to the way we deal with these issues in California and improve the quality of life for people in our State.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for today and tomorrow.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 13, 2024, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3381. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fiscal year 2022 report on the Preventive Medicine and Public Health Training Grant Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 295c(d); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title VII, Sec. 768(d) (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 10501(m)); (124 Stat. 1002); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3382. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; San Diego County; 2008 and 2015 8-Hour Ozone Non-attainment Area Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0135; FRL-9538-01-R9] received February 27, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3383. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Major final rule — Request From States for Removal of Gasoline Volatility Waiver [EPA-HQ-OAR-2022-0513; FRL-9845-02-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AV73) received February 27, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3384. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting

the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; CA; San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2022-0604; FRL-10574-02-R9] received February 27, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3385. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Oklahoma; Updates to the State Implementation Plan Incorporation by Reference Provisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2022-0279; FRL-10675-02-R6] received February 27, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3386. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Arkansas; Negative Declaration for Existing Sulfuric Acid Plants; Plan Revision for Existing Kraft Pulp Mills [EPA-R06-OAR-2022-0984; FRL-11401-02-R6] received February 27, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3387. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Triclopyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2022-0890; FRL-11763-01-OCSP] received February 27, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3388. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's FY 2023 Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3389. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3390. A letter from the Director, Office of Communications and Legislative Affairs, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Report of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission on Its Administration of the Government in the Sunshine Act for Calendar Year 2023, as well as the cumulative report for calendar years 2020-2022; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3391. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — SF1, National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Adjustments to 2023 North Atlantic Albacore Tuna, North and South Atlantic Swordfish, and Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Reserve Category Quotas [Docket No.: 230911-0216] (RTID 0648-XC870) received March 4, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3392. A letter from the Marine Resources Management Specialist, OPR, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Empire Wind Project, Offshore New York [Docket No.: 240118-0017]

(RIN: 0648-BL97) received March 4, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3393. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — GARFO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act Provisions; American Lobster Fishery [Docket No.: 230929-0224] (RIN: 0648-BF01) received March 4, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3394. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — GAR, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Temporary Measures to Reduce 2023 Atlantic Mackerel Catch [Docket No.: 231006-0241] (RIN: 0648-BM61) received March 4, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3395. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — [Southeast], National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 49 [Docket No.: 230920-0228] (RIN: 0648-BL93) received March 4, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3396. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 230224-0053; RTID 0648-XD276] received March 4, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3397. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 230224-0053; RTID 0648-XD331] received March 4, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3398. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — HMS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; Closure of the General Category October Through November Fishery for 2023 [Docket No.: 220919-0193; RTID 0648-XD387] received March 4, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3399. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-Alaska Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in